A GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH

A. T. ROBERTSON
M.A. D.D. LL.D.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

GRAMMAR OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORICAL RESEARCH

BY
A. T. ROBERTSON, M.A., D.D., LL.D., LITT.D.
Professor of Interpretation of the New Testament in the
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Louisville, Ky.

Digitized by Ted Hildebrandt at Gordon College, Wenham, MA
March 2006

Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύσειν,
ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾖ του θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν.
— 2 COR. 4:7

THIRD EDITION
HODDER & STOUGHTON
LONDON : : : MCMXIX

COPYRIGHT, 1914, BY
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED
COPYRIGHT, 1915, BY
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
THIRD EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED
COPYRIGHT, 1919, BY
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

Composition, Electrotyping, and Presswork:
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE, U. S. A.

TO

THE MEMORY OF

John A. Broadus

SCHOLAR TEACHER PREACHER

PREFACE

IT is with mingled feelings of gratitude and regret that I let this book go to the public. I am grateful for God's sustaining grace through so many years of intense work and am fully conscious of the inevitable imperfections that still remain. For a dozen years this Grammar has been the chief task of my life. I have given to it sedulously what time was mine outside of my teaching. But it was twenty-six years ago that my great predecessor in the chair of New Testament Interpretation proposed to his young assistant that they together get out a revised edition of Winer. The manifest demand for a new grammar of the New Testament is voiced by Thayer, the translator of the American edition of Winer's Grammar, in his article on "Language of the New Testament" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

I actually began the work and prepared the sheets for the first hundred pages, but I soon became convinced that it was not possible to revise Winer's Grammar as it ought to be done without making a new grammar on a new plan. So much progress had been made in comparative philology and historical grammar since Winer wrote his great book that it seemed useless to go on with it. Then Dr. Broadus said to me that he was out of it by reason of his age, and that it was my task. He reluctantly gave it up and pressed me to go on. From that day it was in my thoughts and plans and I was gathering material for the great undertaking. If Schmiedel had pushed through his work, I might have stopped. By the time that Dr. James Hope Moulton announced his new grammar, I was too deep into the enterprise to draw back. And so I have held to the titanic task somehow till the end has come. There were many discouragements and I was often tempted to give it up at all costs. No one who has not done similar work can understand the amount of research, the mass of detail and the reflection required in a book of this nature. The mere physical effort of writing was a joy of expression in comparison with the rest. The title of Cauer's brilliant book, *Grammatica Militans* (now in the third edition), aptly describes the spirit of the grammarian who to-day attacks the

problems of the language of the New Testament in the light of historical research.

From one point of view a grammar of the Greek New Testament is an impossible task, if one has to be a specialist in the whole Greek language, in Latin, in Sanskrit, in Hebrew and the other Semitic tongues, in Church History, in the Talmud, in English, in psychology, in exegesis.[1] I certainly lay no claim to omniscience. I am a linguist by profession and by love also, but I am not a specialist in the Semitic tongues, though I have a working knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, but not of Syriac and Arabic. The Coptic and the Sanskrit I can use. The Latin and the Greek, the French and German and Anglo-Saxon complete my modest linguistic equipment. I have, besides, a smattering of Assyrian, Dutch, Gothic and Italian.

I have explained how I inherited the task of this Grammar from Broadus: He was a disciple of Gessner Harrison, of the University of Virginia, who was the first scholar in America to make use of Bopp's *Vergleichende Grammatik*. Broadus' views of grammar were thus for long considered queer by the students who came to him trained in the traditional grammars and unused to the historical method; but he held to his position to the end.

This Grammar aims to keep in touch at salient points with the results of comparative philology and historical grammar as the true linguistic science. In theory one should be allowed to assume all this in a grammar of the Greek N. T., but in fact that cannot be done unless the book is confined in use to a few technical scholars. I have tried not to inject too much of general grammar into the work, but one hardly knows what is best when the demands are so varied. So many men now get no Greek except in the theological seminary that one has to interpret for them the language of modern philology. I have simply sought in a modest way to keep the Greek of the N. T. out in the middle of the linguistic stream as far as it is proper to do so. In actual class use some teachers will skip certain chapters.

Alfred Gudemann,[2] of Munich, says of American classical scholars: "Not a single contribution marking genuine progress, no work on an extensive scale, opening up a new perspective or breaking entirely new ground, nothing, in fact, of the slightest scientific value can be placed to their credit." That is a serious charge, to be sure, but then originality is a relative matter. The

[1] Cf. Dr. James Moffatt's remarks in The Expositor, Oct., 1910, p. 383 f.
[2] The Cl. Rev., .June, 1909, p. 116.

true scholar is only too glad to stand upon the shoulders of his predecessors and give full credit at every turn. Who could make any progress in human knowledge but for the ceaseless toil of those[1] who have gone before? Prof. Paul Shorey,[2] of the University of Chicago, has a sharp answer to Prof. Gudemann. He speaks of "the need of rescuing scholarship itself from the German yoke." He does not mean "German pedantry and superfluous accuracy in insignificant research — but . . . in all seriousness from German inaccuracy." He continues about "the disease of German scholarship" that "insists on 'sweat-boxing' the evidence and straining after 'vigorous and rigorous' demonstration of things that do not admit of proof." There probably are German scholars guilty of this grammatical vice (are American and British scholars wholly free?). But I wish to record my conviction that my own work, such as it is, would have been impossible but for the painstaking and scientific investigation of the Germans at every turn. The republic of letters is cosmopolitan. In common with all modern linguists I have leaned upon Brugmann and Delbrtick as masters in linguistic learning.

I cannot here recite my indebtedness to all the scholars whose books and writings have helped me. But, besides Broadus, I must mention Gildersleeve as the American Hellenist whose wit and wisdom have helped me over many a hard place. Gildersleeve has spent much of his life in puncturing grammatical bubbles blown by other grammarians. He exercises a sort of grammatical censorship. "At least whole grammars have been constructed about one emptiness."[3] It is possible to be "grammar mad," to use *The Independent's* phrase.[4] It is easy to scout all grammar and say: "Grammar to the Wolves."[5] Browning sings in *A Grammarian's Funeral*:

"He settled *Hoti's* business — let it be!
Properly based *Oun*
Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic *De*,
Dead from the waist down."

[1] F. H. Colson, in an article entitled "The Grammatical Chapters in Quintilian," I, 4–8 (The Cl. Quarterly, Jan., 1914, p. 33), says: "The five chapters which Quintilian devotes to 'Grammatica' are in many ways the most valuable discussion of the subject which we possess," though he divides "grammatica" into "grammar" and "literature," and (p. 37) "the whole of this chapter is largely directed to meet the objection that grammar is '*tenuis et jejuna*.'"

[2] The Cl. Weekly, May 27, 1911, p. 229.

[3] Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., July, 1909, p. 229. [4] 1911, 717.

[5] Article by F. A. W. Henderson, Blackwood for May, 1906.

Perhaps those who pity the grammarian do not know that he finds joy in his task and is sustained by the conviction that his work is necessary. Prof. C. F. Smith (*The Classical Weekly*, 1912, p. 150) tells of the joy of the professor of Greek at Bonn when he received a copy of the first volume of Gildersleeve's *Syntax of Classical Greek*. The professor brought it to the Seminar and "clasped and hugged it as though it were a most precious darling (Liebling)." Dr. A. M. Fairbairn[1] once said: "No man can be a theologian who is not a philologian. He who is no grammarian is no divine." Let Alexander McLaren serve as a good illustration of that dictum. His matchless discourses are the fruit of the most exact scholarship and spiritual enthusiasm. I venture to quote another defence of the study of Greek which will, I trust, yet come back to its true place in modern education. Prof. G. A. Williams, of Kalamazoo College, says[2]: "Greek yet remains the very best means we have for plowing up and wrinkling the human brain and developing its gray matter, and wrinkles and gray matter are still the most valuable assets a student can set down on the credit side of his ledger."

Dr. J. H. Moulton has shown that it is possible to make grammar interesting, as Gildersleeve had done before him. Moulton protests[3] against the notion that grammar is dull: "And yet there is no subject which can be made more interesting than grammar, a science which deals not with dead rocks or mindless vegetables, but with the ever changing expression of human thought." I wish to acknowledge here my very great indebtedness to Dr. Moulton for his brilliant use of the Egyptian papyri in proof of the fact that the New Testament was written in the vernacular κοινή. Deissmann is the pioneer in this field and is still the leader in it. It is hard to overestimate the debt of modern New Testament scholarship to his work. Dr. D. S. Margoliouth, it is true, is rather pessimistic as to the value of the papyri: "Not one per cent. of those which are deciphered and edited with so much care tell us anything worth knowing."[4] Certainly that is too

[1] Address before the Baptist Theological College at Glasgow, reported in The British Weekly, April 26, 1906.

[2] The Cl. Weekly, April 16, 1910.

[3] London Quarterly Review, 1908, p. 214. Moulton and Deissmann also disprove the pessimism of Hatch (*Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 1): "The language of the New Testament, on the other hand, has not yet attracted the special attention of any considerable scholar. There is no good lexicon. There is no good philological commentary. There is no adequate grammar."

[4] The Expositor, Jan., 1912, p. 73.

gloomy a statement. Apart from the linguistic value of the papyri and the ostraca which has been demonstrated, these letters and receipts have interest as human documents. They give us real glimpses of the actual life of the common people in the first Christian centuries, their joys and their sorrows, the little things that go so far to make life what it is for us all. But the student of the Greek New Testament finds a joy all his own in seeing so many words in common use that were hitherto found almost or quite alone in the New Testament or LXX. But the grammar of the N. T. has also had a flood of light thrown on it from the papyri, ostraca and inscriptions as a result of the work of Deissmann; Mayser, Milligan, Moulton, Radermacher, Thumb, Volker, Wilcken and others. I have gratefully availed myself of the work of these scholars and have worked in this rich field for other pertinent illustrations of the New Testament idiom. The material is almost exhaustless and the temptation was constant to use too much of it. I have not thought it best to use so much of it in proportion as Radermacher has done, for the case is now proven and what Moulton and Radermacher did does not have to be repeated. As large as my book is, the space is precious for the New Testament itself. But I have used the new material freely. The book has grown so that in terror I often hold back. It is a long step from Winer, three generations ago, to the present time. We shall never go back again to that standpoint. Winer was himself a great emancipator in the grammatical field. But the battles that he fought are now ancient history.

It is proper to state that the purpose of this Grammar is not that of the author's *Short Grammar* which is now in use in various modern languages of America and Europe. That book has its own place. The present volume is designed for advanced students in theological schools, for the use of teachers, for scholarly pastors who wish a comprehensive grammar of the Greek New Testament on the desk for constant use, for all who make a thorough study of the New Testament or who are interested in the study of language, and for libraries. If new editions come, as I hope, I shall endeavour to make improvements and corrections. *Errata* are sure to exist in a book of this nature. Occasionally (cf. Accusative with Infinitive) the same subject is treated more than once for the purpose of fulness at special points. Some repetition is necessary in teaching. Some needless repetition can be eliminated later. I may explain also that the

works used by me in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum had the citations copied twice with double opportunity for errors of reference, but I have guarded that point to the best of my ability. I have been careful to give credit in detail to the many works consulted.

But, after all is said, I am reluctant to let my book slip away from my hands. There is so much yet to learn. I had hoped that Mayser's *Syntax der griechischen Papyri* could have appeared so that I could have used it, but he sorrowfully writes me that illness has held him back. Neither Helbing nor Thackeray has finished his *Syntax of the LXX*. The N. T. Vocabulary of Moulton and Milligan, though announced, has not yet appeared. Deissmann's *Lexicon* is still in the future. Thumb's revision of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* appeared after my book had gone to the press.[1] I could use it only here and there. The same thing is true of Debrunner's revision of Blass' *Grammatik des neatest. Griechisch*. New light will continue to be turned on the Greek Of the N. T. Prof. J. Rendel Harris (*The Expository Times*, Nov., 1913, p. 54 f.) points out, what had not been recently noticed, that Prof. Masson, in his first edition of Winer in 1859, p. vii, had said: "The diction of the New Testament is the plain and unaffected Hellenic of the Apostolic Age, as employed by Greek-speaking Christians when discoursing on religious subjects . . . Apart from the Hebraisms — the number of which has, for the most part, been grossly exaggerated — the New Testament may be considered as exhibiting the only genuine *fac-simile* of the colloquial diction employed by *unsophisticated* Grecian gentlemen of the first century, who spoke without pedantry — as ἰδιῶται and not as σοφισταί." The papyri have simply confirmed the insight of Masson in 1859 and of Lightfoot in 1863 (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 242). One's mind lingers with fascination over the words of the New Testament as they meet him in unexpected contexts in the papyri, as when ἀρετή (cf. 1 Pet. 2 : 9) occurs in the sense of 'Thy Excellency,' ἔχω παρασχεῖν τῇ σῇ ἀρετῇ, 0. P. 1131, 11 f. (v/A.D.), or when ὑπερῷον (Ac. 1:13) is used of a pigeon-house, τὸν ὑπερῷον τόπον τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτῷ ἐν Μουχινὺρ οἰκίας, 0. P. 1127, 5-7 (A.D. 183). But the book must now go forth to do its part in the elucidation of the New

[1] Prof. E. H. Sturtevant (Cl. Weekly, Jan. 24, 1914, p. 103) criticises Thumb because he retains in his revision of Brugmann's book the distinction between accidence and syntax, and so is "not abreast of the best scholarship of the day." But for the N.T. the distinction is certainly useful.

Testament, the treasure of the ages.[1] I indulge the hope that the toil has not been all in vain. Marcus Dods (*Later Letters,* p. 248) says:, "I admire the grammarians who are content to add one solid stone to the permanent temple of knowledge instead of twittering round it like so many swallows and only attracting attention to themselves." I make no complaint of the labour of the long years, for I have had my reward in a more intimate knowledge of the words of Jesus and of his reporters and interpreters. **Τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωή ἐστιν** (Jo. 6:63).

I must record my grateful appreciation of the sympathy and help received from many friends all over the world as I have plodded on through the years. My colleagues in the Seminary Faculty have placed me under many obligations in making it possible for me to devote myself to my task and in rendering substantial help. In particular Pres. E. Y. Mullins and Prof. J. R. Sampey have been active in the endowment of the plates. Prof. Sampey also kindly read the proof of the Aramaic and Hebrew words. Prof. W. 0. Carver graciously read the proof of the entire book and made many valuable suggestions. Dr. S. Angus, of Edinburgh, read the manuscript in the first rough draft and was exceedingly helpful in his comments and sympathy. Prof. W. H P. Hatch, of the General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York, read the manuscript for the publishers and part of the proof and exhibited sympathetic insight that is greatly appreciated. Prof. J. S. Riggs, of the Auburn Theological Seminary, read the proof till his health gave way, and was gracious in his enthusiasm for the enterprise. Prof. Walter Petersen, Ph.D., of Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas, read all the proof and freely gave his linguistic attainments to the improvement of the book. Last, but not least in this list, Mr. H. Scott, of Birkenhead, England, read the book in galley proof, and in the Accidence verified all the references with minute care and loving interest, and all through the book contributed freely from his wealth of knowledge of detail concerning the Greek N. T. The references in Syntax were verified by a dozen of my students whose labour of love is greatly appreciated. Pres. J. W. Shepherd, of Rio Janeiro, Brazil, and Prof. G. W. Taylor, of Pineville, La., had verified the Scripture references in the MS., which were again verified in proof. The Index of Quotations has been prepared by

[1] Brilliant use of the new knowledge is made by Dr. James Moffatt's New Testament (A New Translation, 1913).

Rev. W. H. Davis, of Richmond College, Va.; the Index of Greek Words by Rev. S. L. Watson, Tutor of N. T. Greek for this session in the Seminary. All this work has been done for me freely and gladly. The mere recital of it humbles me very much. Without this expert aid in so many directions the book could not have been produced at all. I must add, however, that all errors should be attributed to me. I have done the best that I could with my almost impossible task. I have had to put on an old man's glasses during the reading of the proof.

I must add also my sincere appreciation of the kind words of Prof. Edwin Mayser of Stuttgart, Oberlehrer H. Stocks of Cottbus, Pres. D. G. Whittinghill of Rome, Prof. Caspar Rene Gregory of Leipzig, the late Prof. E. Nestle of Maulbronn, Prof. James Stalker of Aberdeen, Prof. Giovanni Luzzi of Florence, Prof. J. G. Machen of Princeton, Profs. G. A. Johnston Ross and Jas. E. Frame of Union Seminary, and many others who have cheered me in my years of toil. For sheer joy in the thing Prof. C. M. Cobern of Allegheny College, Penn., and Mr. Dan Crawford, the author of *Thinking Black*, have read a large part of the proof.

I gladly record my gratitude to Mr. G. W. Norton, Misses Lucie and Mattie Norton, Mr. R. A. Peter (who gave in memory of his father and mother, Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Peter), Rev. R. N. Lynch, Rev. R. J. Burdette, Mr. F. H. Goodridge, and others who have generously contributed to the endowment of the plates so that the book can be sold at a reasonable price. I am indebted to Mr. K. B. Grahn for kindly co-operation. I am deeply grateful also to the Board of Trustees of the Seminary for making provision for completing the payment for the plates.

It is a pleasure to add that Mr. Doran has shown genuine enthusiasm in the enterprise, and that Mr. Linsenbarth of the University Press, Cambridge, has taken the utmost pains in the final proofreading.

I should say that the text of Westcott and Hort is followed in all essentials. Use is made also of the Greek Testaments of Nestle, Souter, and Von Soden whose untimely death is so recent an event. In the chapter on Orthography and Phonetics more constant use is made, for obvious reasons, of variations in the manuscripts than in the rest of the book. It is now four hundred years since Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros had printed the Greek New Testament under the auspices of the University of Alcahi or Complutum, near Madrid, though it

was not circulated till 1522. Erasmus got his edition into circulation in 1516. "The Complutensian edition of 1514 was the first of more than a thousand editions of the New Testament in Greek" (E. J. Goodspeed, *The Biblical World*, March, 1914, p. 166). It thus comes to pass that the appearance of my Grammar marks the four hundredth anniversary of the first printed Greek New Testament, and the book takes its place in the long line of aids to the study of the "Book of Humanity." The Freer Gospels and the Karidethi Gospels show how much we have to expect in the way of discovery of manuscripts of the New Testament. I think with pleasure of the preacher or teacher who under the inspiration of this Grammar may turn afresh to his Greek New Testament and there find things new and old, the vital message all electric with power for the new age. That will be my joy so long as the book shall find use and service at the hands of the ministers of Jesus Christ.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

LOUISVILLE, KY., 1914.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

THE second edition has been called for so soon that I did not have the opportunity for rest that I desired before preparing for it. But I have gone steadily through the book with eager eyes. The result is that some five hundred changes have been made in the text here and there, all for the improvement of the book in one way or another, besides the *Addenda* at the end of the book. Most of the changes are small details, but they are all worth making. The *Addenda* are as few as possible because of the great size of the volume. I have been more than gratified at the kindly reception accorded the book all over the world in spite of the distraction of the dreadful war. Many scholars have offered helpful criticisms for which I am deeply grateful. In particular I wish to mention Prof. C. M. Cobern, Allegheny College, Meadville, Penn.; Prof. D. F. Estes, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.; Prof. Basil L. Gildersleeve, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Prof. E. J. Goodspeed, the University of Chicago; Prof. D. A. Hayes, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Prof. James Moffatt, Mansfield College, Oxford, England; Prof.

C. W. Peppler, Trinity College, Durham, N. C.; Prof. W. Petersen, Bethany College, Lindsborg; Kansas; Mr. William Pitfield, Manchester, England; Rev. Dr. Alfred Plummer, Bideford, England; Mr. H. Scott, Birkenhead, England; Prof. James Stalker, United Free Church College, Aberdeen, Scotland; Dr. Gross Alexander, Nashville, Tenn. I hope that future editions may make it possible to improve the book still further. Various minor repetitions have been removed, though more still remain than is necessary. But the book is at least made more intelligible thereby. The numerous cross-references help also.

In the *Neutestamentliche Studien* (1914) in honour of the seventieth birthday of Dr. Georg Heinrici of the University of Leipzig there is a paper by Heinrich Schlosser "Zur Geschichte der biblischen Philologie." He tells the story of "the first grammar of the New Testament Greek" (1655). It is by Georg Pasor and is entitled *Grammatica Graeca Sacra Novi Testamenti Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. His son, Matthias Pasor, Professor of Theology at Groningen, found his father's manuscript and let it lie for eighteen years because many held grammatical study to be puerile or pedantic and the book would have few readers. Finally he published it in 1655, since he held grammar to be "clavis scientiarum omnisque soliclae eruditionis basis ac fundamentum." He was cheered by Melanchthon's "fine word": "Theologia vera est grammatica quaedam divinae vocis." It is only 260 years since 1655.

New books continue to come out that throw light on the language of the New Testament. Part I (through a) of Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources* (1914) is now a rich treasure in the hands of students. Sharp's *Epictetus and the New Testament* (1914) is a very helpful monograph full of suggestions. A note from Dr. Albert Thumb announces that he is at work on a revision of his *Hellenismus*. So the good work goes on.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

AUGUST, 1915.

PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION

MY grammar has had to live and do its work in spite of the Great War, but the time for the Third Edition has come. In a letter Dr. Alfred Plummer says: "That so technical and expensive a volume should be already in a third edition in the fifth year of the war is indeed triumphant evidence of the value of the book. Scientific grammar is appreciated more widely than one would antecedently have ventured to expect." These few years have allowed time for a thorough verification of the multitudinous references. This enormous task has been done as a labor of love by Mr. H. Scott, of Birkenhead, England, whose patient skill has placed all users of the book under a debt of gratitude that can never be paid. He had already put his invaluable services at my disposal, but now his leisure permitted him to employ his really wonderful statistical knowledge of the Greek New Testament for the benefit of students. These extremely useful tables are found in the *Addenda* to this Edition. I am sure that all New Testament students will appreciate and profit greatly from these tables.

A brilliant student of mine, Rev. W. H. Davis, has found some striking illustrations in the papyri that appear in the Addenda, besides a number from my own readings. Dr. Davis is at work on the lexical aspects of the papyri and the inscriptions. If his studies lead him on to prepare a New Testament lexicon, the world will be the better for such an outcome.

Mr. J. F. Springer, of New York City, has also made some valuable contributions which appear in the *Addenda*. I am indebted also to Prof. Robert Law, of Knox College, Toronto, for *errata*.

I have watched with eagerness for criticisms of the book and have done my best to turn them to the improvement of the grammar. It is gratifying to know that ministers are using it in their studies as one of the regular tools in the shop. In the classroom only selected portions can be covered; but the preacher can use it every day (as many do) in his reading and study of the Greek New Testament. There are many ministers who read the Greek New Testament through once a year, some of it every day, besides the solid, critical study of a Gospel or Epistle with commentary, lexicon and grammar. This is the work that pays one a hundredfold in his preaching. My own reward for the long years of devotion to this grammar is found in the satisfaction that

scholarly ministers are using the book for their own enrichment. I have been gratified to learn of laymen who use the book regularly.

Besides the correction of infelicities and errata that could be found here and there and the Addenda at the end of the volume I have inserted a detailed Table of Contents which will greatly aid one in finding topics in the various chapters. The minute subdivisions with page references will supplement the various Indices to great advantage. The Index of Greek words, large as it is, was still incomplete. It has been doubled in this edition by Mr. Scott's assistance. The Additional Bibliography records the most important recent contributions.

Death has been busy with New Testament linguists. Dr. Gross Alexander, of Nashville, has been claimed by death. Dr. George Heinrici, of Leipzig, is dead. Dr. Albert Thumb, of Marburg, has likewise passed on. Dr. H. B. Swete, of Cambridge, and Principal James Denney, of Glasgow, have also joined the great majority. These are irreparable losses, but there are others and even greater ones. Dr. Caspar Rene Gregory, of Leipzig, though seventy years old, volunteered for the army and was killed in battle in France. With his death perished the hope of a new and revised edition of Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece* for many years to come. A younger man must now take hold of this problem and make available for students the new textual knowledge.

Dr. James Hope Moulton fell a victim in April, 1917, in the Mediterranean Sea, to the German submarine. He was placed in a boat, but after several days succumbed to the exposure and cold. It was he who first applied in detail Deissmann's discovery that the New Testament was written in the current **κοινή** as seen in the Egyptian papyri. He had planned three volumes on the New Testament grammar. Volume I (the Prolegomena) appeared in 1906 (Third Ed., 1908). He had nearly finished Volume II (Accidence), but had done nothing on Syntax, the most important of all. His death is an unspeakable calamity, but his work will live, for his Prolegomena preserves his interpretation of the New Testament language. The Accidence will appear in due time (is already in press). Prof. George Milligan, of Glasgow, has completed the publication of the Vocabulary of the New Testament.

The workers die, but the work goes on. It is pleasant to think that Greek is renewing its grip upon the world. Professors Stuart and Tewksbury are preparing a grammar and lexicon for Chinese students of the New Testament. Japan will do likewise. Prof.

H. P. Houghton, of Waynesburg College, Pennsylvania, is confident that Greek can be saved for the college and the university, for "it is the basis of true culture" (*The Classical Weekly*, Dec. 11, 1916, p. 67). There is nothing like the Greek New Testament to rejuvenate the world, which came out of the Dark Ages with the Greek Testament in its hand. Erasmus wrote in the Preface to his Greek Testament about his own thrill of delight: "These holy pages will summon up the living image of His mind. They will give you Christ Himself, talking, healing, dying, rising, the whole Christ in a word; they will give Him to you in an intimacy so close that He would be less visible to you if He stood before your eyes." The Greek New Testament is the New Testament. All else is translation. Jesus speaks to us out of every page of the Greek. Many of his *ipsissima verba* are here preserved for us, for our Lord often spoke in Greek. To get these words of Jesus it is worth while to plow through any grammar and to keep on to the end.

At the age of sixteen John Brown, of Haddington, startled a bookseller by asking for a copy of the Greek Testament. He was barefooted and clad in ragged homespun clothes. He was a shepherd boy from the hills of Scotland. "What would *you* do with that book?" a professor scornfully asked. "I'll try to read it," the lad replied, and proceeded to read off a passage in the Gospel of John. He went off in triumph with the coveted prize, but the story spread that he was a wizard and had learned Greek by the black art. He was actually arraigned for witchcraft, but in 1746 the elders and deacons at Abernethy gave him a vote of acquittal, though the minister would not sign it. His letter of defence, Sir W. Robertson Nicoll says (*The British Weekly*, Oct. 3, 1918), "deserves to be reckoned among the memorable letters of the world." John Brown became a divinity student and finally professor of divinity. In the chapel at Mansfield College, Oxford, Brown's figure ranks with those of Doddridge, Fry, Chalmers, Vinet, Schleiermacher. He had taught himself Greek while herding his sheep, and he did it without a grammar. Surely young John Brown of Haddington should forever put to shame those theological students and busy pastors who neglect the Greek Testament, though teacher, grammar, lexicon are at their disposal.

In *Current Opinion* for January, 1919, page 18, in an article called "Europe's Ideas of Wilson the Man," one notes a pertinent sentence: "President Wilson once told a member of the diplo-

matic corps in Washington, who repeated it later in Paris, that if he were going to college all over again he would pay more attention to the Greek language, and literature, which American universities, on the whole, neglect." So the scholar-statesman feels. So the preacher ought to feel.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

FULL TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION	xv
PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION	xvii
LIST OF WORKS MOST OFTEN REFERRED TO	lxiii
ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY TO THIRD EDITION	lxxv
PART I — INTRODUCTION	1-139
CHAPTER I. New Material	3-30
The Ideal Grammar?	3
I. The Pre-Winer Period	3
II. The Service of Winer	4
(a) Winer's Inconsistencies	4
(b) Winer Epoch-Making	4
(c) Schmiedel	4
(d) Buttmann	5
(e) Blass	5
III. The Modern Period	5
(a) Deissmann	5
(b) Thumb	6
(c) Moulton	6
(d) Other Contributions	6
(c) Richness of Material	7
IV. The New Grammatical Equipment	8
(a) Comparative Philology	8
1. The Linguistic Revolution	8
2. A Sketch of Greek Grammatical History	8
3. The Discovery of Sanskrit	10
4. From Bopp to Brugmann	10
(b) Advance in General Greek Grammar	12
(c) Critical Editions of Greek Authors	13
(d) Works on Individual Writers	13
(e) The Greek Inscriptions	14
(f) Fuller Knowledge of the Dialects	16
(g) The Papyri and Ostraca	17
(h) The Byzantine and the Modern Greek	21

PAGE
(i) The Hebrew and Aramaic 24
1. The Old View 24
2. A Change with Kennedy 25
3. Deissmann's Revolt 25
4. The Language of Jesus 26
(j) Grammatical Commentaries 29
V. The New Point of View 30

CHAPTER II. The Historical Method 31-48
I. Language as History 31
(a) Combining the Various Elements 31
(b) Practical Grammar a Compromise 32
II. Language as a Living Organism 33
(a) The Origin of Language 33
(b) Evolution in Language 34
(c) Change Chiefly in the Vernacular 34
III. Greek Not an Isolated Language 36
(a) The Importance of Comparative Grammar 36
(b) The Common Bond in Language 37
(c) The Original Indo-Germanic Speech 38
(d) Greek as a "Dialect" of the Indo-Germanic Speech 39
IV. Looking at the Greek Language as a Whole 40
(a) Descriptive Historical Grammar 41
(b) Unity of the Greek Language 41
(c) Periods of the Greek Language 43
(d) Modern Greek in Particular 44
V. The Greek Point of View 46

CHAPTER III. The **Κοινή** 49-75
I. The Term **Κοινή** 49
II. The Origin of the **Κοινή** 51
(a) Triumph of the Attic 51
(b) Fate of the Other Dialects 52
(c) Partial Koines 53
(d) Effects of Alexander's Campaigns 53
(e) The March toward Universalism 54
III. The Spread of the **Κοινή** 54
(a) A World-Speech 54
(b) Vernacular and Literary 56
1. Vernacular 56
2. Literary 57
(c) The Atticistic Reaction 58

PAGE
IV. The Characteristics of the Vernacular **Κοινή** 60
(a) Vernacular Attic the Base 60
(b) The Other Dialects in the **Κοινή** 62
(c) Non-Dialectical Changes 64
(d) New Words, New Forms, or New Meanings to Old Words 65
(e) Provincial Influences 66
(f) The Personal Equation 69
(g) Résumé 71
Phonetics and Orthography 71
Vocabulary 72
Word-Formation 72
Accidence 72
Syntax 73
V. The Adaptability of the **Κοινή** to the Roman World 74

CHAPTER IV. The Place of the New Testament in the **Κοινή** 76-139
I. The New Testament Chiefly in the Vernacular **Κοινή** 76
(a) Not a Biblical Greek 76
(b) Proof that N. T. Greek is in the Vernacular **Κοινή** 79
Lexical 80
Grammatical 82
II. Literary Elements in the New Testament Greek 83
III. The Semitic Influence 88
(a) The Tradition 88
(b) The View of Deissmann and Moulton 89
(c) Little Direct Hebrew Influence 94
(d) A Deeper Impress by the Septuagint 96
(e) Aramaisms 102
(f) Varying Results 106
IV. Latinisms and Other Foreign Words 108
V. The Christian Addition 112
VI. Individual Peculiarities 116
(a) Mark 118
(b) Matthew 119
(c) Luke 120
(d) James 123
(e) Jude 124
(f) Peter 125
(g) Paul 127
(h) Writer of Hebrews 132
(i) John 133
VII. N. T. Greek Illustrated by the Modern Greek Vernacular 137

PAGE

PART II— ACCIDENCE 141-376

CHAPTER V. Word-Formation 143-176
I. Etymology 143
II. Roots 144
III. Words, with Formative Suffixes 146
(a) Verbs 146
1. Primary or Primitive Verbs 146
2. Secondary or Derivative Verbs 147
(b) Substantives 150
1. Primary or Primitive Substantives 150
2. Secondary or Derivative Substantives 151
(α) Those from verbs 151
(β) Those from substantives 154
(γ) Those from adjectives 156
(c) Adjectives 157
1. Primary or Primitive Adjectives 157
2. Secondary or Derivative Adjectives 158
(α) Those from verbs 158
(β) Those from substantives 158
(γ) Those from adjectives 159
(δ) Those from adverbs 160
(d) The Adverb 160
IV. Words Formed by Composition (*Composita*) 160
(a) Kinds of Compound Words in Greek 161
(b) Inseparable Prefixes 161
(c) Agglutinative Compounds (Juxtaposition or Parathesis) 163
1. Verbs 163
2. Substantives 165
3. Adjectives 168
4. Adverbs 169
V. Personal Names Abbreviated or Hypocoristic 171
VI. The History of Words 173
VII. The Kinship of Greek Words 174
VIII. Contrasts in Greek Words or Synonyms 175

CHAPTER VI. Orthography and Phonetics 177-245
I. The Uncertainty of the Evidence 177
(a) The Ancient Literary Spelling 177
(b) The Dialect-Coloured Vernacular 178
(c) The Uncials 179
(d) The Papyri 181

PAGE
II. Vowel-Changes 181
(a) The Changes (Interchanges) with α 182
α and ε 183
ε and α 184
α and η 184
α and o 184
α and ω 184
α and αι 185
α and αυ 185
αι and ε 186
(b) The Changes with ε 187
ε and ει 187
ε and η 187
ε and ι 188
ε and ο 189
ἐάν and ἄν 190
(c) The Changes with η 191
η and ι 191
η and ει 192
ηι and ει 193
η and ῃ 194
η and υ 195
(d) The Changes with ι 195
ι and ει 195
ει and ι 197
ι and ο 198
ι and οι 198
ι and υ 198
(e) The Changes with ο 199
ο and ου 199
ο and υ 200
ο and ω 200
ω and ο 201
(f) The Changes with υ 201
υ and ευ 201
ο and ου 202
(g) The Changes with ω 202
ω and ου 202
ω and ωϋ 203
(h) Contraction and Syncope 203
(i) Diphthongs and Dieresis 204
(j) Aphaeresis and Prothetic Vowels 205
(k) Elision 206
(l) Crisis 208
III. Consonant-Changes 209
(a.) Origin and Character of the Consonants 209
(b) The Insertion of Consonants 210

PAGE
(c) The Omission of Consonants 210
(d) Single or Double Consonants 211
(e) Assimilation of Consonants 215
(f) Interchange and Changing Value of Consonants 217
(g) Aspiration of Consonants 219
(h) Variable Final Consonants 219
(i) Metathesis 221
IV. Breathings 221
(a) Origin of the Aspirate 221
(b) Increasing De-aspiration (Psilosis) 222
(c) Variations in the MSS. (Aspiration and Psilosis) 223
(d) Transliterated Semitic Words 225
(e) The Use of Breathings with ρ and ρρ 225
(f) The Question of **Αὑτοῦ** 226
V. Accent 226
(a) The Age of Greek Accent 226
(b) Significance of Accent in the **Κοινή** 228
(c) Signs of Accent 229
(d) Later Developments in Accent 229
(e) N. T. Peculiarities 230
1. Shortening Stem-Vowels 230
2. Separate Words 231
3. Difference in Sense 232
4. Enclitics (and Proclitics) 233
5. Proper Names 235
6. Foreign Words 235
VI. Pronunciation in the **Κοινή** 236
VII. Punctuation 241
(a) The Paragraph 241
(b) Sentences 242
(c) Words 243
(d) The Editor's Prerogative 244

CHAPTER VII. The Declensions 246-302
I. The Substantive 246
1. History of the Declensions 246
2. The Number of the Cases 247
(a) The History of the Forms of the Cases 247
(b) The Blending of Case-Endings 249
(c) Origin of Case-Suffixes 250
3. Number in Substantives 251
4. Gender in Substantives 252
(a) Variations in Gender 252

PAGE
(b) Interpretation of the LXX 254
(c) Variations Due to Heteroclisis and Metaplasm 254
5. The First or α Declension 254
(a) The Doric Genitive-Ablative Singular α 254
(b) The Attic Genitive-Ablative Singular 255
(c) Vocative in —α of masc. nouns in — της 256
(d) Words in —ρα and Participles in — υῖα 256
(e) The Opposite Tendency to (d) 256
(f) Double Declension 257
(g) Heteroclisis and Metaplasm 257
(h) Indeclinable Substantives 259
6. The Second or o Declension 259
(a) The So-Called Attic Second Declension 260
(b) Contraction 260
(c) The Vocative 261
(d) Heteroclisis and Metaplasm 261
(e) The Mixed Declension 263
(f) Proper Names 263
7. The Third Declension (consonants and close vowels ι and υ) 263
(a) The Nominative as Vocative 264
(b) The Accusative Singular 264
(c) The Accusative Plural 265
(d) Peculiarities in the Nominative 267
(e) The Genitive-Ablative Forms 268
(f) Contraction 268
(g) Proper Names 268
(h) Heteroclisis and Metaplasm 269
8. Indeclinable Words 269
II. The Adjective 270
1. The Origin of the Adjective 270
2. Inflection of Adjectives 271
(a) Adjectives with One Termination 271
(b) Adjectives with Two Terminations 272
(c) Adjectives with Three Terminations 273
(d) The Accusative Singular 274
(e) Contraction in Adjectives 274
(f) Indeclinable Adjectives 275
3. Comparison of Adjectives 276
(a) The Positive 276
(b) The Comparative 276
(c) The Superlative 278
III. Numerals 281
1. The Origin of Numerals 281
2. Variety among Numerals 281
(a) Different Functions 281
(b) The Cardinals 281

PAGE
(c) The Ordinals 283
(d) Distributives in the N. T. 284
(e) Numeral Adverbs 284
IV. Pronouns 284
1. Idea of Pronouns 284
2. Antiquity of Pronouns 285
3. Pronominal Roots 285
4. Classification 286
(a) The Personal Pronouns 286
(b) The Intensive Pronoun 287
(c) Reflexive Pronouns 287
(d) Possessive Pronouns 288
(e) Demonstrative Pronouns 289
(f) Relative Pronouns 290
(g) Interrogative Pronouns 291
(h) Indefinite Pronouns 292
(i) Distributive and Reciprocal Pronouns 292
V. Adverbs 293
1. Neglect of Adverbs 293
2. Formation of the Adverb 294
(a) Fixed Cases 294
(1) The Accusative 294
(2) The Ablative 295
(3) The Genitive 295
(4) The Locative 295
(5) The Instrumental 295
(6) The Dative 296
(b) Suffixes 296
(c) Compound Adverbs 296
(d) Analogy 297
(e) The Comparison of Adverbs 297
3. Adverbial Stems 297
(a) Substantives 298
(b) Adjectives 298
(c) Numerals 298
(d) Pronouns 298
(e) Verbs 298
4. Use of Adverbs 299
(a) Adverbs of Manner 299
(b) Adverbs of Place 299
(c) Adverbs of Time 300
5. Scope of Adverbs 300
(a) Relation between Adverbs and Prepositions 301
(b) Adverbs and Conjunctions 301
(c) Adverbs and Intensive Particles 302
(d) Adverbs and Interjections 303

PAGE
CHAPTER VIII. Conjugation of the Verb 303-376
I. Difficulty of the Subject 303
II. Nature of the Verb 303
(a) Verb and Noun 303
(b) Meaning of the Verb 304
(c) Pure and Hybrid Verbs 304
III. The Building of the Verb 305
IV. The Survival of – μι Verbs 306
(a) A Cross Division 306
(b) The Oldest Verbs 306
(c) Gradual Disappearance 306
(d) N. T. Usage as to - μι Verbs 307
1. The Second Aorists (active and middle) 307
2. Some - μι Presents 311
3. Some – μι Perfects 319
V. The Modes 320
(a) The Number of the Moods or Modes (*Modi*) 320
(b) The Distinctions between the Moods 321
(c) The Indicative 322
(d) The Subjunctive 323
(e) The Optative 325
(f) The Imperative 327
1. The Non-Thematic Stem 327
2. The Thematic Stem 327
3. The Suffix – θι 328
4. The Suffix - τω 328
5. The Old Injunctive Mood 328
6. Forms in — σαι 329
7. The Form in –σον 329
8. First Person 329
9. Prohibitions 330
10. Perfect Imperative 330
11. Periphrastic Presents 330
12. Circumlocutions 330
VI. The Voices 330
(a) Transitive and Intransitive 330
(b) The Names of the Voices 331
(c) The Relative Age of the Voices 332
(d) The So-Called "Deponent" Verbs 332
(e) The Passive Supplanting the Middle 333
(f) The Personal Endings 335
(g) Cross-Divisions 335
(h) The Active Endings 335

PAGE
(i) The Middle Endings 339
(j) Passive Endings 340
(k) Contract Verbs 341
VII. The Tenses 343
(a) The Term Tense 343
(b) Confusion in Names 344
(c) The Verb-Root 344
(d) The Aorist Tense 345
(e) The Present Tense 350
1. The Root Class 350
2. The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present 350
3. The Non-Thematic Present with – να– and – νυ-- 351
4. The Simple Thematic Present 351
5. The Reduplicated Thematic Present 351
6. The Thematic Present with a Suffix 351
(α) The ι class 351
(β) The ν class 352
(γ) The σκ class 352
(δ) The τ class 352
(ε) The θ class 353
(f) The Future Tense 353
(g) The Perfect Tenses 357
1. The Name 357
2. The Original Perfect 357
3. The κ Perfect 358
4. The Aspirated Perfects 359
5. Middle and Passive Forms 359
6. The Decay of the Perfect Forms 359
7. The Perfect in the Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative 360
8. The Perfect Indicative 360
9. Σ in Perfect Middle and Passive and Aorist Passive 362
(h) Reduplication 362
1. Primitive 362
2. Both Nouns and Verbs 362
3. In Three Tenses in Verbs 362
4. Three Methods in Reduplication 363
5. Reduplication in the Perfect 363
(i) Augment 365
1. The Origin of Augment 365
2. Where Found 365
3. The Purpose of Augment 365
4. The Syllabic Augment 365
5. The Temporal Augment 366
6. Compound Verbs 367
7. Double Augment 367
VIII. The Infinitive 368
1. No Terminology at First 368

PAGE
2. Fixed Case-Forms 368
3. With Voice and Tense 369
4. No Personal Endings 370
5. Dative and Locative in Form 370
6. The Presence of the Article 371
7. The Disappearance of the Infinitive 371
8. Some N. T. Forms 371
IX. The Participle 371
1. The Name 371
2. Verbal Adjectives 372
3. True Participles 373
4. In Periphrastic Use 374

PART III — SYNTAX 377-1208
CHAPTER IX. The Meaning of Syntax 379-389
I. Backwardness in the Study of Syntax 379
II. New Testament Limitations 381
III. Recent Advance by Delbruck 383
IV. The Province of Syntax 384
(a) The Word Syntax 384
(b) Scope of Syntax 385
(c) Construction of Words and Clauses 385
(d) Historical Syntax 386
(e) Irregularities 386
V. The Method of this Grammar 387
(a) Principles, not Rules 387
(b) The Original Significance 387
(c) Form and Function 387
(d) Development 388
(e) Context 388
(f) Translation 389
(g) Limits of Syntax 389

CHAPTER X. The Sentence 390-445
I. The Sentence and Syntax 390
II. The Sentence Defined 390
(a) Complex Conception 390
(b) Two Essential Parts 390
(c) One-Membered Sentence 391
(d) Elliptical Sentence 391
(e) Only Predicate 391
(f) Only Subject 393
(g) Verb not the Only Predicate 394

PAGE

(h) Copula not Necessary 395
(i) The Two Radiating Foci of the Sentence 396
(j) Varieties of the Simple Sentence 397
III. The Expansion of the Subject 397
(a) Idea-Words and Form-Words 397
(b) Concord and Government 397
(c) The Group around the Subject 398
1. Subordinate Clause 398
2. With the Article 398
3. The Adverb 398
4. The Adjective 398
5. The Substantive 398
(α) By an oblique case 398
(β) Apposition 398
IV. The Expansion of the Predicate 400
(a) Predicate in Wider Sense 400
(b) The Infinitive and the Participle 400
(c) The Relation between the Predicate and Substantives 400
(d) The Pronoun 400
(e) Adjectives 401
(f) The Adverb 401
(g) Prepositions 401
(h) Negative Particles **οὐ** and **μή** 401
(i) Subordinate Clauses 401
(j) Apposition with the Predicate and Looser Amplifications 401
V. Subordinate Centres in the Sentence 402
VI. Concord in Person 402
VII. Concord in Number 403
(a) Subject and Predicate 403
1. Two Conflicting Principles 403
2. Neuter Plural and Singular Verb 403
3. Collective Substantives 404
4. The Pindaric Construction 404
5. Singular Verb with First Subject 405
6. The Literary Plural 406
(b) Substantive and Adjective 407
(c) Representative Singular 408
(d) Idiomatic Plural in Nouns 408
(e) Idiomatic Singular in Nouns 409
(f) Special Instances 409
VIII. Concord in Gender 410
(a) Fluctuations in Gender 410
(b) The Neuter Singular 411

PAGE
(c) Explanatory ὅ ἐστιν and τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν 411
(d) The Participle 412
(e) Adjectives 412
IX. Concord in Case 413
(a) Adjectives 413
(b) Participles 413
(c) The Book of Revelation 413
(d) Other Peculiarities in Apposition 416
(e) The Absolute Use of the Cases (nominative, genitive, ablative and accusative) 416
X. Position of Words in the Sentence 417
(a) Freedom from Rules 417
(b) Predicate often First 417
(c) Emphasis 417
(d) The Minor Words in a Sentence 418
(e) Euphony and Rhythm 419
(f) Prolepsis 423
(g) Hysteron Proteron 423
(h) Hyperbaton 423
(i) Postpositives 424
(j) Fluctuating Words 424
(k) The Order of Clauses in Compound Sentences 425
XI. Compound Sentences 425
(a) Two Kinds of Sentences 425
(b) Two Kinds of Compound Sentences 426
(c) Paratactic Sentences 426
(d) Hypotactic Sentences 426
XII. Connection in Sentences 427
(a) Single Words 427
(b) Clauses 428
1. Paratactic Sentences 428
2. Hypotactic Sentences 429
3. The Infinitive and Participle as Connectives 431
(c) Two Kinds of Style 432
(d) The Parenthesis 433
(e) Anacoluthon 435
1. The Suspended Subject 436
2. Digression 437
3. The Participle in Anacolutha 439
4. Asyndeton Due to Absence of δέ and ἀλλά 440
(f) Oratio Variata 440
1. Distinction from Anacoluthon 440
2. Heterogeneous Structure 441

PAGE

3. Participles in Oratio Variata 442
4. Exchange of Direct and Indirect Discourse 442
(g) Connection between Separate Sentences 443
(h) Connection between Paragraphs 444
XIII. Forecast 444

CHAPTER XI. The Cases 446-543
I. History of the Interpretation of the Greek Cases 446
(a) Confusion 446
(b) Bopp's Contribution 446
(c) Modern Usage 447
(d) Green's Classification 447
(e) Syncretism of the Cases 448
(f) Freedom in Use of Case 448
II. The Purpose of the Cases 449
(a) Aristotle's Usage 449
(b) Word-Relations 449
III. The Encroachment of Prepositions on the Cases 450
(a) The Reason 450
(b) No "Governing" of Cases 450
(c) Not Used Indifferently 450
(d) Original Use with Local Cases 451
(e) Increasing Use of Prepositions 451
(f) Distinction Preserved in the N. T 452
IV. The Distinctive Idea of Each of the Cases 453
(a) Fundamental Idea 453
(b) Cases not Used for One Another 454
(c) Vitality of Case-Idea 454
(d) The Historical Development of the Cases 454
(e) The Method of this Grammar 456
V. The Nominative Case 456
(a) Not the Oldest Case 456
(b) Reason for the Case 457
(c) Predicate Nominative 457
(d) Sometimes Unaltered 458
(e) The Nominative Absolute 459
(f) The Parenthetic Nominative 460
(g) In Exclamations 461
(h) Used as Vocative 461
VI. The Vocative Case 461
(a) Nature of the Vocative 461

PAGE
(b) Various Devices 462
(c) Use of ὦ with the Vocative 463
(d) Adjectives Used with the Vocative 464
(e) Apposition to the Vocative 464
(f) Vocative in Predicate 464
(g) The Article with the Vocative 465

VII. The Accusative Case 466
(a) The Name 466
(b) Age and History 466
(c) The Meaning of the Accusative 467
(d) With Verbs of Motion 468
(e) Extent of Space 469
(f) Extent of Time 469
(g) With Transitive Verbs 471
(h) The Cognate Accusative 477
(i) Double Accusative 479
(j) With Passive Verbs 484
(k) The Adverbial Accusative 486
(1) The Accusative by Antiptosis 488
(m) The Accusative by Inverse Attraction 488
(n) The Accusative with the Infinitive 489
(o) The Accusative Absolute 490
(p) The Accusative with Prepositions 491
VIII. The Genitive (True) Case 491
(a) Two Cases with One Form 491
(b) Name Incorrect 492
(c) The Specifying Case 493
(d) The Local Use 494
(e) The Temporal Use 495
(f) With Substantives 495
1. The Possessive Genitive 495
2. Attributive Genitive 496
3. The Predicate Genitive 497
4. Apposition or Definition 498
5. The Subjective Genitive 499
6. The Objective Genitive 499
7. Genitive of Relationship 501
8. Partitive Genitive 502
9. The Position of the Genitive 502
10. Concatenation of Genitives 503
(g) The Genitive with Adjectives 503
(h) The Genitive with Adverbs and Prepositions 505
(i) The Genitive with Verbs 505

PAGE

1. Very Common 506
2. Fading Distinction from Accusative 506
3. Verbs of Sensation 507
4. Verbs of Emotion 508
5. Verbs of Sharing, Partaking and Filling 509
6. Verbs of Ruling 510
7. Verbs of Buying, Selling, Being Worthy of 510
8. Verbs of Accusing and Condemning 511
9. Genitive Due to Prepositions in Composition 511
10. Attraction of the Relative 512

(j) The Genitive of the Infinitive 512
(k) The Genitive Absolute 512

IX. The Ablative Case 514
(a) The Name 514
(b) The Meaning 514
(c) Rare with Substantives 514
(d) The Ablative with Adjectives 515
(e) The Ablative, with Prepositions 516
(f) The Ablative with Verbs 517
1. Verbs of Departure and Removal 518
2. Verbs of Ceasing, Abstaining 518
3. Verbs of Missing, Lacking, Despairing 518
4. Verbs of Differing, Excelling 519
5. Verbs of Asking and Hearing 519
6. Verbs with the Partitive Idea 519
7. Attraction of the Relative 519

X. The Locative Case 520
(a) The Name Locative 520
(b) The Significance of the Locative 520
(c) Place 521
(d) Time 522
(e) Locative with Adjectives 523
(f) Locative with Verbs 523
(g) The Locative, with Substantives 524
(h) The Locative with Prepositions 524
(i) The Pregnant Construction of the Locative 525

XI. The Instrumental Case 525
(a) The Term Instrumental 525
(b) Syncretistic? 526
(c) Place 526
(d) Time 527
(e) The Associative Idea 528
(f) With Words of Likeness and Identity 530
(g) Manner 530

PAGE
(h) Degree of Difference 532
(i) Cause 532
(j) Means 532
(k) With Prepositions 534
XII. The Dative (True) Case 535
(a) Syncretism 535
(b) The Decay of the Dative 535
(c) The Idea of the Dative 536
(d) The Dative with Substantives 536
(e) With Adjectives 537
(f) With Adverbs and Prepositions 537
(g) With Verbs 538
1. Indirect Object 538
2. Dativus Commodi vel Incommodi (Ethical) 538
3. Direct Object 539
4. The Dative with Intransitive Verbs 541
5. Possession 541
6. Infinitive as Final Dative 541
7. The Dative of the Agent 542
8. The Dative because of the Preposition 542
(h) Ambiguous Examples 543

CHAPTER XII. Adverbs 544-552
I. Special Difficulties 544
(a) Nature of the Adverb 544
(b) The Narrower Sense of Adverb 544
II. Adverbs with Verbs 545
(a) Commonest Use 545
(b) N. T. Usage 545
(c) Predicative Uses with γίνομαι and εἰμι 545
(d) With ἔχω 546
(e) With Participles 546
(f) Loose Relation to the Verb 546
III. Adverbs Used with Other Adverbs 546
IV. Adverbs with Adjectives 546
V. Adverbs with Substantives 547
VI. Adverbs Treated as Substantives 547
VII. The Pregnant Use of Adverbs 548
VIII. Adverbs as Marks of Style 548
IX. The Adverb Distinguished from the Adjective 549
(a) Different Meaning 549
(b) Difference in Greek and English Idiom 549

PAGE

X. Adverbial Phrases 550
(a) Incipient Adverbs 550
(b) Prepositional Phrases 550
(c) Participles 551
(d) The Verb Used Adverbially 551

CHAPTER XIII. Prepositions 553-649
I. The Name 553
(a) Some Postpositive 553
(b) Not Originally Used with Verbs 553
(c) Explanation 553
II. The Origin of Prepositions 554
(a) Originally Adverbs 554
(b) Reason for Use Of Prepositions 554
(c) Varying History 555
III. Growth in the Use of Prepositions 555
(a) Once No Prepositions 555
(b) The Prepositions Still Used as Adverbs in Homer 555
(c) Decreasing Use as Adverbs after Homer 555
(d) Semitic Influence in N. T. 556
(e) In Modern Greek 557
IV. Prepositions in Composition with Verbs 557
(a) Not the Main Function 557
(b) Preposition Alone 558
(c) Increasing Use 558
(d) Repetition after Verb 559
(e) Different Preposition after Verb 560
(f) Second Preposition Not Necessary 562
(g) Effect of Preposition on Meaning of the Verb 562
(h) Dropping the Preposition with Second Verb 563
(i) Intensive or Perfective 563
(j) Double Compounds 565
V. Repetition and Variation of Prepositions 565
(a) Same Preposition with Different Cases 565
(b) Repetition with Several Nouns 566
(c) Repetition with the Relative 566
(d) Condensation by Variation 567
VI. The Functions of Prepositions with Cases 567
(a) The Case before Prepositions 567
(b) Notion of Dimension 567
(c) Original Force of the Case 567

PAGE
(d) The Ground-Meaning of the Preposition 568
(e) The Oblique Cases Alone with Prepositions 568
(f) Original Freedom 568
(g) No Adequate Division by Cases 569
(h) Situation in the N. T. 569
1. Those with One Case 570
2. Those with Two Cases 570
3. Those with Three Cases 570
4. Possibly Four with ἐπί 570
(i) Each Preposition in a Case 570
VII. Proper Prepositions in the N. T 571
(a) ᾽Ανά 571
(b) ᾽Αντί 572
(c) ᾽Από 574
1. Original Significance 575
2. Meaning 'Back' 576
3. "Translation-Hebraism" in φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό 577
4. Comparison with ἐκ 577
5. Comparison with παρά 578
6. Compared with ὑπό 579
(d) Διά 580
1. The Root-Idea 580
2. 'By Twos' or 'Between' 580
3. 'Passing Between' or 'Through' 581
4. 'Because of' 583
(e) ᾽Εν 584
1. Old Use of ἐν with Accusative or Locative 584
2. ᾽Εν Older than εἰς 585
3. Place 586
4. Expressions of Time 586
5. 'Among' 587
6. 'In the Case of,' 'in the Person of' or simply 'in' 587
7. As a Dative? 588
8. Accompanying Circumstance 588
9. 'Amounting to,' ‘Occasion,’ ‘Sphere’ 589
10. Instrumental Use of ἐν 589
(f) Εἰς 591
1. Original Static Use 591
2. With Verbs of Motion 593
3. With Expressions of Time 594
4. Like a Dative 594
5. Aim or Purpose 594
6. Predicative Use 595
7. Compared with ἐπί and πρός 596
(g) ᾽Εκ 596
1. Meaning 596
2. In Composition 596

PAGE
3. Place 597
4. Time 597
5. Separation 597
6. Origin or Source 598
7. Cause or Occasion 598
8. The Partitive Use of ἐκ 599
9. ᾽Εκ and ἐν 599
(h) ᾽Επί 600
1. Ground-Meaning 600
2. In Composition in the N. T 600
3. Frequency in N. T. 600
4. With the Accusative 601
5. With the Genitive 602
6. With the Locative 604
7. The True Dative 605
(i) Κατά 605
1. Root-Meaning 605
2. Distributive Sense 606
3. κατά in Composition 606
4. With the Ablative 606
5. With the Genitive 607
6. With the Accusative 607
(j) Μετά 609
1. The Root-Meaning 609
2. In Composition 609
3. Compared with aim 609
4. Loss of the Locative Use 610
5. With the Genitive 610
6. With the Accusative 612
(k) Παρά 612
1. Significance 612
2. Compared with πρός 613
3. In Composition 613
4. With the Locative 614
5. With the Ablative 614
6. With the Accusative 615
(l) Περί 616
1. The Root-Meaning 617
2. In Composition 617
3. Originally Four Cases Used 617
4. With the Ablative 617
5. With the Genitive 618
6. With the Accusative 619
(m) Πρό 620
1. The Original Meaning 620
2. In Composition 620
3. The Cases Used with πρό 621
4. Place 621

PAGE
5. Time 621
6. Superiority 622
(n) **Πρός** 622
1. The Meaning 622
2. In Composition 623
3. Originally with Five Cases 623
4. The Ablative 623
5. With the Locative 624
6. With the Accusative 624
(o) **Σύν** 626
1. The Meaning 626
2. History 627
3. In Composition 627
4. N. T. Usage 628
(p) **῾Υπέρ** 628
1. The Meaning 629
2. In Composition 629
3. With Genitive? 629
4. With Ablative 630
5. The Accusative with **ὑπέρ** 632
(q) **῾Υπό** 633
1. The Original Meaning 633
2. In Composition 633
3. The Cases Once Used with **ὑπό** 634
4. With the Accusative 635
5. With the Ablative 635
VIII. The "Adverbial" Prepositions 638
1. **῎Αμα** 638
2. **῞Ανευ** 638
3. **῞Αντικρυ(ς)** 638
4. **᾽Αντίπερα** 638
5. **᾽Απέναντι** 639
6. **῞Ατερ** 639
7. **῞Αχρι(ς)** 639
8. **᾽Εγγύς** 639
9. **᾽Εκτός** 640
10. **῞Εμπροσθεν** 640
11. **῞Εναντι** 640
12. **᾽Εναντίον** 640
13. **῎Ενεκα** 641
14. **᾽Εντός** 641
15. **᾽Ενώπιον** 641
16. **῞Εξω** 642
17. **῞Εξωθεν** 642
18. **᾽Επ-άνω** 642
19. **᾽Επέκεινα** 642
20. **῞Εσω** 642
21. **῞Εως** 643
22. **Κατέναντι** 643

PAGE

23. **Κατενώπιον** 644
24. **Κυκλόθεν** 644
25. **Κύκλῳ** 644
26. **Μέσον** 644
27. **Μεταξύ** 645
28. **Μέχρι** 645
29. **᾽Οπισθεν** 645
30. **᾽Οπίσω** 645
31. **᾽Οψέ** 645
32. **Παρα-πλήσιον** 646
33. **Παρ-εκτός** 646
34. **Πέραν** 646
35. **Πλήν** 646
36. **Πλησίον** 646
37. **῾Υπερ-άνω** 646
38. **῾Υπερ-έκεινα** 647
39. **῾Υπερ-ἐκ-περισσοῦ** 647
40. **῾Υπο-κάτω** 647
41. **Χάριν** 647
42. **Χωρίς** 647

IX. Compound Prepositions 648
X. Prepositional Circumlocutions 648
(a) **Μέσον** 648
(b) **᾽Ονομα** 649
(c) **Πρόσωπον** 649
(d) **Στόμα** 649
(e) **Χείρ** 649

CHAPTER XIV. Adjectives 650-675
I. Origin of Adjectives 650
II. The Adjectival or Appositional Use of the Substantive 651
III. The Adjective as Substantive 652
(a) Any Gender 652
(b) With Masculine Adjectives 652
(c) With Feminine Adjectives 652
(d) With the Neuter 653
IV. Agreement of Adjectives with Substantives 654
(a) In Number 654
(b) In Gender 655
(c) In Case 655
(d) Two or More Adjectives 655
V. The Attributive Adjective 655
VI. The Predicate Adjective 656
VII. Adjective Rather than Adverb 657

PAGE
VIII. The Personal Construction 657
IX. Adjectives Used with Cases 658
X. Adjectives with the Infinitive and Clauses 658
XI. The Adjective as Adverb 659
XII. The Positive Adjective 659
(a) Relative Contrast 659
(b) Used as Comparative or Superlative 660
(c) With Prepositions 661
(d) Comparison Implied by 661
(e) In Absolute Sense 661
XIII. The Comparative Adjective 662
(a) Contrast or Duality 662
(b) Degree 663
(c) Without Suffixes 663
(d) Double Comparison 663
(e) Without Object of Comparison 664
(f) Followed by 666
(g) Followed by the Ablative 666
(h) Followed by Prepositions 667
(i) The Comparative Displacing the Superlative 667
XIV. The Superlative Adjective 669
(a) The Superlative Vanishing 669
(b) A Few True Superlatives in the N. T. 669
(c) The Elative Superlative 670
(d) No Double Superlatives 670
(e) Followed by Ablative 670
(f) No "Hebraistic" Superlative 671
XV. Numerals 671
(a) **Εἷς** and **Πρῶτος** 671
(b) The Simplification of the "Teens" 672
(c) The Inclusive Ordinal 672
(d) The Distributives 673
(e) The Cardinal **Ἑπτά** 673
(f) Substantive Not Expressed 674
(g) Adverbs with Numerals 674
(h) **Εἷς** as Indefinite Article 674
(i) **Εἷς = Τις** 675
(j) The Distributive Use of **Εἷς** 675

CHAPTER XV. Pronouns 676-753
I. Personal. Pronouns 676
(a) The Nominative 676
1. The First Person 677
2. The Second Person 678
3. The Third Person 679

PAGE
(b) The Oblique Cases of the Personal Pronouns 680
1. Originally Reflexive 680
2. **Αὐτοῦ** 681
3. Genitive for Possession 681
4. Enclitic Forms 681
(c) The Frequency of the Personal Pronouns 682
(d) Redundant 683
(e) According to Sense 683
(f) Repetition of the Substantive 684
II. The Possessive Pronouns 684
(a) Just the Article 684
(b) Only for First and Second Persons 684
(c) Emphasis, When Used 684
(d) With the Article 685
(e) Possessive and Genitive Together 685
(f) Objective Use 685
(g) Instead of Reflexive 685
III. The Intensive and Identical Pronoun 685
(a) The Nominative Use of **Αὐτός** 685
(b) Varying Degrees of Emphasis 686
(c) **Αὐτός** with **οὗτος** 686
(d) **Αὐτός** almost Demonstrative 686
(e) In the Oblique Cases 686
(f) **Αὐτός** Side by Side with the Reflexive 687
(g) **Ὁ αὐτός** 687
IV. The Reflexive Pronoun 687
(a) Distinctive Use 687
(b) The Absence of the Reflexive from the Nominative 688
(c) The Indirect Reflexive 688
(d) In the Singular 688
(e) In the Plural 689
(f) Article with 690
(g) Reflexive in the Reciprocal Sense 690
(h) Reflexive with Middle Voice 690
(i) The Use of **Ἴδιος** 691
V. The Reciprocal Pronoun 692
VI. Demonstrative Pronouns 693
(a) Nature 693
(b) Different Shades of Meaning 693
(c) **Ὁ, ἡ, τό** 693
(d) **Ὅς** 695
(e) **Ὅδε** 696

PAGE

(f) **Οὗτος** 697
1. The Purely Deictic 697
2. The Contemptuous Use of **οὗτος** 697
3. The Anaphoric Use 697
4. In Apposition 698
5. Use of the Article 700
6. Article Absent 701
7. **Οὗτος** in Contrast with **ἐκεῖνος** 702
8. As Antecedent of the Relative Pronoun 703
9. Gender and Number of **Οὗτος** 704
10. The Adverbial Uses of **τοῦτο** and **ταῦτα** 704
11. The Phrase **τοῦτ' ἔστιν** 705
12. In Combination with Other Pronouns 705
13. Ellipsis of **Οὗτος** 705
14. Shift in Reference 706

(g) **Ἐκεῖνος** 706
1. The Purely Deictic 707
2. The Contemptuous Use 707
3. The Anaphoric 707
4. The Remote Object (Contrast) 707
5. Emphasis 708
6. With Apposition 708
7. Article with Nouns except when Predicate 708
8. As Antecedent to Relative 708
9. Gender and Number 708
10. Independent Use 709

(h) **Αὐτός** 709

(i) The Correlative Demonstratives 709

VII. Relative Pronouns 710

(a) List in the N T. 710

(b) The Name "Relative" 711

(c) A Bond between Clauses 711

(d) **Ὅς** 711
1. In Homer 711
2. Comparison with Other Relatives 711
3. With Any Person 712
4. Gender 712
5. Number 714
6. Case 714
(α) Absence of attraction normal 714
(β) Cognate accusative 715
(γ) Attraction to the case of the antecedent 715
(δ) Inverse attraction 717
(ε) Incorporation 718
7. Absence of Antecedent 719
8. Prepositions with the Antecedent and the Relative 721
9. Relative Phrases 721
10. Pleonastic Antecedent 722

PAGE
11. The Repetition of ὅς 723
12. A Consecutive Idea 724
13. Causal 724
14. In Direct Questions 725
15. In Indirect Questions 725
16. The Idiom **οὐδείς ἐστιν ὅς** 726
(e) **Ὅστις** 726
1. Varied Uses 726
2. The Distinction between ὅς and ὅστις 726
3. The Indefinite Use 727
4. The Definite Examples 727
5. Value of ὅς? 728
6. Case 728
7. Number 729
8. Gender 729
9. Direct Questions 729
10. Indirect Questions 730
(f) **Οἷος** 731
1. Relation to ὅς 731
2. Incorporation 731
3. Indirect Question 731
4. Number 731
5. **Οἷόν τέ ἐστιν** 732
(g) **Ὁποῖος** 732
1. Qualitative 732
2. Double Office 732
3. Correlative 732
(h) **Ὅσος** 732
1. Quantitative 732
2. Antecedent 732
3. Attraction 732
4. Incorporation 733
5. Repetition 733
6. With **ἄν** 733
7. Indirect Questions 733
8. In Comparison 733
9. Adverbial 733
(i) **Ἡλίκος** 733
(j) **Ὁ** as Relative 734
VIII. Interrogative Pronouns 735
(a) **Τίς** 735
1. Substantival or Adjectival 735
2. The Absence of Gender 735
3. **Τίς** = **ποῖος** 735
4. Indeclinable **τί** 736
5. Predicate Use of **τί** with **τοῦτο** 736
6. In Alternative Questions 736
7. The Double Interrogative 737

PAGE
8. As Relative 737
9. Adverbial Use 738
10. With Prepositions 739
11. With Particles 739
12. As Exclamation 739
13. Indirect Questions 739
14. **Τίς** or **τίς** 739
(b) **Ποῖος** 740
1. Qualitative 740
2. Non-qualitative 740
3. In Indirect Questions 740
(c) **Πόσος** 740
1. Less Frequent than **ποῖος** 740
2. Meaning 740
3. In Indirect Questions 741
4. The Exclamatory Use 741
(d) **Πηλίκος** 741
1. Rare 741
2. Indirect Questions 741
(e) **Ποταπός** 741
(f) **Πότερος** 741
IX. Indefinite Pronouns 741
(a) **Τὶς** 741
1. The Accent 741
2. Relation to **τίς** 741
3. **Τὶς** as Substantive 742
4. With Numerals= 'About' 742
5. With Substantives 742
6. With Adjectives 743
7. As Predicate 743
8. The Position of **τις** 743
9. As Antecedent 743
10. Alternative 743
11. The Negative Forms 743
12. Indeclinable **τι** 744
(b) **Εἷς = Τις** 744
(c) **Πᾶς** = 'any one' 744
(d) **Ὁ Δεῖνα** 744
X. Alternative or Distributive Pronouns 744
(a) **Ἀμφότεροι** 744
(b) **Ἕκαστος** 745
1. Without Substantive 745
2. With Substantive 745
3. With **εἷς** 746
4. With Genitive 746
5. Partitive Apposition 746
6. Rare in Plural 746
7. Repetition 746

PAGE

(c) **Ἄλλος** 746
1. Used absolutely= 'An-other,' 'One Other' 746
2. For Two 746
3. As Adjective 747
4. With the Article 747
5. The Use of ἄλλος ἄλλο 747
6. In Contrast for 'Some - Others' 747
7. Ellipsis of ἄλλος 747
8. The Use of ἄλλος and ἕτερος Together 747
9. ='Different' 747
10. **Ἀλλότριος** 748

(d) **Ἕτερος** 748
1. Absolutely 748
2. With Article 748
3. Second of Pair 748
4. = 'Different' 748
5. = 'Another' of Three or More 749
6. In Contrast 749

(e) Other Antithetic Pronouns 750

XI. Negative Pronouns 750

(a) **Οὐδείς** 750
1. History 750
2. **Οὐθείς** 750
3. Gender 751
4. **Οὐδὲ εἷς** 751
5. **Εἷς—οὐ** 751

(b) **Μηδείς** 751

(c) **Οὔτις** and **Μήτις** 751

(d) With **Πᾶς** 752
1. **Οὐ** πᾶς 752
2. **Οὐ** –πᾶς 752
3. **Μή** -- πᾶς 752
4. **Οὐ μή** -- πᾶν 753
5. **Πᾶς** – **οὐ** 753
6. **Πᾶς** – **μή** 753
7. **Πᾶς** – **οὐ μή** 753
8. **Οὐ** – πάντες 753
9. **Πάντες οὐ** 753

CHAPTER XVI. The Article 754-796

I. Other Uses of **ὁ, ἡ, τό** 754

II. Origin and Development of the Article 754
(a) A Greek Contribution 754
(b) Derived from the Demonstrative 755

III. Significance of the Article 755

IV. The Method Employed by the Article 756

PAGE
(a) Individuals from Individuals 756
(b) Classes from Other Classes 757
(c) Qualities from Other Qualities 758
V. Varied Usages of the Article 758
(a) With Substantives 758
1. Context 758
2. Gender of the Article 759
3. With Proper Names 759
4. Second Mention (Anaphoric) 762
(b) With Adjectives 762
1. The Resumptive Article 762
2. With the Adjective Alone 762
3. The Article not Necessary with the Adjective 763
4. With Numerals 764
(c) With Participles 764
(d) With the Infinitive 765
(e) With Adverbs 765
(f) With Prepositional Phrases 766
(g) With Single Words or Whole Sentences 766
(h) With Genitive Alone 767
(i) Nouns in the Predicate 767
(j) Distributive 769
(k) Nominative with the Article=Vocative 769
(1) As the Equivalent of a Possessive Pronoun 769
(m) With Possessive Pronouns 770
(n) With **Αὐτός** 770
(o) With Demonstratives 770
(p) With **Ὅλος**, **Πᾶς** (**Ἅπας**) 771
(q) With **Πολύς** 774
(r) **Ἄκρος, Ἥμισυς, Ἔσχατος, Μέσος** 775
(s) With **Ἄλλος** and **Ἕτερος** 775
(t) **Μόνος** 776
VI. Position with Attributives 776
(a) With Adjectives 776
1. Normal Position of the Adjective 776
2. The Other Construction (Repetition of the Article) 776
3. Article Repeated Several Times 777
4. One Article with Several Adjectives 777
5. With Anarthrous Substantives 777
6. With Participles 777
(b) With Genitives 779
1. The Position between the Article and the Substantive 779
2. Genitive after the Substantive without Repetition of the Article 779
3. Repetition of Article with Genitive 780

PAGE
4. The Article Only with Genitive 780
5. Article Absent with Both 780
6. The Correlation of the Article 780
(c) With Adjuncts or Adverbs 782
1. Between the Article and the Noun 782
2. Article Repeated 782
3. Only with Adjunct 782
4. Only with the Noun 782
5. When Several Adjuncts Occur 783
6. Phrases of Verbal Origin 784
7. Exegetical questions 784
8. Anarthrous Attributives 784
(d) Several Attributives with Καί 785
1. Several Epithets Applied to the Same Person or Thing 785
2. When to be Distinguished 786
3. Groups Treated as One 787
4. Point of View 787
5. Difference in Number 788
6. Difference in Gender 788
7. With Disjunctive Particle 789
VII. Position with Predicates 789
VIII. The Absence of the Article 790
(a) With Proper Names 791
(b) With Genitives 791
(c) Prepositional Phrases 791
(d) With Both Preposition and Genitive 792
(e) Titles of Books or Sections 793
(f) Words in Pairs 793
(g) Ordinal Numerals 793
(h) In the Predicate 794
(i) Abstract Words 794
(j) Qualitative Force 794
(k) Only Object of Kind 794
IX. The Indefinite Article 796

CHAPTER XVII. Voice 797-820
I. Point of View 797
(a) Distinction between Voice and Transitiveness 797
(b) Meaning of Voice 798
(c) Names of the Voices 798
(d) History of the Voices 793
(e) Help from the Sanskrit 798
(f) Defective Verbs 799
II. The Active Voice 799
(a) Meaning of the Active Voice 799

PAGE
(b) Either Transitive or Intransitive 799
(c) Effect of Prepositions in Composition 800
(d) Different Tenses Vary 800
(e) The Active as Causative 801
(f) Active with Reflexives 802
(g) Impersonal Active 802
(h) Infinitives 802
(i) Active Verbs as Passives of Other Verbs 802
III. The Middle Voice 803
(a) Origin of the Middle 803
(b) Meaning of the Middle 803
(c) Often Difference from Active Acute 804
(d) The Use of the Middle not Obligatory 804
(e) Either Transitive or Intransitive 806
(f) Direct Middle 806
(g) Causative or Permissive Middle 808
(h) Indirect Middle 809
(i) Reciprocal Middle 810
(j) Redundant Middle 811
(k) Dynamic (Deponent) Middle 811
(1) Middle Future, though Active Present 813
(m) The Middle Retreating in the N. T. 814
IV. The Passive Voice 814
(a) Origin of the Passive 814
(b) Significance of the Passive 815
(c) With Intransitive or Transitive Verbs 815
(d) The Passive Usually Intransitive 816
(e) Aorist Passive 816
(f) Future Passive 818
(g) The Agent with the Passive Voice 820
(h) Impersonal Construction 820

CHAPTER XVIII. Tense 821-910
I. Complexity of the Subject 821
1. The Difficulty of Comparing Greek Tenses with Germanic Tenses 821
2. Bad Influence of the Latin on Greek Grammarians 822
3. Absence of Hebrew Influence 822
4. Gradual Growth of the Greek Tenses 822
5. "Aktionsart" of the Verb-Stem 823
6. The Three Kinds of Action Expressed in Terms of Tense 824
7. Time Element in Tense 824
8. Faulty Nomenclature of the Tenses 825

PAGE
9. The Analytic Tendency (Periphrasis) 826
10. The Effect of Prepositions on the Verb 826
11. "Aktionsart" with Each Tense 828
12. Interchange of Tenses 829
II. Punctiliar Action 830
1. The Aorist 831
(a) Aktionsart in the Aorist 831
(α) Constative Aorist 831
(β) Ingressive Aorist 834
(γ) Effective Aorist 834
(b) Aorist Indicative 835
(α) The Narrative or Historical Tense 835
(β) The Gnomic Aorist 836
(γ) Relation to the Imperfect 837
(δ) Relation to the Past Perfect 840
(ε) Relation to the Present 841
(ζ) Relation to Present Perfect 843
(η) Epistolary Aorist 845
(θ) Relation to the Future 846
(ι) Aorist in Wishes 847
(κ) Variations in the Use of Tenses 847
(λ) Translation of the Aorist into English 847
(c) The Aorist Subjunctive and Optative 848
(α) No Time Element in Subjunctive and Optative 848
(β) Frequency of Aorist Subjunctive 848
(γ) Aktionsart 850
(δ) Aorist Subjunctive in Prohibitions 851
(ε) Aorist Subjunctive with οὐ μή 854
(ζ) Aorist Optative 854
(d) The Aorist Imperative 855
(e) The Aorist Infinitive 856
(f) The Aorist Participle 858
(α) Aktionsart 858
(β) ὁ and the Aorist Participle 859
(γ) Antecedent Action 860
(δ) But Simultaneous Action is Common also 860
(ε) Subsequent Action not Expressed by the Aorist Participle 861
(ζ) Aorist Participle in Indirect Discourse (Complementary Participle) 864
2. Punctiliar (Aoristic) Present 864
(a) The Specific Present 865
(b) The Gnomic Present 866
(c) The Historical Present 866
(d) The Futuristic Present 869
3. The Punctiliar (Aoristic) Future 870
(a) Punctiliar or Durative 870

PAGE
(b) The Modal Aspect of the Future 872
(α) Merely Futuristic 873
(β) The Volitive Future 874
(γ) Deliberative Future 875
(c) The Future in the Moods 876
(α) The Indicative 876
(β) The Subjunctive and Optative 876
(γ) The Infinitive 876
(δ) The Participle 877
(d) The Periphrastic Substitutes for the Future 878
III. Durative (Linear) Action 879
1. Indicative 879
(a) The Present (ὁ ἐνεστώς) for Present Time 879
(α) The Descriptive Present 879
(β) The Progressive Present 879
(γ) The Iterative or Customary Present 880
(δ) The Inchoative or Conative Present 880
(ε) The Historical Present 880
(ζ) The Deliberative Present 880
(η) The Periphrastic Present 880
(θ) Presents as Perfects 881
(ι) Perfects as Presents 881
(κ) Futuristic Presents 881
(b) The Imperfect for Past Time 882
(α) Doubtful Imperfects 882
(β) The Descriptive Tense in Narrative 883
(γ) The Iterative (Customary) Imperfect 884
(δ) The Progressive Imperfect 884
(ε) The Inchoative or Conative Imperfect 885
(ζ) The "Negative" Imperfect 885
(η) The "Potential" Imperfect 885
(θ) In Indirect Discourse 887
(ι) The Periphrastic Imperfect 887
(κ) Past Perfects as Imperfects 888
(c) The Future for Future Time 888
(α) The Three Kinds of Action in the Future (futuristic, volitive, deliberative) 889
(β) The Periphrastic Future 889
2. Subjunctive and Optative 889
3. Imperative 890
4. Infinitive 890
5. Participle 891
(a) The Time of the Present Participle Relative 891
(b) Futuristic 891
(c) Descriptive 891
(d) Conative 892
(e) Antecedent Time 892
(f) Indirect Discourse 892

PAGE
(g) With the Article 892
(h) Past Action Still in Progress 892
(i) "Subsequent" Action 892
(j) No Durative Future Participles 892
IV. Perfected State of the Action 892
1. The Idea of the Perfect 892
(a) The Present Perfect 892
(b) The Intensive Perfect 893
(c) The Extensive Perfect 893
(d) Idea of Time in the Tense 894
2. The Indicative 894
(a) The Present Perfect 894
(a) The Intensive Present Perfect 894
(β) The Extensive Present Perfect=a completed state 895
(γ) The Present Perfect of Broken Continuity 896
(δ) The Dramatic Historical Present Perfect 896
(ε) The Gnomic Present Perfect 897
(ζ) The Perfect in Indirect Discourse 897
(η) Futuristic Present Perfect 898
(θ) The "Aoristic" Present Perfect 898
(ι) The Periphrastic Perfect 902
(κ) Present as perfect 903
(6) The Past Perfect 903
(α) The Double Idea 903
(β) A Luxury in Greek 903
(γ) The Intensive Past Perfect 904
(δ) The Extensive Past Perfect 904
(ε) The Past Perfect of Broken Continuity 905
(ζ) Past Perfect in Conditional Sentences 906
(η) The Periphrastic Past Perfect 906
(θ) Special Use of ἐκείμην 906
(c) The Future Perfect 906
3. The Subjunctive and Optative 907
4. The Imperative 908
5. The Infinitive 903
(a) Indirect Discourse 903
(b) Perfect Infinitive not in Indirect Discourse 909
(α) Subject or Object Infinitive 909
(β) With Prepositions 909
6. The Participle 909
(a) The Meaning 909
(b) The Time of the, Tense 909
(c) The Perfect Tense Occurs with Various Uses of the Participle 910
(d) The Periphrastic, Participle 910

CHAPTER XIX. Mode 911-1049
Introductory 911
A. Independent or Paratactic Sentences 914

PAGE
I. The Indicative Mode 914
1. Meaning of the Indicative Mode 914
2. Kinds of Sentences Using the Indicative 915
(a) Either Declarative or Interrogative 915
(b) Positive and Negative 917
3. Special Uses of the Indicative 918
(a) Past Tenses 918
(α) For Courtesy 918
(β) Present Necessity, Obligation, Possibility, Propriety in Tenses of the Past 919
(γ) The Apodosis of Conditions of the Second Class 921
(δ) Impossible Wishes 923
(b) The Present 923
(c) The Future 924
II. The Subjunctive Mode 924
1. Relations to Other Modes 924
(a) The Aorist Subjunctive and the Future Indicative 924
(b) The Subjunctive and the Imperative 925
(c) The Subjunctive and the Optative 925
2. Original Significance of the Subjunctive 926
3. Threefold Usage 928
(a) Futuristic 928
(b) Volitive 930
(c) Deliberative 934
III. The Optative Mode 935
1. History of the Optative 935
2. Significance 936
3. The Three Uses 937
(a) Futuristic or Potential 937
(b) Volitive 939
(c) Deliberative 940
IV. The Imperative 941
1. Origin of the Imperative 941
2. Meaning of the Imperative 941
3. Disappearance of the Imperative Forms 941
4. Alternatives for the Imperative 942
(a) The Future Indicative 942
(b) The Subjunctive 943
(c) The Optative 943
(d) The Infinitive 943
(e) The Participle 944
5. Uses of the Imperative 946
(a) Command or Exhortation 946
(b) Prohibition 947
(c) Entreaty 947
(d) Permission 948

PAGE
(e) Concession or Condition 948
(f) In Asyndeton 949
(g) In Subordinate Clauses 949
(h) The Tenses 950
(i) In Indirect Discourse 950
B. Dependent or Hypotactic Sentences 950
Introductory 950
(a) Use of Modes in Subordinate Sentences 950
(b) The Use of Conjunctions in Subordinate Clauses 951
(c) Logical Varieties of Subordinate Clauses 952
1. Relative Sentences 953
(a) Relative Sentences Originally Paratactic 953
(b) Most Subordinate Clauses Relative in Origin 953
(c) Relative Clauses Usually Adjectival 954
(d) Modes in Relative Sentences 955
(e) Definite and Indefinite Relative Sentences 956
(f) The Use of ἄν in Relative Clauses 957
(g) Special Uses of Relative Clauses 960
(h) Negatives in Relative Clauses 962
2. Causal Sentences 962
(a) Paratactic Causal Sentences 962
(b) With Subordinating Conjunctions 963
(c) Relative Clauses 965
(d) **Διὰ τό** and the Infinitive 966
(e) The Participle 966
3. Comparative Clauses 966
(a) The Relative ὅσος 966
(b) Relative ὅς with **κατά** 967
(c) **Καθότι** in a Comparative Sense 967
(d) ᾿Ως and its Compounds 967
4. Local Clauses 969
5. Temporal Clauses 970
(a) Kin to Relative Clauses in Origin and Idiom 970
(b) Conjunctions Meaning 'When' 971
(c) The Group Meaning 'Until' (‘While’) 974
(d) Some Nominal and Prepositional Phrases 977
(e) The Temporal Use of the Infinitive 978
(f) Temporal Use of the Participle 979
6. Final and Consecutive Clauses 980
(a) Kinship 980
(b) Origin in Parataxis 980
(c) Pure Final Clauses 981
(α) **῞Ινα** 981
(β) **῞Οπως** 985
(γ) ᾿Ως 987
(δ) **Μή, μή ποτε, μή πως** 987
(ε) Relative Clauses 989
(ζ) The Infinitive 989
(η) The Participle 991

PAGE
(d) Sub-Final Clauses 991
(α) **Ἵνα** 991
(β) **Ὅπως** 994
(γ) **Μή, μή πως, μή ποτε** 995
(δ) The Relative Clause 996
(ε) The Infinitive 996
(ζ) **Εἰ** and **ὅτι** 997
(e) Consecutive Clauses 997
(α) **Ἵνα** 997
(β) **Ὥστε** 999
(γ) **Ὡς** 1000
(δ) **Ὅτι** 1001
(ε) The Relative 1001
(ζ) The Infinitive 1001
7. Wishes 1003
8. Conditional Sentences 1004
(a) Two Types 1004
(b) Four Classes 1004
(α) Determined as Fulfilled 1007
(β) Determined as Unfulfilled 1012
(γ) Undetermined, but with Prospect of Determination 1016
(δ) Remote Prospect of Determination 1020
(c) Special Points 1022
(α) Mixed Conditions 1022
(β) Implied Conditions 1022
(γ) Elliptical Conditions 1023
(δ) Concessive Clauses 1026
(ε) Other Particles with **εἰ** and **ἐάν** 1027
9. Indirect Discourse 1027
(a) Recitative **Ὅτι** in Oratio Recta 1027
(b) Change of Person in Indirect Discourse 1028
(c) Change of Tense in Indirect Discourse 1029
(d) Change of Mode in Indirect Discourse 1030
(e) The Limits of Indirect Discourse 1031
(f) Declarative Clauses 1032
(α) **Ὅτι** and the Indicative 1032
(β) The Infinitive 1036
(γ) The Participle 1040
(δ) **Καὶ ἐγένετο** 1042
(g) Indirect Questions 1043
(α) Tense 1043
(β) Mode 1043
(γ) Interrogative Pronouns and Conjunctions Used 1044
(h) Indirect Command 1046
(α) Deliberative Question 1046
(β) The Conjunctions **ἵνα** and **ὅπως** 1046
(γ) The Infinitive 1046

PAGE
(i) Mixture 1047
(j) The Subordinate Clause 1048
10. Series of Subordinate Clauses 1048

CHAPTER XX. Verbal Nouns 1050-1141
I. Kinship 1050
II. The Infinitive 1051
1. Origin 1051
2. Development 1052
(a) The Prehistoric Period 1052
(b) The Earliest Historic Period 1052
(c) The Classic Period from Pindar on 1054
(d) The **Κοινή** Period 1054
(e) The Later Period 1056
3. Significance 1056
4. Substantival Aspects of the Infinitive 1058
(a) Case (Subject or Object Infinitive) 1058
(b) The Articular Infinitive 1062
(c) Prepositions 1068
(d) The Infinitive with Substantives 1075
(e) The Infinitive with Adjectives 1076
(f) The Infinitive with Verbs 1077
(g) The Appositional Infinitive 1078
5. Verbal Aspects of the Infinitive 1079
(a) Voice 1079
(b) Tense 1080
(c) Cases with the Infinitive 1082
(d) The Infinitive in Indirect Discourse 1082
(e) Personal Construction with the Infinitive 1085
(f) Epexegetical Infinitive 1086
(g) Purpose 1087
(h) Result 1089
(i) Cause 1091
(j) Time 1091
(k) The Absolute Infinitive 1092
(1) Negatives 1093
(m) **᾽Αν** with the Infinitive 1095
III. The Participle 1095
1. The Verbals in --τος and —τέος 1095
2. History of the Participle 1098
(a) The Sanskrit Participle 1098
(b) Homer's Time 1098
(c) The Attic Period 1098
(d) The **Κοινή** 1099
(e) Modern Greek 1099
3. Significance of the Participle 1100
(a) Originally an Adjective 1100
(b) The Addition of the Verbal Functions 1101

PAGE
(c) The Double Aspect of the Participle 1101
(d) Relation between Participle and Infinitive 1101
(e) Method of Treating the Participle 1103
4. Adjectival Aspects of the Participle 1104
(a) Declension 1104
(b) Attributive Participle 1105
(α) Anarthrous 1105
(β) Articular 1106
(c) Predicate Participle 1108
(d) The Participle as a Substantive 1108
(e) The Participle as an Adverb 1109
5. Verbal Aspects of the Participle 1110
(a) Voice 1110
(b) Tense 1111
(α) Timelessness of the Participle 1111
(β) The Aorist 1112
(γ) The Present 1115
(δ) The Perfect 1116
(ε) The Future 1118
(c) Cases 1119
(d) The Supplementary Participle 1119
(α) The Periphrastic Construction 1119
(β) A Diminution of the Complementary Participle 1120
(γ) Verbs of Emotion 1121
(δ) Indirect Discourse 1122
(e) The Circumstantial Participle 1124
(α) The General Theory 1124
(β) Varieties of the Circumstantial Participle 1125
(γ) The Absolute Participle in Subordinate Clauses 1130
(f) The Independent Participle in a Sentence 1132
(g) Co-ordination between Participles 1135
(h) **Οὐ** and μή with the Participle 1136
(i) Other Particles with the Participle 1139

CHAPTER XXI. Particles 1142-1193
I. Scope 1142
II. Intensive or Emphatic Particles 1144
1. Limitations 1144
2. The N. T. Illustrations 1147
(a) **Γέ** 1147
(b) **Δή** 1149
(c) **Εἶ μήν, νή** and **ναί** 1150
(d) **Μέν** 1150
(e) **Πέρ** 1153
(f) **Τοί** 1154
III. Negative Particles 1155
1. The Objective **οὐ** and its Compounds 1155
(a) Origin 1155

PAGE
(b) History 1156
(c) Meaning 1156
(d) Uses 1156
(i) The Indicative 1157
(α) Independent Sentences 1157
(β) Subordinate Clauses 1158
(ii) The Subjunctive 1160
(iii) The Optative 1161
(iv) The Imperative 1161
(v) The Infinitive 1162
(vi) The Participle 1162
(vii) With Nouns 1163
(e) **Καὶ Οὐ** 1164
(f) Redundant or Pleonastic **Οὐ** 1164
(g) Repetition of **Οὐ** 1164
(h) The Intensifying Compound Negative 1164
(i) The Disjunctive Negative 1165
2. The Subjective Negative **Μή** and Its Compounds 1166
(a) The History of **Μή** 1166
(b) Significance of **Μή** 1167
(c) Uses of **Μή** 1168
(i) The Indicative 1168
(ii) The Subjunctive 1169
(iii) The Optative 1170
(iv) The Imperative 1170
(v) The Infinitive 1170
(vi) The Participle 1172
(vii) Nouns 1172
(d) The Intensifying Compounds with **Μή** 1172
(e) **Καὶ μή** 1173
(f) Disjunctive Use of **Μή** 1173
3. Combination of the Two Negatives 1173
(a) **Μὴ οὐ** 1173
(b) **Οὐ μή** 1174
IV. Interrogative Particles 1175
1. Single Questions 1175
(a) Direct Questions 1175
(i) No Particle at All 1175
(ii) The Use of Negative Particles 1175
(iii) Other Particles 1176
(iv) Interrogative Pronouns 1176
(v) Interrogative Conjunctions 1176
(b) Indirect Questions 1176
(i) Pronouns 1176
(ii) Conjunctions 1177
2. Double Questions 1177
(i) Direct 1177
(ii) Indirect 1177

PAGE
V. Conjunctions 1177
1. Paratactic Conjunctions 1177
(a) Copulative 1177
(i) **Τέ** 1178
(ii) **Καί** 1179
(iii) **Δέ** 1183
(iv) **᾽Αλλά** 1185
(b) Adversative 1186
(i) **Δέ** 1186
(ii) **᾽Αλλά** 1186
(iii) **Πλήν** 1187
(iv) **Μέντοι** 1188
(v) **῞Ομως** 1188
(vi) **Εἰ μή** 1188
(c) Disjunctives 1188
(i) **῍Η** 1188
(ii) **Εἴτε-- εἴτε (ἐάντε –ἐάντε)** 1189
(iii) **Οὔτε--οὔτε (μήτε—μήτε)** 1109
(d) Inferential Conjunctions 1189
(i) **῎Αρα** 1189
(ii) **Γάρ** 1190
(iii) **Οὖν** 1191
2. Hypotactic Conjunctions 1192
VI. Interjections 1193

CHAPTER XXII. Figures of Speech 1194-1208
I. Rhetorical, not Grammatical 1194
II. Style in the N. T. 1194
III. Figures of Idea or Thought 1198
IV. Figures of Expression 1199
(a) Parallels and Contrasts 1199
(b) Contrasts in Words 1200
(c) Contraction and Expansion 1201
(d) Metaphors and Similar Tropes 1206
ADDITIONAL NOTES 1209-1221
1. **Κ**αθαρίζω or καθερίζω 1209
2. Prothetic Vowels hi the N. T 1209
3. Elision 1210
4. **Π**αρρησία 1210
5. Assimilation of ἐν μέσῳ 1210
6. Rules for Assimilation of Consonants 1210
7. Metathesis 1210
8. Enclitics and Proclitics 1211
9. **Βουστροφηδόν** 1211
10. Perfect of ὁράω 1211
11. Augment in the Past Perfect 1211
12. List of Important Verbs 1212-1220
13. Ablaut 1220

	PAGE
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	1223-1248
INDEX OF GREEK WORDS	1249-1290
INDEX OF QUOTATIONS	1291-1376
(a) New Testament	1291
(b) Old Testament	1361
(c) Inscriptions	1366
(d) Papyri and Ostraca	1367
(e) Greek Literature	1372
(i) Classical	1372
(ii) **Κοινή**	1373
(f) Latin	1376
ADDENDA TO THE SECOND EDITION	1377
ADDENDA TO THE THIRD EDITION	1385
INDEX TO ADDENDA TO SECOND AND THIRD EDITIONS	1433-1454

LIST OF WORKS MOST OFTEN REFERRED TO

I HAD prepared an exhaustive analytic bibliography of the pertinent literature, but it was so long that, on the advice of several friends, I have substituted an alphabetical list of the main works mentioned in the book. The editions of Greek authors, the papyri and the inscriptions will be found in the Index of Quotations. Look there for them. For full histories of grammatical discussion one may turn to Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, vols. I–III (1906-1908); Gudemann, *Grundriss der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie* (2. Aufl., 1909); and Hubner, *Grundriss zu Vorlesungen uber die griechische Syntax* (1883). By no means all the works consulted and referred to in the Grammar are given below. Only the most important can be mentioned. Hundreds that were consulted are not alluded to in the Grammar. But the following list represents fairly well the works that have contributed most to the making of my book. The chief journals quoted are also mentioned here.

ABBOTT, E. A., Clue. A Guide through Greek to Hebrew (1904).

_____, Johannine Grammar (1906).

_____, Johannine Vocabulary (1905).

Am. J. Ph., The American Journal of Philology (Baltimore).

ALEXANDER, W. J., Participial Periphrases in Attic Orators (Am. J. Ph., IV, pp. 291-309).

ALLEN, H. F., The Infinitive in Polybius compared with the Infinitive in Biblical Greek (1907).

Am. J. of Sem. L. and Lit., The American Journal of Semitic, Languages and Literature (Chicago).

Am. J. of Theol., The American Journal of Theology (Chicago).

ANGUS, S., Modern Methods in New Testament Philology (Harvard Theol. Rev., Oct., 1909).

_____. The **Κοινή**, the Language of the New Testament (Princ. Theol. Rev., Jan., 1910).

ANZ, H., Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita (Diss. phil. Hal., XII, 1894, pp. 259-387).

APOSTOLIDES, Essai sur l'Hellenisme Egyptien et ses rapports avec l'Hellenisme classique et l'Hellenisme moderne (1898).
_____, Du grec alexandrin et des rapports avec le grec ancien et le grec moderne (1892).
Archiv fur Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete (Leipzig).
ARNAUD, Essai sur le caractere de la langue grec du N. T. (1899).
ARNOLD and CONWAY, The Restored Pronunciation of Greek and Latin (1885).
AUDOIN, E., De la declinaison dans les langues indo-europeennes (1898).
BABBITT, The Use of **Μή** in Questions (Harvard Studies in Class. Phil., 1901).
BACON, ROGER, Oxford Greek Grammar. Edited by Nolan and Hirsch (1902).
BAMBERG, Hauptregeln der griechischen Syntax (1890).
BARON, Le Pronom Relatif et la Conjonctive en Grec (1892).
BARRY, W., The Holy Latin Tongue (Dublin Rev., April, 1906); Our Latin Bible (*ib*., July).
BAUMLEIN, Untersuchungen uber die griech. Modi und die Partikeln **κέν** und **ἄν** (1846).
_____, Untersuch. uber griech. Partikeln (1861).
BEKKER, Anecdota Graeca. 3 Bde. (1814-1821).
BE.NARD, Formes verbales en grec d'apres le texte d'Herodote (1890).
BERDOLT, Der Konsekutivsatz in der ahem griech. Lit. (1896).
BERNHARDY, G., Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache (1829).
Bibl. Ec. Bibliotheque de l'ecole des hautes Etudes (Paris).
Bibl. Gr. V., Bibliotheque grecque vulgaire (Paris).
Bibl. S., The Bibliotheca Sacra (Oberlin).
Bibl. W., The Biblical World (Chicago).
BIRKE, De Particularum **μή** et **οὐ** Usu Polybiano Dionysiaeo Diodoreo Straboniano (1897).
BIRKLEIN, F., Entwickelungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs (1882).
BLASS, F., Acta Apostolorum (1895).
_____, Die griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis auf August. (1865).
_____, Die Rhythmen der asianischen und romischen Kunstprosa (1905).
_____, Die rhythm. Kompos. d. Hebr.-Briefes (Theol. Stud. und Krit., 1902, pp. 420-461).
_____, Evangelium sec. Lukam (1897).

BLASS, F., Grammatik d. neut. Griech. 2. Aufl. (1902).
_____, Hermeneutik and Kritik (1892).
_____, Philology of the Gospels (1898).
_____, Pronunciation of Ancient Greek (translation by Purton in 1890 of 3. Aufl. of Uber die Aussprache des Griech. 1888).
BLASS-DEBRUNNER, Grammatik d. neut. Griech. 4. Aufl. (1913).
BLASS-THACKERAY, Grammar of New Testament Greek. 2d ed. (1905).
BLOOMFIELD, Study of Greek Accent (A. J. Ph., 1883).
BOHMER, J., Das biblische "im Namen" (1898).
BOISACQ, Les dialectes doriens (1891).
_____, Dictionnaire etymol. de la langue grecque (1907 ff.).
BOLLING, The Participle in Hesiod (Cath. Univ. Bulletin, 1897).
BONHOFFER, A., Epiktet und das N. T. (1911).
BOPP, Vergleichende Grammatik (1857).
Br. W., The British Weekly (London).
BROADUS, JOHN A., Comm. on Matt. (1886).
BROCKELMANN, C., Grunclriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen (1907).
BRUGMANN, K., Elements of Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages (translation by Wright, 1895).
_____, Griechische Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1900), the ed. quoted. Vierte vermehrte Aufl. of A. Thumb (1913).
_____, Grundriss der vergl. Gr. d. indog. Sprachen. 2. Aufl., Bde. I, II (1897-1913).
_____, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (1904).
BUCK, C. D., Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects (1910).
BULTMANN, R., Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (1910).
BURESCH, Γέγοναν und anderes Vulgdrgriechisch (Rhein. Mus. f. Phil., 1891, pp. 193-232).
BURKITT, F. C., Syriac Forms of N. T. Proper Name 1912).
BURROWS, R. M., Discoveries in Crete (1907).
BURTON, E. D., Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the N. T. Gk. 3d ed. (1909).
BURTON-ZWAAN, Syntax d. Wijzen etijden in h. Gr. N. T. (1906).
BUTCHER, S. H., Some Aspects of the Greek Genius (1893).
_____, Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects (1904).
BUTTMANN, A., Grammatik d. neut. Sprachgebrauchs (1859).
BUTTMANN-THAYER, A Grammar of the N. T. Greek (1880).

BYWATER, J., The Erasinian Pronunciation of Greek and its Precursors (1908).
Byz. Z., Byzantinische Zeitschrift (Leipzig).
Cambr. Ph. J., Cambridge Philological Journal.
Cath. Univ. Bull., Catholic University Bulletin.
CAUER, Grammatica Militans. 3d ed. (1912).
CHANDLER, H., A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation. 2d ed. (1881).
CHASE, F. H., The Credibility of the Acts (1902).
CHRIST, W., Geschichte der griech. Literatur bis auf die Zeit Justinians. 4. Aufl. (1905). 5. Aufl. (1913).
CHURTON, The Influence of the Septuagint upon the Progress of Christianity (1861),
CLAFLIN, EDITH, Syntax of Boeotian Dialect Inscriptions (1905).
CLASSEN, J., De Grammaticae Graecae Primordiis (1829).
Cl. Ph., Classical Philology (Chicago).
Cl. Q., Classical Quarterly (London).
Cl. Rev., Classical Review (London).
Cl. W., Classical Weekly (New York).
CLYDE, J., Greek Syntax (1876).
COMPERNASS, De Sermone Gr. Volg. Pisidiae Phrygiaeque mendionalis (1895).
CONYBEARE and STOCK Selections from the LXX. A Grammatical Introduction (1905).
COURTOZ, Les Prefixes en Grec, en Latin et en Francais (1894).
CREMER, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N. T. Greek (1892). Urwick's translation.
_____, Bibl.-theol. Worterbuch d. neut. Gracitat. 9. Aufl. (1902) Cremer-Kogel, neue Aufl. (1912).
CRONERT, W., Memoria Graeca Herculanensis (1903).
_____, Questiones Herculanenses (1898).
CRUM, W. E., Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others (1902).
CURTIUS, G., Greek Etymology. 2 vols. (1886).
_____, Studien zur griech. and lat. Grammatik (1868-1878).
DALMAN, G., Grammatik des judisch-palastinischen Aramaisch (1894).
_____, Worte Jesu (1902).
_____, The Words of Jesus (1902). Translation by D. M. Kay.
DAWES, E. S., Pronunciation of the Gk. Aspirates (1894).
D. B., Dictionary of the Bible (Hastings, 1898-1904).
D. C. G., Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (Hastings, 1906).

DEISSMANN, A., Bible Studies (1901). Tr. by A. Grieve; cf. Bibelstudien (1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (1897).
_____, Biblische Gracitat etc. (Theol. Rundschau, Okt. 1912).
_____, Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus (N. Jahrb. f. d. kl. Alt., 1903).
_____, Die neut. Formel "in Christo" (1892).
_____, Die Sprache d. griech. Bibel (Theol. Rundschau, 1906, No. 116).
_____, Die Urgeschichte des Christentums im Lichte der Sprachforschung (Intern. Woch., 30. Okt. 1909).
_____, Hellenistisches Griechisch (Herzog-Hauck's Realencyc., VII, 1899).
_____, Licht vom Osten (1908).
_____, Light from the Ancient East (1910). Tr. by Stachan.
_____, New Light on the N. T. (1907). Tr. by Strachan.
_____, Papyri (Encyc. Bibl., III, 1902).
_____, St. Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912).
DELBRIYCE, B., Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis (1867).
_____, Grundriss der vergl. Gramm. d. indog. Spracheh. Syntax. Bde. III-V (1893, 1897, 1900).
_____, Introduction to the Study of Language (1882). Einleitung in das Sprachstudium. 4. Aufl. (1904). 5. Aufl. (1913).
_____, Syntaktische Forschungen. 5 Bde. (1871-1888).
DICK, Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus (1900).1
DICKEY, S., New Points of View for the Study of the Greek of the N. T. (Princeton Theol. Rev., Oct., 1903).
DIEL, De enuntiatis finalibus apud graecarum rerum scriptores posterioris aetatis (1894).
DIETERICH, K., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Sprache von der hellen. Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrh. n. Chr. (1898).
DONALDSON, J. W., The New Cratylus (1859).
DRAEGER, Hist. Syntax d. lat. Sprache (1878-1881).
Dubl. Rev., The Dublin Review (Dublin).
DURR, Sprachliche Untersuchungen (1899).
DYROFF, A., Geschichte des Pronomen Reflexivum (1892, 1893).
EARLE, M. L., Classical Papers (1912).
EBELING, H., Griechisch-deutsches Worterbuch zum N. T. (1913).
ECKINGER, Die Orthographie lateinischer Wirter in griech. Inschriften (1893).
E. G. T., Expositor's Greek Testament.
Encyc. Bibl., Encyclopaedia Biblica.
Encyc. Brit., Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th ed. (1910).

ENGEL, E., Die Aussprache des Griechischen (1887).
ERNAULT, Du Parfait en Grec et en Latin (1886).
EVANS, A. J., Cretan Pictographs and Pre-Phoenician Script (1895).
_____, Further Researches (1898).
Exp., The Expositor (London).
Expos. T., The Expository Times (Edinburgh).
FARNELL, L. R., Greek Conditional and Relative Sentences (1892).
FARRAR, F. W., Greek Syntax (1876).
FICK-BECHTEL, Die griechischen Personennamen. 2.1Aufl. (1894).
FIELD, F., Otium NorVicense. Pars Tertia (1881).
FLENSBERG, Uber Ursprung und Bildung des Pron. αὐτός (1893).
FOWLER, The Negatives of the Indo-European Languages (1896).
FOY, K., Lautsystem der griech. Vulgarsprache (1879).
FRANKEL, Griechische Denominativa (1906).
FRENZEL, Die Entwickr des relativen Satzbaues im Griech. (1889).
_____, Die Entwick. der Satze mit πρίν (1896).
FUCHS, A., Die Temporalsatze mit den Konjunktionen "bis" und "so lang als" (1902).
FUHRER, De Particulae ὡς cum Participiis et Praepos. punctae Usu Thucydideo (1889).
GALLOWAY, W. F., On the Use of **Μή** with the Participle in Classical Greek (1897).
GEDDES, A Compendious Greek Grammar (1888).
GELDART, The Modern Greek Language in Its Relation to Ancient Greek (1870).
GERSDORF, C. G., Beitrage zur Sprachcharakteristik der Schriftsteller des N. T. (1816).
GESENIUS-KATITZSCH, Hebrew Grammar.
GEYER, M., Observationes epigraphicae de praepositionum graec. forma et usu (1880).
GILDERSLEEVE, B. L., Editions of Pindar and Justin Martyr.
_____, Latin Grammar. Many editions since 1867.
_____, Notes on Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb (1910).
_____, Numerous articles in the American Journal of Philology.
GILDERSLEEVE and MILLER, Syntax of Classical Greek. Part I (1900), Part II (1911).
Gildersleeve Studies. Volume in honour of Prof. Gildersleeve of Johns Hopkins (1902).
GILES, P., A Short Manual of Comparative Philology. 2d ed. (1901).
_____, The Greek Language (Encyc. Britannica, 1910).

GILES-HERTEL, Vergl. Grammatik (1896). Tr. of Giles' Manual.
GOETZELER, L., De Polybii elocutione (1887).
_____, Einfluss d. Dion. Hal. auf d. Sprachgebrauch 1891).
GOODSPEED, E. J., Did Alexandria Influence the Nautical Language of St. Luke? (The Expositor, VIII, 1903, pp. 130-141).
GOODWIN, W. W., Greek Grammar. Various editions.
_____, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. Rev. Ed. (1890).
GRANIT, De Inf. et Part. in Inscr. Dial. Graec. Questiones Synt. (1892).
GREEN, **Μή** for **οὐ** before Lucian (Studies in Honour of B. Gildersleeve, 1902).
GREEN, B., Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax (1897).
GREEN, S. G., Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek N. T. Rev. Ed. (1904).
GREGORY, C. R., Canon and Text of the N. T. (1907).
_____, Die griech. Handschriften d. N. T. (1908).
_____, Nov. Test. Graece, ed. Tischendorf. Bd. III, Prolegomena (1884-1894).
_____, Textkritik d. N. T. 3 Bde. (1900-1909).
GRIMM-THAYER, A Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).
GRUNEWALD, L., Der freie formeihafte Inf. d. Limitation im Griech. (1888).
GUDEMANN, A., Grundriss der -Geschichte d. Klass: Philologie. 2. Aufl. (1909).
GUILLEMARD, W. H., Hebraisms in the Greek Testament (1879).
GUNTHER, R., Die Prapos. in d. griech. Dialektinschriften (Indog. Forsch., 1906).
HADLEY and ALLEN, Greek Grammar (1895).
HADLEY, JAMES, Essays Philological and Critical (1873).
_____, Language of the N. T. (vol. II, Hackett and Abbott's ed. of Smith's B. D., 1898).
HAHNE, Zur sprachlichen Asthetik d. Griechischen (1896).
HALE, W. G., The Anticipatory Subj. in Gk. and Lat. (Stud. Cl. Phil., 1895).
_____, The *Cum* Constructions (Studies in Class. 1887).
_____, The Origin of Subj. and Opt. Conditions in Gk. and Lat. (Harvard Studies in Class. Philol., 1901).
HAMILTON, The Negative Compounds in Greek (1899).
HAMMER, De **τέ** Particulae Usu Herodoteo Thucydideo Xenophonteo (1904).
HAMMERSCHMIDT, Uber die Grundb. von Konjunktiv and Optativ.

HARNACK, A., Luke the Physician (1907).
_____, The Acts of the Apostles (1909).
HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Side-Lights on N. T. Research (1908).
HARRISON, GESSNER, A Treatise on the Philology of Greek Prepositions (1858).
HARRISON, Miss JANE, Prol. to the Study of Greek Religion (1903).
HARSING, C., De Optativi in Chartis Aegyptiis Usu. Diss. Bonn (1910).
HARTEL, Abriss der Gr. d. horn. und herod. Dial. (1888).
HARTUNG, J. A., Lehre von den Partikeln der griech. Spr., I, II (1832-1833).
HATCH, E., Essays in Bibl. Greek (1892).
HATCH, W. H. P., Some Illustrations of N. T. Usage from Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor (Journ. of Bibl. Lit., 1908, pp. 134-146).
HATZIDAKIS, G. N., Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik (1892).
HAVERS, W., Untersuch. zur Kasussyntax der indog. Sprachen (1911).
HAWKINS, J. C., Horae Synopticae. 2d ed. (1909).
HEINE, G., Synonymik des neutest. Griechisch (1898).
HEINRICI, K. F., Der literarische Charakter der neutest. Schriften (1908).
HEIMULLER, W., Im Narnen Jesu (1902).
HELBING, R., Die Prapos. bei Herodot und andern Historikern (1904).
_____, Grammatik der Septuaginta. Laut- und Wortlehre (1907).
_____, Uber den Gebrauch des echten und soziativen Dativs bei Herodot.
HENRY, Precis de grammaire du grec et du latin. 5th ed. (1894). Elliott's tr. of 11st ed. (1890).
Hermes, Zeitschrift fur klassische Philologie.
HESSELING, D. C., De Koine en de oude dialekten van Griechenland (1906).
HICKS, E. L., St. Paul and Hellenism (Studia Biblica et Eccl., 1896).
_____, Traces of Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the N. T. (1896).
_____, Use of Political Terms in the N. T. (Class. Rev., March and April, 1887).
HICKS, E. L., and HILL, G. F., A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions (1901).

HIRT, H., Handbuch der griech. Laut- und Formenlehre (1902). 2. Aufl. (1912).
HOBART, W. K., The Medical Language of Luke (1882).
HOFFMANN, F., Neutestamentliche Bibelstudien. '5 Bde. (1903). Uber die Entwick. des Begriffs der Grammatik bei den Alten (1891).
HOFFMANN, O., Das Prdsens der indog. Grundsprache (1889).
_____, Die griechischen Dialekte, I–III (1891-1898).
_____, Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum (1906).
_____, Geschichte d. griech. Sprache (1911).
HOGARTH, D. G., Philip and Alexander (1897).
HOLL, K., Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in nachchristlicher Zeit (Hermes, 1908, 43, pp. 243 ff.).
HOOLE, C. H., The Classical Element in the N. T. (1888).
HORT, F. J. A., Notes on Orthography (pp. 141-173, vol. II of the N. T. in the Original Greek, 1882).
HOWES, The Use of **Μή** with the Participle (Harv. St. in Cl. Ph., 1901).
HATCH and REDPATH, Concordance to the LXX (1897).
HUBNER, E., Grundriss zu Vorlesungen uber die griech. Syntax (1883).
HUBSCHMANN, Zur Kasuslehre (1875).
HUMPHREYS, M. W., The Problems of Greek (Congress of Arts and Sciences, 1904, vol. III, pp. 171 ff.).
Indog. Forsch., Indogermanische Forschungen (Stratiburg).
IMMER, J., Hermeneutics of the N. T. Tr. by A. H. Newman (1877).
I*ntern. Woch*., Internationale Wochenschrift.
JACOBSTHAL, H. K., Der Gebrauch der Tempora und Modi in den kretischen Dialektinschriften (1906).
JACQUIER, E., Histoire des Livres du N. T. Tomes I–IV. Ch. ii, Tome I, Langue du N. T.
J. kl. Ph., Jahrbuch fur klass. Philologie (Leipzig).
JANNARIS, A. N., A Historical Greek Grammar (1897).
_____, On the True Meaning of the **Κοινή** (Class. Rev., 1903, pp. 93 ff.).
JEBB, R. C., Attic Orators. 2d ed. (1893).
_____, Introduction to the Iliad and the Odyssey (1892).
_____, On the Relation of Classical to Modern Greek (Appendix to Vincent and Dickson's Handbook to Mod. Gk., 1887).
JELF, W. E., A Grammar of the Greek Language. 2 vols. (1866).

JOHANNESSOHN, M., Der Gebrauch der Kasus uncl der Praposi-
tionen in der Septuaginta. Teil I (1910).
JOLLY, Ein Kapitel d. vergl. Syntax. Der Konjunktiv und Op-
tativ.
_____, Geschichte des lnfinitivs im Indog. (1873).
JOY, On the Syntax of Some Prepositions in the Greek Dialects
(1905).
J. of Phil., The Journal of Philology (London).
J. B. L., The Journal of Biblical Literature (Boston).
J. H. S., The Journal Of Hellenic Studies (London).
J. T. S., The Journal of Theological Studies (London).
JULICHER, A., Introduction to the N. T. Tr. by Ward (1904).
KAERST, J., Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters (1901).
KAIBEL, Stil und Text der **Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία**.
KALKER, F., Questioned de elocutione Polybiana (1880).
KALLENBERG, Stud. uber den griech. Artikel (1891).
KAUTZSCH, E., Grammatik d. bibl. Aram. (1884).
KENNEDY, H. A. A., Recent Research in the Language of the
N. T. (The Expos. T., xii, 1901).
_____, Sources of N. T. Greek (1895).
_____, St Paul and the Mystery Religions (1913).
KENYON, F. G., Evidence of the Papyri for Textual Criticism of
the N. T. (1905).
_____, Handbook to the Textual Crit. of the N. T. 2d ed. (1912).
_____, Palaeography of the Greek Papyri (1899).
_____, Papyri (Hastings' D. B., extra vol., 1904).
KING and COOKSON, The Principles of Sound and Inflexion as
Illustrated in the Greek and Latin Languages (1888).
KRAUSS, S., Griechische and lateinische Lehnworter in Talmud,
Midrasch und Targum. I (1898), II (1899).
KREBS, F., Die Prapositionen bei Polybius (1882. Schanz' Bei-
trage).
_____, Die Prapositionsadrerbien in der spateren hist. Gracitat.
Tl. I (1889).
_____, Zur Rektion der Kasus in der spateren hist. Gracit. (1887–
1890).
KRENKEL, Josephus und Lukas (1894).
KRETSCHMER, P., Die Einl. in die Geschichte der griech. Sprache
(1906).
_____, Die Entstehung der **Κοινή** (Sitz. ber. d. Wien. Akad., 1900).
_____, Die griech. Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht
(1894).

KRUMBACHER, K., Beitrage zu einer Geschichte der griech. Sprache (Kuhn's Zeitschr., 1885, pp. 481-545).
_____, Das Problem d. neugriech. Schriftsprache (1902).
_____, Das Programm des neuen Thesaurus d. griech. Spr. (1909).
_____, Die griech. Lit. des Mittelalters (Kultur d. Gegenwart, T1. I, Abt. viii, 1905).
KUHNER-BLASS, Ausfuhrliche Grammatik d.griech. Sprache. 3. Aufl. of Kuhner. Teil I, Bde. I, II (1890, 1892).
KUHNER-GERTH, Ausf. Gramm. d. griech. Spr. 3. Aufl. of Kuhner. TI. II, Bde. I, II (1898, 1904).
KUHRING, G., De praepositionum Graecarum in chartis Aegyptiacis (1906).
KUPFF, Der Gebr. d. Opt. bei Diod. Sic. (1903).
K. Z., Kuhn's Zeitschrift fur vergl. Sprachforschung (Berlin).
LAFOSCADE, Infl. du Lat. sur le Grec (Biol. de l'Ecole des hautes Et., 1892, pp. 83-158).
LAGARDE, P. DE, Septuagintastudien. I (1891).
LAKE, K., The Text of the N. T. 4th ed. (1908).
LAMBERT, Etude sur le dialecte eolien (1903).
LANG, A., Homer and His Age (1906).
LAQUEUR, Questiones epigraphicae et papyrologicae selectae (1904).
LA ROCHE, Beitrage zur griech. Gr. (1883).
_____, Das Augment des griech. Verbums (1882).
LAUGHLIN, T. C., The Solecisms of the Apocalypse (1902).
LAUTENSACH, Verbalflexion der attischen Inschriften (1887).
LEFEVRE, Race and Language (1909).
LELL, Der Absolut-Akk. im Griech. bis zu Aristoteles (1892).
LEUTNER, W. G., The Article in Theocritus (1907).
LIDDELL and SCOTT, Greek-English Lexicon. 8th, ed. (1882).
LIETZMANN, H., Die klass. Philologic und das N. T. (N. Jahrb. f. kl. Alt., 1908, Bd. 21).
_____, Griechische Papyri ausgewahlt und erklart. 2. Aufl. (1910).
LIGHTFOOT, TRENCH, ELLICOTT, The Revision of the N. T. (1873).
LIPSIUS, K. H. A., Grammatische Untersuchungdn uber die bibl. Gracitat (1863).
LIVINGSTON, The Greek Genius and Its Meaning to Us (1912).
LOBECK, C. A., Phrynichi ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum (1820).
LOCK, W., The Bible and Christian Life (1905).
LOISY, A., Histoire critique du texte et des versions de la Bible (1892).

LOTTICH, B., De sermone vulgari Atticorum (1881).
LUTZ, Die Kasus-Adverbien bei att. Rednern (1891).
MADVIG, Bemerk. uber einige Punkte des Griech. (1848).
_____, Syntax of the Greek Language (1880).
MAHAFFY, J. P., A Survey of Greek Civilization (1897).
_____, Greek Life and Thought (1896).
_____, Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire (1905).
_____, The Greek World under Roman Sway (1890).
_____, What Have the Greeks Done for Civilization? (1909).
MARGOLIOUTH, D. S., Language of the O. T. (Hastings' D. B.).
MARGOLIS, The Particle ᾗ in O. T. Gk. (Am. J. of Sem. Lang. and Lit., July, 1909).
MARSHALL, J. T., The Aramaic Gospel (The Expositor, ser. IV, ii, iii, iv, vi, viii; The Expos. Times, iv, 260).
MARTI, K., Kurzgef. Gr. d. bibl. aram. Spr. (1911).
MAYSER, E., Grammatik der griech. Papyri aus der Ptolemaerzeit. Laut- and Wortlehre (1906).
MEILLET, A., Introduction a l'etude comparative des langues indo-europeennes (1908). 4th ed. (1915).
_____, L'aoriste en lat. (Revue de Phil., 1897, p. 81 f.).
_____, Notes d'Etymologie Grecque (1896).
MEISTER, R., Beitrage zur Lautlehre d. LXX (1909).
_____, Der syntakt. Gebrauch d. Genitivs in den kret. Dialekt-inschriften (Indog. Forsch., XVIII, pp. 133-204).
_____, Die griech. Dialekte. 2 Bde. (1882-1889).
_____, Prol. zu einer Gramm. d. LXX (1907).
MEISTERHANS-SCHWYZER, Gramm. d. attischen Inschriften. 3. Aufl. (1900) of Meisterhans.
MERRIAM, A. C., Temporal Coincidence of the Aor. Part. with the Principal Verb (Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1877).
MEYER, A., Jesu Muttersprache (1896).
MEYER, G., Griech. Grammatik. 3. Aufl. (1896).
MEYER, L., Griech. Aoriste (1879).
_____, Vergl. Gr. d. griech. and lat. Spr. 2 Bde. 2. Aufl. (1882-1884).
MEYER-LUBKE, Gramm. d. roman. Spr. 3 Bde. (1890-1899).
MIDDLETON, Analogy in Syntax (1892).
_____, The Doctrine of the Greek Article (1855).
MILDEN, The Limitations of the Predicate Position in Greek.
MILLER, C. W. E., The Limitation of the Imperative in the Attic Orators (Am. J. ph., 1892, pp. 399-436).
MILLIGAN, G., Selections from the Greek Papyri (1910).

MILLIGAN, G., The Greek Papyri with Special Reference to their Value for N. T. Study (1912).
_____, The N. T. Documents (1913).
MITSOTAKIS, Praktische Gr. d. neugriech. Schrift- und Umgangssprache (1891).
MITTEIs und WILCKEN, Grundztige und Chrestoinathie der Papyruskunde. 2 Bde. (1912).
MOFFATT, J., The New Testament. A New Translation (1913).
MOMMSEN, T., Beitrage zur Lehre der griech. Prapositionen (1886-1895).
_____, Die Prap. σύν and μετά bei den nachhom. Epikern (1879).
MONRO, D. B., Homeric Grammar (1882). 2d el. (1891). First ed. used.
MOULTON, J. H., A Grammar of N. T. Greek. Vol. I, Prolegomena (1906). 3d ed. (1908).
_____, Characteristics of N. T. Greek (The Expositor, 1904).
_____, Einleitung in die Sprache des N. T. (1911).
_____, Grammatical Notes from the Papyri (The Expositor, 1901, pp. 271-282; 1903, pp. 104-121, 423-439. The Classical Review, 1901, pp. 31-37, 434-441; 1904, pp. 106-112, 151-155).
_____, Introduction to N. T. Greek (1895). 2d ed: (1904).
_____, Language of Christ (Hastings' One-vol. 1 B., 1909).
_____, N. T. Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery (Cambr. Bibl. Essays, 1909, pp. 461-505).
_____, The Science of Language (1903).
MOULTON, W. F., and GEDEN, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek Testament (1897).
MOULTON and MILLIGAN, Lexical Notes from the Papyri (The Expos., 1908--).
_____, The Vocabulary of the N. T. Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Part I (1914), II, III.
MOZLEY, F. W., Notes on the Bibl. Use of the Present and Aorist Imperative (Journ. of Theol. Stud., 1903, iv, pp. 279-282).
MULLACH, F., Grammatik d. griech. Vulgarsprache (1856).
MULLER, H. C., Hist. Gramm. d. hellen. Sprache (1891).
MULLER, I., Handbuch d. klass. Altertumswissenshaft (1885-).
MULLER, MAX, Three Lectures on the Science of Language (1891).
MURRAY, G., A History of Ancient Greek Lit. (1897).
MUTZBAUER, C., Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktivs und Optativs und ihre Entwick. im Griech. (1908).
_____, Die Grundlagen der griech. Tempuslehre kind des horn. Tempusgebrauchs. I (1893), II (1909).

NACHMANSON, E., Beitrage zur Kenntnis der altgriech. Volkssprache (1910).
_____, Epigraphisch-grammatische Bemerkungen (Eranos 11, 1912).
_____, Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften (1903).
NAGELI, T., Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus. α — ϵ (1905).
NAVARRE, Etude sur les particules grecques (R. E. A., vii, pp. 116-130).
NESTLE, E., Einfuhrung in das griech. N. T. 2. Aufl. (1899). Introd. to the Textual Crit. of the N. T. (Tr. 1901).
_____, Novum Testamentum Graece. 8th ed. (1910).
_____, Septuagint (Hastings' D. B., 1902).
_____, Septuaginta-Studien. I-V (1886-1907).
_____, Zum neutest. Griechisch (Z. N. W., vii, 1906).
NEUBAUER, Studia Biblica (1885).
N. k. Z., Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift (Leipzig).
N. Jahrb. kl. Alt., Neue Jahrbucher fur das klass. Altertum (Leipzig).
NILSSON, Kausalsatze im Griech. bis Aristoteles. I., Die Poesie.
NORDEN, E., Die antike Kunstprosa. 2. Aufl. (1909).
OERTEL, H., Lectures on the Study of Language (1902).
OGDEN, De infinitivi finalis vel consecutivi constr. apud priscos poetas Graecos (1913).
PALEY, Greek Particles and their Combinations (1881).
PALLIS, A., A Few Notes on the Gospel (1903).
_____, **῾Η Νέα Διαθήκη** (1902). The N. T. (Gospels) in modern Greek vernacular.
PATER, W., The Renaissance (1904).
PAUL, H., Principles of the History of Language (1888). Tr.
PETERSEN, W., Greek Diminutives in —**ιον** (1910).
PFEIFAUF, Der Artikel vor Personen- und Gotternamen bei Thuk. und Herod. (1908).
PFISTER, Die parataktische Darstellungsform in der volkstumlichen Erzahlung (Woch. f. klass. Phil., 1911, pp. 809-813).
Ph. W., Philologische Wochenschrift.
Ph. Z., Philologus: Zeitschrift f. d. kl. Alt. (Gottingen).
POSTGATE, J. P., Contrasts of **Οὐ** and **Μή** (Cambr. Phil. Jour., 1886).
PRELLWITZ, Etym. WOrterbuch d. griech. Sprache (1893). 2d ed. (1905).
PREUSCHEN, E., Vollstandiges griechisch-deutsches HandwOrterbuch zu den Schriften d. N. T. und d. iibrigen urchristlichen Literatur (1908).

Pr. Rev., The Princeton Review (Princeton).
PSICHARI, J., Essai sur le grec de la Septante (Rev. des etudes juives, April, 1908).
_____, Essais de grammaire historique neo-grecque (1886-1889).
RADERMACHER, L., Neut. Grammatik. Das Griechisch des N. T. im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache (1911).
RAMSAY, W. M., Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. 2 vols. (1895, 1897).
_____, St. Paul the Traveller (1896).
R. E., Herzog-Hauck's Realencyclopalie.
R. E. Gr., Revue des etudes grecques (Paris).
REFFEL, Uber den Sprachgebr. D. Agathias.
REIK, Der Opt. bei Polyb. and Philo (1907).
REINACH, S., Pap. grecs et demotiques (1905).
REINHOLD, H., De graecitate Patrum (1898).
REISART, Zur Attraktion der Relativsiitze in der griech. Prosa.
REITZENSTEIN, Geschichte d. griech. Etym. (1897).
RENAUD, The Distributed Emphasis of the Pers. Pronoun (1884).
Rev. and Exp., The Review and Expositor (Louisville).
Rev. d. Ling., Revue de Linguistique de la Phil. comparee (Paris).
Rev. d. Ph., Revue de Philologie (Paris).
Rev. of Th. & Ph., Review of' Theology and Philosophy (Edinburgh).
Rh. M., Rheinisches Museum (Bonn).
RIDGEWAY, W., The Early Age of Greece. Vol. I (1901).
RIEMANN and GOELZER, Grammaire Comparee du Grec et du Latin. I (1897), II (1901).
RIES, Was ist Syntax? (1894).
ROBERTS, A Short Proof that Greek was the Language of Jesus (1893).
ROBERTS-GARDNER, Introduction to Greek Epigraphy (1883).
ROBERTSON, A. T. A Short Grammar of the Greek N. T. (1908). 3d ed. (1912).
_____, Syllabus on N. T. Greek Syntax (1900).
ROBERTSON-BONACCORSI, Breve grammatica del Nuovo Testamento greco (1910).
ROBERTSON-GROSHEIDE, Beknopte Grammatica op het Grieksche Nieuwe Testament (1912).
ROBERTSON-MONTET, Grammaire du grec du N. T. (1911).
ROBERTSON-STOCKS, Kurzgefasste Grammatik des neut. Griechisch (1911).
ROSE, A., Christian Greece and Living Greek (1898).

ROSSBERG, C., De prapos. graecarum in chartis aegyptiis ptolem, aetatis usu (1909).
ROUFFIAC, J., Recherches sur les caracteres du grec dans le N. T. d'apres les inscriptions de Priene (1911).
RUTHERFORD, W. G., A Chapter in the History of Annotation (1905).
_____, The New Phrynichus (1881).
RUGER, Prap. bei Joh. Antiochenus (1896).
_____, Prap. bei Pausanias (1889).
SANDAY, W., The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel (1905).
SANDYS, J. E., A History of Classical Scholarship. I-III (1906-1908).
SAYCE, A. H., Introduction to the Science of Language (1880).
_____, Language (Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., 1910).
_____, Principles of Comparative Philology (1875).
SCHAEFER, Das Partizip des Aor. bei d. Tragikern (1894).
SCHAFF, P., A Companion to the Greek N. T. and Engl. Vers. 3d ed. (1889).
SCHANZ, M., Beitrage zur histor. Syntax d. griech. Sprache (1882—).
SCHILLING, D., Comm. exeg.-philol. in Hebraism. d. N. T. (1886).
SCHIRLITZ, S. C., Anleitung zur Kenntnis d. neut. Grundsprache (1863).
SCHLACHTER, Statist. Unters. uber den Gebr. der Temp. und Modi bei einzelnen griech. Schriftst. (1908).
SCHLAGETER, J., Der Wortschatz d. ausserhalb Attikas gefundenen Inschriften (1912).
_____, Zur Laut- und Formenlehre d. auss. Att. gef. attischen Inschr. (1908).
SCHLEICHER, A., Compendium d. vergl. Gr. d. indog. Sprachen. 4. Aufl. (1876).
SCHMID, J., Uber den gnomischen Aor. des Griech. (1894).
SCHMID, W., Der Atticismus in semen Hauptvertretern. 4 Bde. (1887-1897).
SCHMIDT, De Articulo in nominibus propiis apud Att. scriptores (1890).
SCHMIDT, W., De Flavii Josephi elocutione (1894).
SCHMITT, P., Uber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griech. (1889).
SCHOEMANN, Die Lehre von den Redet. nach den Alten (1862).
SCHROEDER, Uber die form. Untersch. d. Redet. im Griech. und Lat. (1874).

SCHUERER, A., A History of the Jew. P. in the Time of Jesus Christ. 5 vols. (1898). Tr. by Macpherson.
SCHULZE, Der schriftsteller. Charakter und Wert des Petrus, Judas und Jakobus (1802).
SCHULZE, W., Graeca, Latina (1901).
SCHWAB, 0., Hist. Syntax der griech. Komparative in d. klass. Lit. Heft I (1893), II (1894), III (1895).
SCHWEIZER, E., Bericht uber die Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der griech. Sprachw. mit Ausschluss der Koine und der Dialekte in den Jahren 1890-1903 (Bursian's Jahresbericht, cxx, 1904, pp. 1-152).
_____, Die griech. Sprache in Zeit d. Hellen. (N. Jahrb. f. kl. Alt., 1901, vii, viii).
_____, Grammatik der pergamen. Inschriften (1898).
_____, Neugriech. Syntax und altgriech. (N. Jahrb. f. kl. Alt., 1908, pp. 498-507).
SCHWYZER (SCHWEIZER), E., Die Weltsprachen des Altertums (1902).
SCOMP, H. A., The Case Absolute in the N. T. (Bibl. Sacra, April, 1902).
SEYMOUR, T. D., Homeric Language and Verse (1902).
_____, Life in the Homeric Age (1907).
_____, The Use of the Gk. Aor. Part. (Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., XII, 1881, pp. 88 ff.).
S. H., Sanday and Headlam on Romans.
SHARP, G., Remarks on the Definitive Article in the Greek of the N. T. (1803).
SHEFFIELD, A. D., Grammar and Thinking (1912).
SIMCOX, W. H., The Language of the N. T. (1890).
_____, The Writers of the N. T.
SIMONSON, A., A Greek Grammar. 2 vols. (1903, 1908).
SMITH, R. H., The Theory of Conditional Sentences in Greek and Latin (1894).
SMYTH, H. W., The Sounds and Inflexions of Greek Dialects. I, Ionic (1894).
SODEN, H. VON, Die Schriften des N. T. in ihrer altesten erreichbaren Textgestalt. Teil I, Untersuch. (1902-1910); Teil II, Text und Apparat (1913).
_____, Griechisches N. T. Text mit kurzem Apparat (1913).
SOLMSEN, F., Beitrage zur griech. Wortforschung (1909).
_____, Inscriptiones graecae selectae (1905).
_____, Untersuch. zur griech. Laut- und Verslehre (1901).

SOPHOCLES, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (1888).
SOUTER, A., Novum Testamentum Graece (1910). The Revisers' Text with a New Apparatus Criticus.
SPIEKER, The Gen. Abs. in the Attic Orators (Am. J. of Ph., VI, pp. 310-343).
St. B., Standard Bible Dictionary (Ed. by M. W. Jacobus, 1909).
STAHL, J. M., Kritisch-historische Syntax des griech. Verbums der Mass. Zeit. (1907).
STAURAC, Uber den Gebr. d. Gen. bei Herodot.
STEINTHAL, H., Geschichte der Sprachwiss. bei den Griech. und Romern. 2. Aufl. (1890-1891).
_____, Introduction to the Psychology and Science of Language (1900).
STERENBOURG, The Use of the Cond. Sentence in the Alex. Version of the Pentateuch (1908).
STERRETT, J. R. S., Homer's Iliad with Grammar (1907).
STOCKS, H., Das neutestamentliche Griechisch im Lichte der modernen Sprachforschung (Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, XXIV. Jahrgang, 633-700).
STRACK, H. L., Grammatik des bibl. Aram. 4. Aufl. (1905).
STRONG, LOGEMAN and WHEELER, Introduction to the Study of the History of Lang. (1891).
STURM, J., Geschichtl. Entwick. der Konstrukt. mit πρίν (1882).
STURTEVANT, Studies in Greek Noun Formation (Labial Terminations, I, 1910; II, 1911; III and IV, 1913).
SUSEMIHL, Gesch. der griech. Lit. in der Alexandrinerzeit. I (1891), II (1892).
SUTTERLIN, Gesch. der Verba denom. in Altgriech. (1891).
SWEET, History of Language (1900).
SWETE, H. B., Introduction to the O. T. in Greek (1900) . 2 Ed.,' 14.
_____, The Apocalypse of St. John (1906).
_____, The 0. T. in Greek according to the Septuagint (1887). 3 vols.
SZUCZURAT, De Inf. Horn. Usu (1902).
TELFY, Chron. und Topogr. der griech. Ausspr. nach d. Zeugnisse der Inschr. (1893).
THACKERAY, H. ST., A Grammar of the 0. T. in Greek. Vol. I, Introduction, Orthography and Accidence (1909).
_____, Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Thought (1900).
THAYER, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T. (1887).
_____, Language of the N. T. (Hastings' D. B., 1900).

THEIMER, A., Beitrage zur Kenntnis des Sprachgebr. im N. T. (1896).
Th. L.-Z., Theologische Literaturzeitung (Leipzig).
Th. R., Theologische Rundschau (Tubingen).
Th. St. u. Kr., Theol. Studien und Kritiken (Gotha).
THIEME, G., Die Inschr. von Magnesia am Maander und das N. T. (1906).
THOLUCK, Beitrage zur Spracherklarung des N. T.
THOMPSON, E. M., Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography (1893). New ed. (1913).
THOMPSON, F. E., A Syntax of Attic Greek. New ed. (1907).
THOMSON, J. E. H., The Language of Palestine during the Time of Our Lord (Temple Bible Dict.).
THOMSON, P., The Greek Tenses in the N. T. (1895).
THOUVENIN, P., Les Negations dans lc N. T. (Revue de Philologic, 1894).
THUMB, A., Die Forsch. uber die hellen. Spr. in den Jahren 1902-1904 (Arch. f. Pap. 3, pp. 443-473).
_____, Die griech. Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus (1901).
_____, Die sprachgesch. Steil. des bibl. Griech. (Theol. Rund., 1902).
_____, Handbuch der griech. Dial. (1909).
_____, Handbuch d. neugriech. Volkssprache. 2. Aufl. (1910).
_____, Handbuch des Sanskrits. I, Grammatik (1905).
_____, Unters. uber d. Sp. Asper im Griech. (1889).
THUMB-ANGUS, Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular (1912).
TISCH., Novum Testamentum Graece, by C. Tischendorf. Editio octava critica major. 2 vols. (1869-1872).
TRENCH, R. C., Synonyms of the N. T. 11th ed. (1890). Deutsche Ausgabe von Werner (1907).
TSOUNTAS and MANATT, The Mycenaean Age (1897).
TUCKER, T. G., Introduction to the Natural History of Language (1908).
VANDACLE, L'Optatif Grec (1897).
VEITCH, W., Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective. 2d ed. (1871).
VIERECK, P., Die griech. Papyruskunde (1899-1905). 34. Jahrgang 1906. III. Abt. (1907).
_____, Die Papyrusliteratur in den 70 Jahren bis 1898 (1900). 27. Jahrgang 1899. III. Abt.
_____, Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus (1888).
VIERKE, De μή Particulae cum Indicativo Conjunctae Usu Antiquiore (1876).

VINCENT and DICKSON, A Handbook to Modern Greek (1887).
VITEAU, J., Essai sur la syntax des voix dans le grec du N. T., (Rev. de Phil., 1894).
_____, Etude sur le grec du N. T. I, Le Verbe (1893); II, Le Suje, (1896).
VOGEL, H., Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil (1899).
VOGRINZ, Grammatik d. hom. Dial. (1889).
VOLKER, F., Papyrorum graecorum syntaxis specimen (1900).
_____, Syntax d. griech. Papyri. I, Der Artikel (1903).
VOTAW, C. W., The Use of the Infinitive in Bibl. Greek (1896).
WACKERNAGEL, J., Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Komposita (1889).
_____, Die hellenistische Gemeinsprache. (Die Kult. d. Gegenwart, Tl. I, Abt. viii, 1905, pp. 98-305).
_____, Die Sprache des Plut. etc. Teile I, II (1895-1896).
WAGNER, R., Questiones de epigrammatis graecis ex lapidibus collectis grammaticae (1883).
WALCH, Observationes in Matt. ex graecis inscriptionibus (1779).
WALKER, D., Elementary Greek Syntax (1897).
WARFIELD, B. B., An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the N. T. New ed. (1914).
WARREN, WINIFRED, A Study of Conjunctional Temporal Clauses in Thucyd. (1897).
WEBER, P., Entwick. der Absichtssatze. Heft I (1884), Heft II (1885).
WECKLEIN, Curae epigraphicae ad grammaticam graecam et ad poetas scenicos pertinentes (1869).
WEISS, B., Der Gebr. des Artikels bei den Gottesnamen (Th. Stu. u. Krit., 1911, pp. 319-392).
_____, Textkritik (1894 ff.).
WEISS, J., Beitrage zur paulinischen Rhetorik (1897).
WELLHAUSEN, J., Einl. in die drei ersten Evangelien (1905). 2. Ausg. (1911).
WENDLAND, P., Christentum und Hellenismus (1907).
_____, Hellen.-rom. Kultur. 3. Aufl. (1912).
WESSELEY, C., Die lat. Elemente in d. Gracitat d. dgypt. Pap. (Wien. Stud., xxiv, 1902).
_____, Lit. der Papyruskunde (Stud. zur Palaogr. und Pap. I, 1901, pp. 17-20; II, 1902, pp. 43-52).
_____, Proleg. ad papyrorum graecorum novam collectionem eden-dam (1883).

WESTCOTT, B. F., Language of the N. T. (Smith's B. D.).
W. H., WESTCOTT and HORT'S Edition of the N. T. in the Original Greek. Numerous eds.
_____, The N. T. in the Original Greek. Introduction and Appendix (1882).
WEYMOUTH, On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect (1894).
WHEELER, B. I., The Whence and the Whither of the Modern Science of Language (1905).
WHIBLEY, L., Companion to Greek Studies (1905). 2d ed. (1906).
WHITNEY, S. W., The Revisers' Greek Text. 2 vols. (1892).
WHITNEY, W. D., A Sanskrit Grammar (1891). 4th ed. (1913).
_____, Language and the Study of Language (1867).
_____, Life and Growth of Language (1875).
WILAMOWITZ-MOLLENDORFF, U. VON, Die griech. Literatur des Altertums (Die Kult. d. Gegenw., 1907, TI. I, Abt. viii, pp. 3-238. 3. Aufl. 1912).
_____, Uber die Entstehung der griech. Schriftsprachen (Verf. deutscher Phil. and Schulm., 1879, pp. 36-41).
WILCKEN, U., Die Forschungen fiber die hellen. Spr. in den Jahren 1902-1904 (Archiv f. Pap., 1906, pp. 443-473).
WILHELM, A., Beitrage zur griech. Inschriftenkunde (1909).
WILHELMUS, De Modo Irreali qui Vocatur (1881).
WILKE, Neutestamentliche Rhetorik (1843).
WILLIAMS, C. B., The Participle in the Book of Acts (1908).
WILSON, A. J., Emphasis in the N. T. (Jour. of Th. Stud., VIII, pp. 75 ff.).
WINER, G. B., De verborum cum praep. compos. in N. T. Usu (1834-1843).
_____, Gramm. d. neut. Sprachidioms (1822). 7: Aufl. von Lflnemann (1867).
WINER-MASSON, A Grammar of the N. T. Gk. (1859).
WINER-MOULTON, A Treatise of the Grammar of N. T. Gk. 3d ed. (1882). Various eds.
WINER-SCHMIEDEL, Winer's Grammatik des neutest. Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. (1894-).
WINER-THAYER, A Grammar of the Idiom of the N. T. (1869). Various eds.
WITKOWSKI, ST., Bericht uber die Lit. zur Koine aus den Jakiren 1898-1902 (Bursian's Jahrb. CXX, 1904, pp. 153-256).
_____, Bericht uber die Lit. zur Koine aus den Jahren 1903-1906 (Jahresber. f. Alt., 1912, III. Bd., 159).

WITKOWSKI, ST., Epistulae privatae graecae (1906).
_____, Prodromus grammaticae papyrorum graecarum aetatis Lagidarum (1897).
Woch. f. Icl. Ph., Wochenschrift fur klassische Philologie.
WRIGHT, J., A Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language (1912).
WUNDT, Volkerpsychologie. 2. Aufi. (1904). 3. Aufl. (1911 f.).
YOUNG, Language of Christ (Hastings' D. C. G.).
ZAHN, TH., Einl. in das N. T. Bd. I (190G), II (1907).
_____, On the Language of Palestine. Vol. I, pp. 1-72. Introduction to the N. T. Tr. by Jacobus (1909).
ZARNCKE, E., Die Entstehung der griech. Literatursprachen (1890).
ZEITLIN, The Acc. with Inf. and Some Kindred Constrs. in English (1908).
ZEZSCHWITZ, Profangrac. und bibl. Sprachg. (1859).
ZIEMER, Vergl. Syntax der indog. Kompar. (1884).
Z. N.-T. W., Zeitschrift fur neut. Wissenschaft (Giessen).

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THIRD EDITION

BALLY, Le Langage et la Vie (1913).

BLOMFIELD, An Introduction to the Study of Language (1914).

BRUGMANN, Lehre von den Wortformen and ihren Gebrauch. III. Teil. 2. Lieferung (1917).

BUCK, Studies in Greek Noun-formation (Classical Philology, 1917 and 1918).

COBERN, The New Archaeological Discoveries in their Bearing on the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. 2d ed. (1918).

DAWKINS, Modern Greek in Asia Minor (1916).

DEFERRARI, Lucian's Atticism. The Morphology of the Verb (1916).

DURHAM, The Vocabulary of Menander in Relation to the Koine 1915).

DUTTON, Studies in Greek Prepositional Phrases: διά, ἀπό, ἐκ, εἰς, ἐν (1916).

EAKIN, The Greek Article in First and Second Century Papyri (Am. J. of Phil., No. 147, 1916, pp. 333-340).

HEMPL, Early Cyprian Greek (Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., 1916, pp. 229-248).

HERWERDEN, VAN, Lexicon Graecum Suppletorium et Dialecticum. 2d ed. (1910).

HOUGHTON, Saving Greek in the College (The Cl. Weekly, Dec. 11, 1916).

KAERST, Geschichte des Hellenismus. 2d ed. (1917).

LIVINGSTONE, A Defense of Classical Education (1916).

MAIDHOF, Zur Begriffbestimmung der Koine besonders auf Grund des Attizisten Moiris (1912).

MAIGNIEN, Le Futur Grec (1912).

MEILLET, De Quelques Faits Grammaticaux (Revue des Etudes Grecques, July, 1916).

MILLER, C. W. E., Note on the Use of the Article before the Genitive of the Father's Name in Greek Papyri (Am. J. of Phil., July, 1916, pp. 341-348).

MILLIGAN, Greek Papyri (The Expositor, March, 1918).

MOULTON, J. H., From Egyptian Rubbish Heaps (1916).
_____, The Christian Religion in the Sutdy and the Street (1918).
PETERSON, W., Origin of the Indo-Eur. Nominal Stem-suffixes (Am. J. of Phil., April and July, 1916).
_____, Syncretism in the Eur. Dative (Am. J. of Phil., Jan., 1918).
ROBINSON, Some Inverted Commas (The Expositor, March, 1916).
SANDYS, A Short History of Classical Scholarship (1915).
SLATEN, Qualitative Nouns in the Pauline Epistles and Their Translation in the Revised Version (1918).
SMITH, General Relative Clauses in Greek (The Review, May–June, 1917).
SMYTH, A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges (1916).
SONNENSCHEIN, The Ind. in Rel. Clauses (The Cl. Review, May–June, 1918).
STURTEVANT, Linguistic Change (1918).
TOD, Progress in Greek Epigraphy for 1914-1915 (The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Jan., 1916).
WACKERNAGEL, Ueber die Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache (1913).
_____, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer (Glotta, 7. 161 319).
WEST, Value of the Classics (1917).

PART I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

NEW MATERIAL

The Ideal Grammar? Perhaps the ideal grammar of the New Testament Greek may never be written. It is a supremely difficult task to interpret accurately the forms of human speech, for they have life and change with the years. But few themes have possessed greater charm for the best furnished scholars of the world than the study of language.[1]

The language of the N. T. has a special interest by reason of the message that it bears. Every word and phrase calls for minute investigation where so much is at stake. It is the task and the duty of the N. T. student to apply the results of linguistic research to the Greek of the N. T. But, strange to say, this has not been adequately done.[2]

New Testament study has made remarkable progress in the sphere of criticism, history and interpretation, but has lagged behind in this department. A brief survey of the literary history of the subject shows it.

I. The Pre-Winer Period. It was Winer who in 1822 made a new epoch in N. T. grammatical study by his *Neutestamentliches Sprachidiom*. It is hardly possible for the student of the present day to enter into sympathy with the inanities and sinuosities that characterized the previous treatises on the N. T. idiom. Not alone in the controversy between the Purists and Hebraists was this true, but writers like Storr, by a secret system of *quid pro quo*, cut the Gordian knot of grammatical difficulty by explaining one term as used for another, one preposition for another, one case for another, etc. As a university tutor Winer

[1] See J. Classen, De Gr. Graecae Primordiis, 1829, p. 1, who says: "Inter humani ingenii inventa, quae diuturna consuetudine quasi naturae iura adepta cunt, nullum fere magis invaluit et pervulgatum est, quam grammaticae ratio et usus."

[2] "And despite the enormous advance since the days of Winer toward a rational and unitary conception of the N. T. language, we still labour to-day under the remains of the old conceptions." Samuel Dickey, Prince. Theol. Rev., Oct., 1903, "New Points of View."

combated "this absurd system of interpretation," and not without success in spite of receiving some sneers. He had the temerity to insist on this order of interpretation: grammatical, historical, theological. He adhered to his task and lived to see "an enlightened philology, as deduced and taught by Herrmann and his school," triumph over the previous "unbridled license."[1]

II. The Service of Winer.

(a) WINER'S INCONSISTENCIES. It must be said, however, that great as was the service of Winer to this science, he did not at all points carry out consistently his own principles, for he often explained one tense as used for another. He was not able to rise entirely above the point of view of his time nor to make persistent application of the philosophical grammar. It is to be borne in mind also that the great science of comparative philology had not revolutionized linguistic study when Winer first wrote. In a true sense he was a pathfinder.

(b) WINER EPOCH-MAKING.--WINER IN ENGLISH. But none the less his work has been the epoch-making one for N. T. study. After his death Dr. Gottlieb Lunemann revised and improved the *Neutestamentliches Sprachidiom*. Translations of Winer's *Grammatik* into English were first made by Prof. Masson of Edinburgh, then by Prof. Thayer of Harvard (revision of Masson), and finally by Prof. W. F. Moulton of Cambridge, who added excellent footnotes, especially concerning points in modern Greek. The various editions of Winer-Thayer and Winer-Moulton have served nearly two generations of English and American scholars.

(c) SCHMIEDEL. But now at last Prof. Schmiedel of Zurich is thoroughly revising Winer's *Grammatik*, but it is proceeding slowly and does not radically change Winer's method, though use is made of much of the modern knowledge.[2] Deissmann,[3] indeed, expresses disappointment in this regard concerning Schmiedel's work as being far "too much Winer and too little Schmiedel." But Deissmann concedes that Schmiedel's work "marks a characteristic and decisive turning-point in N. T. philology."

[1] See Pref. to the sixth and last ed. by Winer himself as translated by Dr. J. H. Thayer in the seventh and enlarged ed. of 1869.

[2] Winer's Gr. des neutest. Sprachid. 8. Aufl. neu bearbeitet von Dr. Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, 1894—.

[3] Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, 1898, p. 20. He adds, "Der alte Winer war seiner Zeit ein Protest des philologischen Gewissens gegen die Willkur eines anmassenden Empiricismus." Cf. also Exp., Jan., 1908, p. 63.

(d) BUTTMANN. Buttmann's *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs* had appeared in 1859 and was translated by Thayer as Buttmann's *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (1873), an able work.

(e) BLASS. It is not till the *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* by Prof. Blass in 1896 that any other adequate grammar appears in this field. And Blass departs a little from traditional methods and points of view. He represents a transition towards a new era. The translation by H. St. John Thackeray has been of good service in the English-speaking world.[1]

III. The Modern Period. It is just in the last decade that it has become possible to make a real advance in New Testament grammatical study. The discovery and investigation that have characterized every department of knowledge have borne rich fruit here also.

(a) DEISSMANN. Deissmann[2] sees rightly the immensity of the task imposed upon the N. T. grammarian by the very richness of the new discoveries. He likewise properly condemns the too frequent isolation of the N. T. Greek from the so-called "profane Greek."[3] Deissmann has justly pointed out that the terms "profane" and "biblical" do not stand in linguistic contrast, but rather "classical" and "biblical." Even here he insists on the practical identity of biblical with the contemporary later Greek of the popular style.[4]

It was in 1895 that Deissmann published his *Bibelstudien*, and his *Neue Bibelstudien* followed in 1897. The new era has now fairly begun. In 1901 the English translation of both volumes by Grieve appeared as *Bible Studies*. In 1907 came the *Philol-*

[1] First ed. 1898, second ed. 1905, as Blass' Gr. of N. T. Gk. A revision of the work of Blass (the 4th German edition) by Dr. A. Debrunner has appeared as these pages are going through the press.

[2] Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, 1898, p. 5: "Durch neue Erkenntnisse befruchtet steht die griechische Philologie gegenwartig im Zeichen einer vielverheissenden Renaissance, die fordert von der sprachliehen Erforschung der griechischen Bibel, dass sie in engste, Fuhlung trete mit der historischen Erforschung der griechischen Sprache."

[3] Ib., p. 7. Like, for instance, Zerschwitz, Profangrac. und bibl. Sprachg., 1859.

[4] Die Spr. der griech. Bibel, Theol. 1898, pp. 463-472. He aptly says: "Nicht die Profangracitat ist der sprachgeschichtliche Gegensatz zur 'biblischen,' sondern das classische Griechisch. Die neueren Funde zur Gesehrehte der griechischen Sprache zeigen, dass die Eigentumlichkeiten des 'biblischen' Formen- und Wortschatzes (bei den original-griechischen Schriften auch der Syntax) im grossen und ganzen Eigentumlichkeiten des spateren und zwar zumeist des unliterarischen Griechisch uberhaupt sind."

ogy of the Bible. His *Licht vom Osten* (1908) was his next most important work (*Light from the Ancient East*, 1910, translated by Strachan). See Bibliography for full list of his books. The contribution of Deissmann is largely in the field of lexicography.

(b) THUMB. It was in 1901 that A. Thumb published his great book on the κοινή, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus,* which has done so much to give the true picture of the κοινή. He had already in 1895 produced his *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*. In 1912 the second enlarged edition was issued in English by S. Angus, as *Handbook of Modern Greek Vernacular*. This hook at once took front place for the study of the modern Greek by English students. It is the only book in English that confines itself to the vernacular.

(c) MOULTON. In 1895, J. H. Moulton, son of W. F. Moulton, the translator of Winer, produced his *Introduction to N. T. Greek*, in a noble linguistic succession. In 1901 he began to publish in *The Classical Review* and in *The Expositor*, "Grammatical Notes from the Papyri," which attracted instant attention by their freshness and pertinency. In 1906 appeared his now famous *Prolegomena*, vol. I, of *A Grammar of N. T. Greek*, which reached the third edition by 1908. With great ability Moulton took the cue from Deissmann and used the papyri for grammatical purposes. He demonstrated that the Greek of the N. T. is in the main just the vernacular κοινή of the papyri. In 1911 the *Prolegomena* appeared in German as *Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments*.

(d) OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS. It is not possible to mention here all the names of the workers in the field of N. T. grammar (see Bibliography). The old standpoint is still found in the books of Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (1889); Hoole, *The Classical Element in the N. T.* (1888); Simcox, The Language of the N. T. (1890); Schaff, *A Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version* (1889); Viteau, *Ètude sur le grec du N. T. — Le Verbe* (1893); Le Sujet (1896). The same thing is true of Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary* (1905) and *Johannine Grammar* (1906); Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the N. T. Greek* (1888, third ed. 1909) is yet a genuine contribution. In Kennedy's *Sources of N. T. Greek* (1895) we see a distinct transition toward the new era of N. T. grammar. In 1911 Radermacher's *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* is in fact more a grammar of the κοινή than of the N. T., as it is designed to be an *Einleitung*. The author's *Short Grammar of the Greek N. T.* (1908) gives the new

knowledge in a succinct form. The Italian translation (1910) by Bonaccorsi has additional notes by the translator. Stocks (1911) made numerous additions to the *Laut- und Formenlehre* of the German edition. Grosheide in the Dutch translation (1912) has made a revision of the whole book. The French edition (1911) by Montet is mainly just a translation. The fourth enlarged edition in English appeared in 1916. Many special treatises of great value have appeared (see Bibliography), by men like Angus, Buttmann, Heinrici, Thieme, Vogel, Votaw, J. Weiss, Wellhausen.

(e) RICHNESS OF MATERIAL. Now indeed it is the extent of the material demanding examination that causes embarrassment. And only thirty years ago K. Krumbacher[1] lamented that it was not possible to give "a comprehensive presentation of the Greek language" because of the many points on which work must be done beforehand. But we have come far in the meantime. The task is now possible, though gigantic and well-nigh insurmountable. But it is not for us moderns to boast because of the material that has come to our hand. We need first to use it. Dieterich[2] has well said that the general truth that progress is from error to truth "finds its confirmation also in the history of the development that the Greek language has received in the last two thousand years." By the induction of a wider range of facts we can eliminate errors arising from false generalizations. But this is a slow process that calls for patience. Dionysius Thrax,[3] one of the Alexandrian fathers of the old Greek grammar (circa 100 B.C.), said: **Γραμματική ἐστιν ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων**. Andrew Lang[4] indeed is a disciple of Dionysius Thrax in one respect, for he contends that students are taught too much grammar and too little language. They know the grammars and not the tongue. A bare outline can be given of the sources of the new material for such grammatical study.

[1] Beitr. zu einer Geseh. der griech. Spr., Kuhn's Zeits. far vergl. Sprachforsch., 1882, p. 484: "Fine zusammenhangende Darstellung des Entwicklungsganges der griechischen Sprache ist gegenwartig nicht moglich. Auf allzu vielen Punkten eines langen und viel verschlungenen Weges gebricht es an den Vorarbeiten, welche fur ein solches Unternehmen unerlasslich Sind."

[2] Unters. zur Gesch. der griech. Spr. von der hell. Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrh. n. Chr., 1898, p. x.

[3] As quoted in Bekker, Anec. Graeca (1816), vol. II, p. 629. Dionysius Thrax mentions six **μέρη** in grammar: **ἀνάγνωσις, ἐξήγησις, γλωσσῶν τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ὑπόδοσις, ἐτυμολογίας εὕρησις, ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός, κρίσις ποιημάτων**. A generous allowance truly! [4] Morning Post, Lond., May 5,1905.

IV. The New Grammatical Equipment for N. T. Study.

(a) COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY. We must consider the great advance in comparative philology. The next chapter will deal somewhat at length with various phases of the historical method of linguistic study.

1. *The Linguistic Revolution*. A revolution has been wrought in the study of language. It must be confessed that grammatical investigation has not always been conducted on the inductive principle nor according to the historical method. Too often the rule has been drawn from a limited range of facts. What is afterwards found to conflict with a rule is called an "exception." Soon the exceptions equal or surpass the rule. Unfortunately the ancients did not have the benefit of our distinctions of "regular" and "irregular." Metaphysical speculation with lofty superiority to the facts is sometimes charged upon grammarians.[1] "Grammar and logic do not coincide."[2] Comparative grammar is merely the historical method applied to several languages to gether instead of only one.[3]

2. *A Sketch of Greek Grammatical History*. The Greek has had its own history, but it is related to the history of kindred tongues. "From the days of Plato's *Kratylus* downward . . . the Greek disputed as to whether language originated by convention (νόμῳ) or by nature (φύσει)."[4] Indeed formal Greek grammar was the comparison with the Latin and began "with Dionysius Thrax, who utilized the philological lucubrations of Aristotle and the Alexandrian critics for the sake of teaching Greek to the sons of the aristocratic contemporaries of Pompey at Rome."[5] His Greek grammar is still in existence in Bekker's *Anecdota*,[6] and is the cause of much grotesque etymology since.[7]

This period of grammatical activity came after the great creative period of Greek literature was over, and in Alexandria, not

[1] So Dr. John H. Kerr, sometime Prof. of N. T. in the Pac. Theol. Sem. in conversation with me. [2] Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., 1888, p. 18.

[3] Ib., pp. 1 ff. So Oertel, Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1901, p. 42, "Comparative grammar in Schleicher's sense is in its essence nothing but historical grammar by the comparative method."

[4] Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., 1875, p. 259 f.

[5] Ib., p. 261. [6] *Op. cit*., pp. 629-643.

[7] See Sayce, Intr. to the Sci. of Lang., 1880, vol. I, p. 19 f.; Dionysius Thrax's τέχνη γραμματική was developed into a system by Apollonius Dyscolus (ii/A.D.) and his son Herodian. Dionysius Thrax was born B.C. 166. Dyscolus wrote a systematic Gk. Syntax of accentuation in 20 books (known to us only in epitome) about 200 A.D.

in Athens.[1] Rhetoric was scientifically developed by Aristotle long before there was a scientific syntax. Aristotle perfected logical analysis of style before there was historical grammar.[2] With Aristotle ὁ γραμματικός was one that busied himself with the letters (γράμματα). He was not ἀγράμματος; ἡ γραμματική then had to do with the letters and was exegetical.[3] Plato does not treat grammar, though the substantive and the adjective are distinguished, but only dialectics, metaphysics, logic.[4] The Stoic grammarians, who succeeded Plato and Aristotle, treated language from the logical standpoint and accented its psychological side.[5] So the Alexandrian grammarians made γραμματική more like κριτική. They got hold of the right idea, though they did not attain the true historical method.[6]

Comparative grammar was not wholly unknown indeed to the ancients, for the Roman grammarians since Varro made a comparison between Greek and Latin words.[7] The Roman writers on grammar defined it as the "scientia recte loquendi et scribendi,"[8] and hence came nearer to the truth than did the Alexandrian writers with their Stoic philosophy and exegesis. It has indeed been a hard struggle to reach the light in grammar.[9] But Roger Bacon in this "blooming time" saw that it was necessary for the knowledge of both Greek and Latin to compare them.[10] And Bernhardy in 1829 saw that there was needed a grammatico-historical discussion of syntax because of the "distrust of the union of philosophy with grammar."[11] We needed "the view-

[1] See Jebb in Whibley's Comp. to Gk. Stud., 1905, p. 147 f.

[2] See Steinthal, Gesch. der Sprachw. bei den Griech. und Rom., 2. TI., 1891, p. 179.

[3] F. Hoffmann, Uber die Entwickelung des Begriffs der Gr. bei den Alten, 1891, p. 1.

[4] Ib., p. 144. The early Gk. grammarians were "ohne richtiges historisches Bewusstsein" (Steinthal, Gesch. der Sprachw. etc., 1. Tl., 1863, p. 39). Even in Plato's Kratylus we do not see "das Gauze in seiner Ganzheit" (p. 40).

[5] Ib., p. 277 f. For a good discussion of Dion. Thr. see Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 34 f.

[6] See Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, p. 1.

[7] See Kretschmer, *op. cit*., p. 4.

[8] F. Blass, Hermen. und Krit., 1892, p. 157 f. Steinthal, Gesch. etc., 2. Tl., 1891, p. 1, calls this time of struggle "ihre Blutezeit."

[10] Roger Bacon, Oxford Gk. Gr., edited by Nolan and Hirsch, 1902, p. 27: "Et in hac comparatione Grammaticae Graecae ad Latinam non solum est necessitas propter intelligendam Grammaticam Graecam, sed omnino necqssarium est ad intelligentiam Latinae Grammaticae."

[11] Wissenseh. Synt, der griech. Spr., 1829, pp. 7, 12.

point of the historical Syntax." Humboldt is quoted by Oertel[1] as saying: "Linguistic science, as I understand it, must be based upon facts alone, and this collection must be neither one-sided nor incomplete." So Bopp conceived also: "A grammar in the higher scientific sense of the word must be both history and natural science." This is not an unreasonable demand, for it is made of every other department of science.[2]

3. *The Discovery of Sanskrit.* It is a transcendent fact which has revolutionized grammatical research. The discovery of Sanskrit by Sir William Jones is what did it. In 1786 he wrote thus[3]: "The Sanskrit language, whatever may be its antiquity, is of wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either; yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and the forms of grammar, than could have been produced by accident; so strong that no philologer could examine all the three without believing them to have sprung from some common source which no longer exists. There is a similar reason, though not so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and the Celtic, though blended with a different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanskrit." He saw then the significance of his own discovery, though not all of it, for the Teutonic tongues, the Lithuanian and Slav group of languages, the Iranian, Italic, Armenian and Albanian belong to the same Aryan, Indo-Germanic or Indo-European family as it is variously called.

4. From Bopp to Brugmann. But Bopp[4] is the real founder of comparative philology. Before Bopp's day "in all grammars the mass of 'irregular' words was at least as great as that of the 'regular' ones, and a rule without exception actually excited suspicion."[5] Pott's great work laid the foundation of scientific phonetics.[6] Other great names in this new science are W. von

[1] Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1901, p. 47.

[2] See C. Herrmann, Philos. Gr., 1858, p. 422: "Die Natur der philosophischen Grammatik war von Anfang an bestimmt worden als die eine Grenzwissenschaft zwischen Philosophie and Philologie." But it is a more objective task now.

[3] Cf. Benfey, Gesch. der Sprachw., p. 348. "This brilliant discovery, declared in 1786, practically lies at the root of all linguistic science." J. H. Moulton, Sci. of Lang., 1903, p. 4.

[4] See his Vergl. Gr., 1857. He began publication on the subject in 1816.

[5] Delbruck, Intr. to the Study of Lang., 1882, p. 25.

[6] Etym. Forsch. auf dem Gebiet der indoger. Spr., 1833-1830.

Humboldt,[1] Jacob Grimm,[2] Schlegel,[3] Schleicher,[4] Max Muller,[5] Curtius,[6] Verner,[7] Whitney,[8] L. Meyer.[9]

But in recent years two men, K. Brugmann and B. Delbruck, have organized the previous knowledge into a great monumental work, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*.[10] This achievement is as yet the high-water-mark in comparative grammar. Brugmann has issued a briefer and cheaper edition giving the main results.[11] Delbruck has also a brief treatise on Greek syntax in the light of comparative grammar,[12] while Brugmann has applied comparative philology to the *Laut- and Formenlehre* of Greek grammar.[13] In the *Grundriss* Brugmann has Bde. I, II, while Delbruck treats syntax in Bde. III-V. In the new edition Brugmann has also that part of the syntax which is treated in Vol. III and IV of the first edition. The best discussion of comparative grammar for beginners is the second edition of P. Giles's *Manual*.[14] Hatzidakis successfully undertakes to apply comparative grammar to the modern Greek.[15] Riemann and Goelzer have made an exhaustive comparison of the Greek and Latin languages.[16] There are, indeed, many interesting discussions of the history and principles growing out of all this linguistic development, such as the works

[1] Always mentioned by Bopp with reverence.

[2] Deutsche Gr., 1822. Author of Grimm's law of the interchange of letters. Next to Bopp in influence.

[3] Indische Bibl.

[4] Vergl. Gr. der indoger. Spr., 1876, marks the next great advance.

[5] Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1866. He did much to popularize this study.

[6] His most enduring work is his Prin. of Gk. Etym., vols. I, II, fifth ed., 1886.

[7] The discovery of Verner's law, a variation from Grimm's law, according to which *p*, *t* and *k*, pass into *b, d* and *g*, instead of *f, th* and *h* when not immediately followed by the word-accent.

[8] Life and Growth of Lang., 1875; Sans. Gr., 1892, etc.

[9] Vergl. Gr., 1865.

[10] Bd. I-V, 1st ed. 1886-1900; 2d ed. 1897—; cf. also Giles-Hertel, Vergl. Gr., 1896.

[11] Kurze vergl. Gr., 1902-1904.

[12] Die Grundl. der griech. Synt., 1879.

[13] Griech. Gr., 1900, 3. Aufl.; 4. Aufl., 1913, by Thumb. See also G. Meyer, Griech. Gr., 3. verm. Aufl., 1896.

[14] A Short Man. of Comp. Philol., 1901.

[15] Einl. in die neugr. Gr., 1892.

[16] Gr. comparee du Grec et du Lat.: Syntaxe, 1897; Phonetique et Etude de Formes, 1901. Cf. also King and Cookson's Prin. of Sound and Inflexion as illustrated in the Gk. and Lat. Lang., 1888.

of Jolly,[1] Delbruck,[2] Sweet,[3] Paul,[4] Oertel,[5] Moulton,[6] Whitney,[7] Max Muller,[8] Sayce.[9] It is impossible to write a grammar of the Greek N. T. without taking into consideration this new conception of language. No language lives to itself, and least of all the Greek of the N. T. in the heart of the world-empire.[10] It is not necessary to say that until recently use of this science had not been made by N. T. grammars.[11]

(b) ADVANCE IN GENERAL GREEK GRAMMAR. There has been great advance in the study of general Greek grammar. The foundations laid by Crosby and Ktihner, Kruger, Curtius, Buttmann, Madvig, Jelf and others have been well built upon by Hadley, Goodwin, Gildersleeve, Gerth, Blass, Brugmann, G. Meyer, Schanz, Hirt, Jannaris, etc. To the classical student this catalogue of names[12] is full of significance. The work of Kuhner has been thoroughly revised and improved in four massive volumcs by Blass[13] and Gerth,[14] furnishing a magnificent apparatus for the advanced student. Hirt's handbook[15] gives the modern knowledge in briefer form, a compendium of comparative grammar, while G. Meyer[16] and Brugmann[17] are professedly on the

[1] Schulgr. und Sprachw., 1874.

[2] Intr. to the Study of Lang., 1882; 5th Germ. ed. 1908. Uber die Resultate der vergl. Synt., 1872. Cf. Wheeler, The Whence and Whither of the Mod. Sci. of Lang., 1905; Henry, Précis de gr. du grec et du latin, 5th ed., 1894.

[3] The Hist. of Lang., 1899.

[4] Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., 1888; 4th Germ. ed. 1909.

[5] Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1901.

[6] The Sci. of Lang., 1903.

[7] Lang. and the Study of Lang., 1867.

[8] Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891.

[9] Prin. of Comp. Philol., 1875.

[10] By "die historische Sprachforschung" the Gk. tongue is shown to be a member of the Indo-Germanic family; thus is gained "der sprachgeschichtliche Gesichtspunkt," and then is gained " ein wesentlich richtiges Verstandnis . . . fur den Entwicklungsgang der Sprache." Brugmann, Griech. Gr., 1885, p. 4. Cf. p. 3 in third ed., 1901.

[11] See J. H. Moulton's Prol. to the N. T. Gk. Gr., 1906, and A. T. Robertson's N. T. Syll., 1900, and Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., 1908.

[12] The late G. N. Hatzidakis contemplated a thesaurus of the Gk. language,. but his death cut it short.

[13] Ausfuhrl. Gr. der griech. Spr. von Dr. Raphael Kuhner, 1. Tl.: Elemen-, tar- und Formenlehre, Bd. I, II. Besorgt von Dr. Friedrich Blass, 1890, 1892.

[14] Ib., 2. Tl. Satzlehre, Bd. I, II. Besorgt von Dr. Bernhard Gerth, 1898, 1904.

[15] Handb. der griech. Laut- und Formenlehre, 1902, 1. Aufl.; 2. Aufl., 1912.

[16] Griech. Gr., 3. Aufl., 1896.

[17] Ib., 1900; 4. Aufl., 1913, by Thumb; 3d ed. quoted in this book. A now (1912) Wright has given in English a Comp. Gr. of the Gk. Lang.

basis of comparative philology. Jannaris[1] is the first fairly successful attempt to present in one volume the survey of the progress of the language as a whole. Schanz[2] makes a much more ambitious undertaking and endeavours in a large number of monographs to furnish material for a future historical grammar. Gildersleeve[3] has issued only two volumes of his work, while the grammars of Hadley-Allen and Goodwin are too well known to call for remark. New grammars, like F. E. Thompson's (1907, new ed.) and Simonson's (2 vols., 1903, 1908), continue to appear.

(c) CRITICAL EDITIONS OF GREEK AUTHORS. The Greek authors in general have received minute and exhaustive investigation. The modern editions of Greek writers are well-nigh ideal. Careful and critical historical notes give the student all needed, sometimes too much, aid for the illumination of the text. The thing most lacking is the reading of the authors and, one may add, the study of the modern Greek. Butcher[4] well says "Greek literature is the one entirely original literature of Europe." Homer, Aristotle, Plato, not to say AEschylus, Sophocles and Euripides are still the modern masters of the intellect. Translations are better than nothing, but can never equal the original. The Greek language remains the most perfect organ of human speech and largely because "they were talkers, whereas we are readers."[5] They studied diligently how to talk.[6]

(d) WORKS ON INDIVIDUAL WRITERS. In nothing has the tendency to specialize been carried further than in Greek grammatical research. The language of Homer, Thucydides, Herodotus, the tragic poets, the comic writers, have all called for minute investi-

[1] An Hist. Gk. Gr., chiefly of the Att. Dial., 1897. Cf. also Wackernagel, Die griech. Spr. (pp. 291-318), Tl. I, Abt. VIII, Kultur der Gegenw.

2 Beitr. zur histor. Synt. der griech. Spr., Tl. I. Cf. also Hubner, Grundr. zur Vorlesung tiber die griech. Synt., 1883. A good bibliography. Krumbacher, Beitr. zu einer Gesch. der griech. Spr., Kuhn's Zeitschr. etc., 1885, pp. 481-545.

[3] Synt. of Class. Gk., 1900, 1911.

[4] Harv. Lect. on Gk. Subj., 1904, p. 129. See also Butcher, Some Aspects of the Gk. Genius, 1893, p. 2: "Greece, first smitten with the passion for truth, had the courage to put faith in reason, and, in following its guidance, to take no account of consequences." So p. 1: "To see things as they really are, to discern their meanings and adjust their relations was with them an instinct and a passion."

[5] Ib., p. 203.

[6] See Bernhardy, Griech. Lit., TI. I, II, 1856; Christ, Gesch. der griech. Lit. bis auf die Zeit Justinians, 4. revid. Aufl., 1905; 5. Aufl., 1908 ff. Parnell, Gk. Lyric Poetry, 1891, etc. A. Croiset and M. Croiset, An Abr. Hist. of Gk. Lit., transl. by Heffelbower, 1904.

gation,[1] and those of interest to N. T. students are the monographs on Polybius, Josephus, Plutarch, etc. The concordances of Plato, Aristotle, etc., are valuable. The Apostolic Fathers, Greek Christian Apologists and the Apocryphal writings illustrate the tendencies of N. T. speech. Cf. Reinhold, *De Graec. Patr. Apost.* (1898). The universities of America and Europe which give the Ph.D. degree have produced a great number of monographs on minute points like the use of the preposition in Herodotus, etc. These all supply data of value and many of them have been used in this grammar. Dr. Mahaffy,[2] indeed, is impatient of too much specialism, and sometimes in linguistic study the specialist has missed the larger and true conception of the whole.

(e) THE GREEK INSCRIPTIONS. The Greek inscriptions speak with the voice of authority concerning various epochs of the language. Once we had to depend entirely on books for our knowledge of the Greek tongue. There is still much obscurity, but it is no longer possible to think of Homer as the father of Greek nor to consider 1000 B.C. as the beginning of Greek culture. The two chief names in epigraphical studies are those of August Boeckh (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*) and Theodor Mommsen (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*). For a careful review of "the Nature of the New Texts" now at our service in the inscriptions see Deissmann, *Light*, etc., pp. 10-20. See W. H. P. Hatch's article (*Jour. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1908, pp. 134-146, Part 2) on "Some Illustrations of N. T. Usage from Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor." Cf. also Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maander and das Neue Test.* (1906), and Rouffiac, *Recherches sur les Caracteres du Grec dans le N. T. d'apres les Inscriptions de Priene* (1911). Deissmann, op. cit., p. 18, thinks that ἀγά[πη]ν is rightly restored in a pagan inscription in Pisidia of the imperial period. For the Christian inscriptions see Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 19. Schliemann[3] has not only restored the story of Troy to the reader of the historic past, but he has revealed a great civi-

[1] Cf., for instance, Die Spr. des Plut. etc., T1. I, II, 1895, 1896; Krebs, Die Prapositionen bei Polybius, 1881; Goetzeler, Einfl. des Dion. Hal. auf die Sprachgesch. etc., 1891; Schmidt, De Flavii Josephi eloc. observ. crit., 1894; Kaelker, Quest. de Eloc. Polyb. etc.

[2] "A herd of specialists is rising up, each master of his own subject, but absolutely ignorant and careless of all that is going on around him in kindred studies." Survey of Gk. Civilization, 1897, p. 3.

[3] Mycenae and Tiryns, 1878.

lization at Mycenae.[1] Homer stands at the close of a long antecedent history of linguistic progress, and once again scholars are admitting the date 850 or even 1000 B.C. for his poems as well as their essential unity, thus abandoning Wolff's hypothesis.[2] They have been driven to this by the abundant linguistic testimony from the inscriptions from many parts of Greece. So vast is this material that numerous grammatical discussions have been made concerning the inscriptions, as those by Roehl,[3] Kretschmer,[4] Lautensach,[5] Rang,[6] Meisterhans,[7] Schweizer,[8] Viteau,[9] Wagner,[10] Nachmanson,[11] etc.

These inscriptions are not sporadic nor local, but are found in Egypt, in Crete, in Asia Minor, the various isles of the sea,[12] in Italy, in Greece, in Macedonia, etc. Indeed Apostolides[13] seems to show that the Greeks were in Egypt long before Alexander the Great founded Alexandria. The discoveries of Dr. A. J.

[1] See also Tsountas and Manatt, The Mycenaean Age, 1897.

[2] Ridgeway (Early Age of Greece, vol. I, 1901, p. 635) says that the methods applied to dissection of the Iliad and the Odyssey would pick to pieces the Paradise Lost and The Antiquary. "The linguistic attack upon their age may be said to have at last definitely failed." (T. W. Allen, Cl. Rev., May, 1906, p. 193.) Lang, Homer and Hiss Age (1906), advocates strongly the unity of the Homeric poems.

[3] Inscr. Graecae Antiq., 1882.

[4] Die griech. Vaseninschr. und ihre Spr., 1894.

[5] Verbalfl. der att. Inschr., 1887.

[6] Antiquites hellen., 1842.

[7] Gr. der att. Inschr., 3. Aufl. von E. Schwyzer, 1900.

[8] Gr. der perg. Inschr., 1898.

[9] La decl. dans les inscr. att. de l'Empire, 1895.

[10] Quest. de epigram. Graecis, 1883.

[11] Laute und Formen der magn. Inschr., 1903; cf. also Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae ad illustr. Dial. sel.; Audollent, Defix. Tabellae, 1904; Michel, Rec. d'inscr. Graec., 1883; Dittenberger, Or. Graeci Inscr. Sel., 1903-1905; Roberts-Gardner, Intr. to Gk. Epigr., 1888. See Bibliography. Cf. especially the various volumes of the Corpus Inscr. Graecarum.

[12] As, for example, Paton and Hicks, The Inscr. of Cos, 1891; Kern, Die Inschr. von Magn., 1900; Gartingen, Inschr. von Priene, 1906; Gartingen and Paton, Inscr. Maris Aegaei, 1903; Letronne, Rec. des inscr. lat. et grec. de 1'Egypte, 1842. As early as 1779 Walch made use of the inscriptions for the N. T. Gk. in his Observationes in Matt. ex graecis inscriptionibus. Cf. also the works of E. L. Hicks, Lightfoot; Ramsay.

[13] Essai sur l'Hellenisme Egypt., 1908, p. vi. He says: "Les decouvertes recentes des archeologues ont dissipe ces illusions. Des ruines de Naucratis, de Daphne, de Gurob, et de l'Illahoun (pour ne citer que les localites dans lesquelles les recherches ont donne le plus de resultats) est sortie toute une nouvelle Grece; une Grece anterieure aux Ramses . . .; et, si les recherches se continuent, on ne tardera pas, nous en sommes convaincus, acquerir la certitude que les Grecs sont aussi anciens en Egypte qu'en Grece meme."

Evans in Crete have pushed back the known examples of Greek a thousand years or more. The linear script of Knossos, Crete, may be some primitive form of Greek 500 years before the first dated example of Phoenician writing. The civilization of the Hellenic race was very old when Homer wrote, — how old no one dares say.[1] For specimens of the use of the inscriptions see Buck's *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects* (Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary), 1910.

(f) FULLER KNOWLEDGE OF THE DIALECTS. The new knowledge of the other dialects makes it possible to form a juster judgment of the relative position of the Attic. There has been much confusion on this subject and concerning the relation of the various Greek races. It now seems clear that the Pelasgians, Achaeans, Dorians were successively dominant in Greece.[2] Pelasgian appears to be the name for the various pre-Achaean tribes, and it was the Pelasgian tribe that made Mycenae glorious.[3] Homer sings the glories of the Achaeans who displaced the Pelasgians, while "the people who play a great part in later times — Dorians, AEolians, Ionians — are to Homer little more than names."[4] The Pelasgian belonged to the bronze age, the Achaean to the iron age.[5] The Pelasgians may have been Slavs and kin to the Etruscans of Italy. The Achans were possibly Celts from northern Europe.[6] The old Ionic was the base of the old Attic.[7] This old Ionic-Attic was the archaic Greek tongue, and the choruses in the Attic poets partly represent artificial literary Doric. There was not a sharp division[8] between the early dialects owing to the successive waves of population sweeping over the country. There were numerous minor subdivisions in the dialects (as the Arcadian, Boeotian, Northwest, Thessalian, etc.) due to the mountain ranges, the peninsulas, the islands, etc., and other causes into which we cannot enter. For a skilful attempt at grouping and relating the dialects to each other see Thumb's *Handbuch*, p. 54 f. The matter cannot be elaborated here (see ch. III). But the point needs to be emphasized that

[1] A. J. Evans, Ann. Rep. of the Smiths. Inst., p. 436.
[2] See Ridgeway, The Early Age of Greece, vol. I, p. 84.
[3] Ib., p. 293. For the contribution of the dialects to the **κοινή** see ch. III.
[4] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., 1901, p. 526.
[5] Ib., p. 406.
[6] Ridgeway, *op. cit*., vol. I, p. 337.
[7] Ib., pp. 666-670.
[8] Hoffmann, Die griech. Dial., Bd. I, p. 7. A more recent treatment of the dialects is Thumb's Handb. der griech. Dial. (1909), which makes use of all the recent discoveries from the inscriptions. On the mixing of the dialects see Thumb, p. 61 f.

the literary dialects by no means represent the linguistic history of Greece itself and still less that of the islands and other colonies (cf. Buck's *Greek Dialects*, p. 1). The blending of these dialects into the **κοινή**) was not complete as we shall see.[1] "Of dialects the purest Hellenic is Dorian, preserved in religious odes, — pure because they kept aloof from their subjects. The next is the AEolic, preserved in lyric odes of the Lesbian school. The earliest to be embodied in literature was Ionic, preserved in epic poems. The most perfect is Attic, the language of drama, philosophy and oratory. This arose out of the Ionic by introducing some of the strength of Doric-AEolic forms without sacrificing the sweet smoothness of Ionic."[2] In general concerning the Greek dialects one may consult the works of Meister,[3] Ridgeway,[4] Hoffmann,[5] Thumb,[6] Buck,[7] Boisacq,[8] Pezzi,[9] etc.

(g) THE PAPYRI AND OSTRACA. Thiersch in 1841 had pointed out the value of the papyri for the study of the LXX in his *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina*, but nobody thought it worth while to study the masses of papyri in London, Paris and Berlin for the N. T. language. Farrar (*Messages of the Books*, 1884, p. 151) noted the similarity of phrase between Paul's correspondence and the papyri in the Brit. Mus. "N. T. philology is at present undergoing thorough reconstruction; and probably all the workers concerned, both on the continent and in English-speaking countries, are by this time agreed that the starting-point for the philological investigations must be the language of the non-literary papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions" (Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 55). The **κοινή** is now rich in material for the study of the vernacular or popular speech as opposed to the book language. This distinction belongs to all languages which have a literature and to all periods of the language. It is particularly true of the modern

[1] See Dieterich, Die **Κοινή** and die heut. kleinasiat. Mundarten-Unters. zur Gesch. etc., pp. 271-310. Cf. Chabert, Hist. sommaire des et. d'epigr. grecque, 1906.

[2] MS. Notes on Gk. Gr. by H. H. Harris, late Prof. of Gk. at Richmond College.

[3] Griech. Dial., Bd. I, 1882, Bd. II, 1889; cf. Hicks, Man. of Gk. Hist. Inscr., 1888.

[4] *Op. cit*.

[5] *Op. cit*. and Bd. II, 1893, Bd. III, 1898. See also various volumes of the Samml. der griech. Dial.-Inschr.

[6] Handb. der griech. Dial., 1909.

[7] Gk. Dialects.

[8] Les dialectes Doriens, 1891; cf. also H. W. Smyth, The Gk. Dial. (Ionic only), 1894.

[9] Lingua Greca Antica, 1888. Cf. Lambert, Et. stir le dial. Cohen, 1903.

Greek to-day as it was true in the early period. The Athenian newspapers as a rule affect the καθαρεύουσα. Occasionally a writer like Aristophanes would on purpose write in the language of the street. It is not therefore a peculiarity of the κοινή that the vernacular Greek prevailed then. It always prevails. But the καθαρεύουσα has secured a more disastrous supremacy over the δημοτική than in any other language. And we are now able to estimate the vernacular κοινή, since the great papyri discoveries of Flinders-Petrie, Grenfell and Hunt and others. We had already the excellent discussions of Mullach,[1] Niebuhr,[2] Blass,[3] Foy[4] and Lottich.[5] But in the last fifteen years or so a decided impetus has been given to this phase of Greek grammatical research. It is in truth a new study, the attention now paid to the vernacular, as Moulton points out in his *Prolegomena* (p. 22). "I will go further and say that if we could only recover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other without being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the language of the N. T. generally" (Bishop Lightfoot, 1863, as quoted in Moulton's *Prol*., 2d and 3d ed., p. 242). If Lightfoot only lived now! Cf. Masson's Preface to Winer (1859).

The most abundant source of new light for the vernacular κοινή is found in the papyri collections, many volumes of which have already been published (see Index of Quots. for fuller list), while more are yet to be issued. Indeed, Prof. W. N. Stearns[6] complains: "There would seem to be a plethora of such material already as evidenced by such collections as the Berlinische Urkunde and the Rainier Papyri." But the earnest student of the Greek tongue can only rejoice at the "extraordinary and in part unexpected wealth of material from the contemporary and the later languages."[7] See the publications of Drs. Grenfell and Hunt,[8]

[1] Gr. der griech. Vulgarspr., 1856.

[2] Uber das Agyp.-Griech., Kl. Schr., II, p. 197 f.

[3] Die griech. Beredsamkeit von Alex. bis auf Aug., 1865.

[4] Lauts. der griech. Vulgarspr., 1879.

[5] De Serm. vulg. Att., 1881.

[6] Am. Jour. of Theol., Jan., 1906, p. 134.

[7] Samuel Dickey, New Points of View for the Study of the Gk. of the N. T. (Prince. Theol. Rev., Oct., 1903).

[8] Oxyrhyn. Pap., vols. I–XII, 1898-1916; Faytim Pap., 1900; Tebtunis Pap., 1902 (Univ. of Cal. Publ., pts. I, II, 1907); Hibeh Pap., pt. I, 1906; vol. IV, Oxyrhyn. Pap., pp. 265-271, 1904; Grenfell and Hunt, The Hibeh Pap., 1906, pt. I. In general, for the bibliography of the papyri see Hohlwein, La papyrol. grec., bibliog. raisonnee, 1905.

Mahaffy,[1] Goodspeed,[2] the Berlinische Urkunde,[3] Papyri in the British Museum,[4] the Turin Papyri,[5] the Leyden Papyri,[6] the Geneva Papyri,[7] Lord Amherst's collection (Paris, 1865), etc. For general discussions of the papyri see the writings of Wilcken,[8] Kenyon,[9] Hartel,[10] Haberlin,[11] Viereck,[12] Deissmann,[13] de Ricci,[14] Wessely.[15] A great and increasing literature is thus coming into existence on this subject. Excellent handbooks of convenient size are those by H. Lietzmann, *Greek Papyri* (1905), and by G. Milligan, *Greek Papyri* (1910). For a good discussion of the papyri and the literature on the subject see Deissmann, *Light*, etc., pp. 20-41. The grammatical material in the papyri has not been exhausted. There are a number of excellent workers in the field such as Mayser,16 St. Witkowski,[17] Deissmann,[18] Moulton,[19] H. A. A. Kennedy,[20] Jannaris,[21] Kenyon,[22] Voelker,[23] Thumb.[24]

[1] Flinders-Petrie Pap., 1891, 1892, 1893.

[2] Gk. Pap. from the Cairo Mus., 1902, 1903.

[3] Griech. Urik., 1895, 1898, 1903, 1907, etc.

[4] F. G. Kenyon, Cat. of Gk. Pap. in the B. M., 1893; Evid. of the Pap. for Text. Crit. of the N. T., 1905; B. M. Pap., vol. I, 1893, vol. II, 1898.

[5] Peyron, 1826, 1827.

[6] Zauber Pap., 1885; Leeman's Pap. Graeci, 1843.

[7] J. Nicole, 1896, 1900; cf. Wessely's Corpus Pap., 1895.

[8] Griech. Papyrusurk., 1897; Archly fur Papyrusforsch. und verve. Gebiete, 1900—.

[9] Palaeog. of Gk. Pap., 1899; art. Papyri in Hast. D. B. (ext. vol.).

[10] Uber die griech. Pap.

[11] Griech. Pap., Centralbl. fiir Bibliothekswesen, 14. 1 f.

[12] Ber. uber die altere Pap.-Lit., Jahresb. uber d. Fortschr. etc., 1898, 1899.

[13] Art. Papyri in Encyc. Bibl.

[14] Bul. papyrologique in Rev. des Rt. grecques since 1901.

[15] Papyrus-Samml. since 1883. Cf. also Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., 1903; Reinach, Pap. grecs et &mot. etc., 1905.

[16] Gr. der griech. Pap., Tl. I, Laut- und Wortl., 1906.

[17] Prodromus Gr. Pap. Grace. aetatis Lagidarum, 26. Bd. der Abhandl. der Phil. class. der Acad. zu Krakau, 1897, pp. 196-260.

[18] B. S., 1901; Light, etc.; art. Hell. Griech. in Hauck's Realencyc.; art. Papyrus in Encyc. Bibl., etc.

[19] Gr. Notes from the Pap., Cl. Rev., 1901; Notes on the Pap., Exp., April, 1901, Feb., 1903; Characteristics of N. T. Gk., Exp., March to Dec., 1904; Prol. to Gr. of N. T. Gk., 1908, 3d ed., etc.

[20] Sources of N. T. Gk., 1895; Recent Res. in the Lang. of the N. T., Exp. Times, May, July, Sept., 1901.

[21] Hist. Gk. Gr., 1897; The Term **κοινή**, Cl. Rev., March, 1903.

[22] Art. Papyri in Hast. D. B.

[23] Syntax der griech. Pap., Tl. I, 1903.

[24] Die Forsch. uber die hell. Spr. in d. Jahr. 1896-1901, Archiv far Papyrus-forsch., 1903, pp. 396-426; Die Forsch. uber die hell. Spr. in d. Jahr. 1902-4,

These are all helpful, but Cronert[1] is right in urging that we need a comprehensive discussion of the syntax of the Ptolemaic papyri in order to set forth properly the relation of the papyri both to the N. T. Greek and to the older Attic. This will require time, for the mass of material is very great and is constantly growing.[2] But enough already is clear for us to see the general bearing of the whole on the problem of the N. T. It is just here that the papyri have special interest and value. They give the language of business and life. The N. T. writers were partly ἀγράμματοι, but what they wrote has become the chief Book of Mankind.[3] Hear Deissmann[4] again, for he it is who has done most to blaze the way here: "The papyrus-leaf is alive; one sees autographs, individual peculiarities of penmanship — in a word, men; manifold glimpses are given into inmost nooks and crannies of personal life in which history has no eyes and historians no glasses . . . It may seem a paradox, but it can safely be affirmed that the unliterary papyri are more important in these respects than the literary." Some of the papyri contain literary works, fragments of Greek classics, portions of the LXX or of the N. T., though the great mass of them are non-literary documents, letters and business papers. Cf. also Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 29. Unusual interest attaches to the fragments containing the Logia of Jesus, some of which are new, dating from the second or third centuries A.D. and showing a Gnostic tinge.[5] It is no longer possible to say, what even Friedrich Blass[6] did in 1894, that the N. T. Greek "is to be regarded something by itself and following laws of its own." That view is doomed in the presence of the papyri. Hatch[7] in particular laboured under this error. The N. T. Greek

Archiv fur Pap., 111. 4; also Jahresb. fiber die Fortschr. des Class., 1906; Diegriech. Papyrusurk., 1899-1905, pp. 36-40; Die griech. Spr. etc., 1901.

[1] Archiv fur Pap.-Forsch., 1900, p. 215.

[2] "Zum ersten Mal gewinnen wir reale Vorstellungen von dem Zustand und der Entwickelung der handschriftlichen Lebenslieferung im Altertum selbst. Neue wichtige Probleme sind damit der Philologie gestellt." N. Wilcken, Die griech. Papyrusurk., 1897, p. 7. Mayser's Tl. II will supply this need when it appears.

[3] See Deissmann, Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, 1898, p. 27.

[4] Art. Papyri in Encyc. Bibl.

[5] See **Λόγια ᾽Ιησοῦ**, Sayings of Jesus, by Grenfell and Hunt, 1897. New Sayings of Jesus, by Grenfell and Hunt, 1904. See also two books by Dr. C. Taylor, The Oxyrhyn. Logia, 1899; The Oxyrhyn. Sayings of Jesus, 1905; Lock and Sanday, Two Lect. on the Sayings of Jesus, 1897.

[6] Theol. Literaturzeit., 1894, p. 338.

[7] Essays in Bibl. Gk., 1892, p. 11 f. The earliest dated papyrus is now

will no longer be despised as inferior or unclassical. It will be seen to be a vital part of the great current of the Greek language. For the formal discussion of the bearing of the papyri on the N. T. Greek see chapter IV. A word should be said concerning the reason why the papyri are nearly all found in Egypt.[1] It is due to the dryness of the climate there. Elsewhere the brittle material soon perished, though it has on the whole a natural toughness. The earliest known use of the papyri in Egypt is about 3400 B.C. More exactly, the reign of Assa in the fifth dynasty is put at 3360 B.C. This piece of writing is an account-sheet belonging to this reign (Deissmann, *Light from A. E.*, p. 22). The oldest specimen of the Greek papyri goes back to "the regnal year of Alexander AEgus, the son of Alexander the Great. That would make it the oldest Greek papyrus document yet discovered" (Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 29). The discoveries go on as far as the seventh century A.D., well into the Byzantine period. The plant still grows in Egypt and it was once the well-nigh universal writing material. As waste paper it was used to wrap the mummies. Thus it has come to be preserved. The rubbish-heaps at Faram and Oxyrhynchus are full of these papyri scraps.

Mention should be made also of the ostraca, or pieces of pottery, which contain numerous examples of the vernacular **κοινή**. For a very interesting sketch of the ostraca see Deissmann, *Light*, etc. (pp. 41-53). Crum and Wilcken have done the chief work on the ostraca. They are all non-literary and occur in old Egyptian, Arabic, Aramaic, Coptic, Greek and Latin. "Prof. Wilcken, in his *Griechische Ostraka*,[2] has printed the texts of over sixteen hundred of the inscribed potsherds on which the commonest receipts and orders of Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt were written."[3] It was the material used by the poorer classes.

(h) THE BYZANTINE AND THE MODERN GREEK. The Byzantine and modern Greek has at last received adequate" recognition.

P. Eleph. 1 (311 n.c.), not P. Hibeh, as Thackeray has it in his Gr. of the 0. T. in Gk., p. 56. This was true in 1907; cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., March, 1910, p. 53.

[1] The practical limitation of the papyri to Egypt (and Herculaneum) has its disadvantages; cf. Angus, The **Κοινή**, The Lang. of the N. T. (Prince. Theol. Rev., Jan., 1910, p. 80).

[2] Griech. Ostraka aus Agypten and Nubien, Bd. I, H, 1899; cf. also Crum, Coptic Ostraca, 2 vols. (1899); cf. Hilprecht, S. S. Times, 1902, p. 560. "In many Coptic letters that are written on potsherds the writers beg their correspondents to excuse their having to use an ostrakon for want of papyrus" (Deissmann, Exp. Times, 1906, Oct., p. 15).

[3] E. J. Goodspeed, Am. Jour. of Theol., Jan., 1906, p. 102.

The student of the N. T. idiom has much to learn from the new books on this subject. The scorn bestowed on the κοινή by the intense classicists was intensified by the modern Greek, which was long regarded as a nondescript jumble of Greek, Albanian, Turkish, Italian, etc. Indeed the modern Greeks themselves have not always shown proper appreciation of the dignity of the modern vernacular, as is shown, for instance, in the recent upheaval at Athens by the University students over the translation of the Gospels into the Greek vernacular (δημοτική) of to-day, though the N. T. was manifestly written in the vernacular of its day. "While the later Greeks, however, could no longer write classically, they retained a keen sense for the beauties of the classical language."[1] Just as the "popular Latin finally suppressed the Latin of elegant literature,"[2] so the vernacular κοινή lived on through the Roman and Byzantine periods and survives to-day as the modern Greek. There is unity in the present-day Greek and historical continuity with the past. Dr. Rose is possibly extreme in saying: "There is more difference between the Greek of Herodotus and the Greek of Xenophon than there is between the Greek of the latter and the Greek of to-day."[3] And certainly Prof. Dickey[4] is right in affirming "that the Greek of N. T. stands in the centre of the development of which classical and modern Greek may be called extremes, and that of the two it is nearer to the second in character than the first. The interpretation of the N. T. has almost entirely been in the sole light of the ancient, i. e. the Attic Greek, and, therefore, to that extent has been unscientific and often inaccurate." Hatzidakis[5] indeed complained that the whole subject had been treated with

[1] Dr. Achilles Rose, Chris. Greece and Living Gk., 1898, p. 7.

[2] R. C. Jebb, On the Rela. of Mod. to Class. Gk., in V. and D.'s Handb.: to Mod. Gk., 1887, p. 287. "In other words, the Bible was cast into spoken Latin, familiar to every rank of society though not countenanced in the schoolroom; and thus it foreshadowed the revolution of ages whereby the Roman tongue expanded into what we may label as Romance." W. Barry, "Our Latin Bible," in Dublin Rev., July, 1906, p. 4; cf. also art. on The Holy Latin Tongue, in April number.

[3] Chris. Greece and Living Greek, p. 253.

[4] New Points of View for the Study of N. T. Gk. (Prince. Theol. Oct., 1903). See also S. Angus, Mod. Methods in N. T. Philol. (Harv. Theol. Rev., Oct., 1911, p. 499): "That the progress of philology has thus broken down the wall of partition of the N. T. and removed its erstwhile isolation a great service to the right understanding of the book's contents."

[5] Einl. in die neugr. Gr., 1892, p. ix; cf. also H. C. Muller, Hist. Gr. de hell. Spr., 1891.

unworthy "dilettanteism" and not without ground for the complaint. He himself did much by his great work to put the study of modern Greek on a scientific basis,[1] but he has not worked alone in this important field. Another native Greek, Prof. Sophocles, has produced a *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* in which there is an excellent discussion for that time[2] of the κοινή, the Byzantine and the modern Greek. Other scholars have developed special phases of the problem, as Krumbacher,[3] who has enriched our knowledge of the Byzantine[4] or Middle Ages Greek. Dieterich[5] also has done fine work in this period of Greek, as has Thumb.[6] Worthy of mention also is the work of G. Meyer,[7] Geldart[8] and Preste1,[9] though the latter have not produced books of great value. See also Meyer-Lithke's grammar,[10] Jannaris' *Historical Greek Grammar* and the writings of Psichari.[11] In general great progress has been made and it is now possible to view the development of the N. T. idiom in the light of the modern Greek. The apparent drift in the vernacular

[1] "Und wenn es mir gelingt, die wissenschaftliche Welt von ihrer wohlberechtigten Zuruckhaltung abzubringen und ihr nachzuweisen, dass das Mittel- und Neugriechische ein vielversprechendes unkultivirtes Gebiet der Wissenschaft ist, woraus man viel, sehr viel bezuglich der Sprachwissenschaft uberhaupt wie des Altgriechischen speciell lernen kann, so ist mein Zweck vollkommen erreicht." Ib., p. x.

[2] 1870. One of the pressing needs is a lexicon of the papyri also. See Contopoulos, Lex. of Mod. Gk., 1868, and others.

[3] Das Problem der neugr. Schriftspr., 1903. "Heute bedarf das Studiengebiet der byzantinischen und neugricchischen Philologie keine Apologie," p. 3. In his hands the middle Gk. (Byzantine) is shown to be a rich field for the student both of philology and literature; cf. also Gesch. der byzant. Lit., p. 20.

[4] Gesch. der byzant. Lit. etc.; cf. also his Byz. Zeitschr. and his Beitr. zu einer Gesch. der griech. Spr., Kuhn's Zeitschr., 1885.
Unters. zur Gesch. d. griech. Spr. etc., 1898; Gesch. der byz. und neugr. Lit., 1902.

[5] Handb. d. neugr. Volkspr., 1895; Thumb-Angus, Handb. of Mod. Gk. Vernac., 1912; Die neugr. Sprachforsch. in d. Jahr. 1890 u. 1891 (Anz. fur indoger. Spr., I, 1892; VI, 1896, and IX, 1898); Die griech. Spr. im Zeitalter des Hellen., 1901; Die sprachgesch. Stellung des bibl. Griechisch, Theol. Runds., March, 1902.

[7] Neugr. Stud., 1894.

[8] The Mod. Gk. Lang. in its Rela. to Anc. Gk., 1870. On the Orig. and Devel. of the Mod. Gk. Lang., Jour. of Philol., 1869.

[9] Zur Entwickelungsgesch. der griech. Spr.

[10] Gr. der romanischen Spr.

[11] Essais de Gr. hist. Neogrecque, 1886; cf. also Boltz Die hell. Spr. der Gegenw., 1882.

κοινή of the N. T., like ἵνα in the non-final clause, is too common for remark in the modern Greek. Indeed the N. T. had a predominant influence on the later Greek as the chief literature of the period, and especially as Christianity won the victory over heathenism. The Byzantine Greek is in subject-matter largely ecclesiastical. The sermons and treatises of the Greek Christian Fathers constitute a large and valuable literature and amply illustrate the language of the time.[1] The modern Greek is in all essential points the same as the Byzantine Greek of 1000 A.D. In forty years[2] we have seen a revolution in the study of the modern Greek. But as late as 1887 Vincent and Dickson[3] could say: "By many it is believed that a corrupt *patois* of Turkish and Italian is now spoken in Greece; and few even among professed scholars are aware how small the difference is between the Greek of the N. T. and the Greek of a contemporary Athenian newspaper." The new Greek speech was developed not out of the Byzantine literary language, but out of the Hellenistic popular speech.[4]

(i) THE HEBREW AND ARAMAIC. Less that is new has come from the Hebrew and Aramaic field of research. Still real advance has been made here also. The most startling result is the decrease of emphasis upon Hebraisms in the N. T. style. In chapter IV, iii the Semitic influence on the N. T. language is discussed. Here the literary history is sketched.

1. *The Old View*. It was only in 1879 that Guillemard[5] issued his *Hebraisms in the Greek Testament*, in which he said in the Preface: "I earnestly disavow any claim to an exhaustive exhibition of all the Hebraisms, or all the deviations from classical phraseology contained in the Greek Testament; of which I have gathered together and put forward only a few specimens, in the hope of stimulating others to fuller and more exact research." Even in 1889, Dr. Edwin Hatch[6] says: "Biblical Greek is thus a

[1] See the Migne Lib. and the new Ben Royal Lib. ed.

[2] Dieterich, *op. cit*., p. 10.

[3] Handb. to Mod. Gk., p. 3. See also Horae Hellenicae, by Stuart Blackie, 1874, p. 115: "Byzantine Gk. was classical Gk. from beginning to end, wit" only such insignificant changes as the altered circumstances, combined with the law of its original genius, naturally produced." Cf. Rangabe, Gr. Abregee du grec actuel; **Γεννάδιος, Γραμματικὴ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης.**

[4] Dieterich, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[5] See also A. Miller, Semit. Lehnw. in alteren Griech., Bezzenb. Beitr. 1878, I, pp. 273 ff.; S. Krauss, Griech. und lat. Lehnw. im Tal., 1898, 1899.

[6] Essays in Bibl. Gk., p. 11.

language by itself. What we have to find out in studying it is what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind." Again he says[1]: "The great majority of N. T. words are words which, though for the most part common to biblical and to contemporary secular Greek, express in their biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race, and which must consequently be examined by the light of the cognate documents which form the LXX." And W. H. Simcox[2] says: "Thus it is that there came to exist a Hellenistic dialect, having real though variable differences from the Common or Hellenic."

2. *A Change with Kennedy*. But a turn comes when H. A. A. Kennedy[3] says: "But while the writer began with a complete, though provisional, acceptance of Hatch's conclusions, the farther the inquiry was pushed, the more decidedly was he compelled to doubt those conclusions, and finally to seek to establish the connection between the language of the LXX and that of the N. T. on a totally different basis." He finds that common bond in "the colloquial Greek of the time."[4]

3. *Deissmann's Revolt.* The full revolt against the theory of a Semitic or biblical Greek is seen in the writings of Deissmann,[5] who says[6]: "The theory indicated is a great power in exegesis, and that it possesses a certain plausibility is not to be denied. It is edifying, and what is more, is convenient. But it is absurd. It mechanizes the marvellous variety of the linguistic elements of the Greek Bible and cannot be established either by the psychology of language or by history." There is here some of the zeal of new discovery, but it is true. The old view of Hatch is dead and gone. The "clamant need of a lexicon to the LXX" is emphasized by Deissmann[7] himself. Prof. H. B. Swete of Cambridge has laid all biblical students under lasting obligation

[1] Ib., p. 34. See also p. 9: "Biblical Gk. belongs not only to a later period of the history of the language than classical Gk., but also to a different country." On page 14 we read: "It is a true paradox that while, historically as well as philologically, the Gk. (LXX) is a translation of the Hebrew, philologically, though not historically, the Hebrew may be regarded as a translation of the Gk."

[2] The Lang. of the N. T., 1890, p. 15. Note the date, as late as 1890.

[3] Sources of N. T. Gk., 1895, p. v.

[4] Ib., p. 146.

[5] Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, 1898; B. S., 1901; Hell. Griech., Hauck's Realencyc., New Light (1907), etc.

[6] B. S., p. 65.

[7] Ib., p. 73. Schleusner, 1821, is hopelessly inadequate and out of date. Hatch and Redpath have issued in six parts (two volumes) a splendid concordance to the LXX and other Gk. versions of the 0. T., 1892-1896, 1900.

to him by his contribution to the study of the Septuagint, consisting of an edition of the LXX[1] with brief critical apparatus and a general discussion[2] of the Septuagint. Brooke and McLean are publishing an edition of the Septuagint with exhaustive critical apparatus.[3] Students of the LXX now rejoice in Helbing's *Gr. der Septuaginta: Laut- u. Formenlehre* (1907) and Thackeray's *Gr. of the 0. T. in Greek*, vol. I (1909). Conybeare and Stock's *Selections from the Septuagint* (1905) has the old standpoint. Other modern workers in this department are Nestle,[4] Lagarde,[5] Hartung,[6] Ralf's,[7] Susemihl,[8] Apostolides.[9]

4. *The Language of Jesus*. Another point of special interest in this connection, which may be discussed as well now as later, is the new light concerning the Aramaic as the language habitually spoken by Jesus. This matter has been in much confusion and the scholars are not at one even now. Roberts[10] maintains that Greek, not Hebrew, was "the language of the common public intercourse in Palestine in the days of Christ and His apostles." By Hebrew he means Aramaic. In *The Expositor* (1st series, vols. VI, VII) Roberts argued also that Christ usually spoke Greek. He was replied to (vol. VII) by Sanday. Lightfoot (on Gal. 4:6) holds that Jesus said ᾽Αββά ὁ πατήρ thus, Mark not having translated it. Thomson, "The Language of Palestine" (*Temple Bible Dict*.), argues strongly that Christ spoke Greek, not Aramaic. Neubauer[11] contends that there was spoken besides at Jerusalem and in Judea a modernized Hebrew, and comments[12] on "how

[1] The O.T. in Gk. according to the LXX, vols. I–III, 1887-1894. He does not give an edited text, but follows one MS. at a time with critical apparatus in footnotes.

[2] An Intr. to the 0. T. in Gk., 1900; 2d ed., 1914.

[3] The Larger Camb. LXX, 1906—.

[4] Ed. of the LXX with Crit. Apparatus, 1880-1887; Sept.-Stud., 1886-1896; Urtext and ubersetz. der Bibel, 1897. Nestle died in 1913.

[5] Sept.-Stud., 1891-1892. [6] Ib., 1886. [7] Ib., 1904.

[8] Gesch. der griech. Lit. in der Alexandrinzeit, Bd. I, II, 1891, 1892.

[9] Du grec Alexandrin et de ses rapports avec le grec ancien et le grec moderne, 1892. Cf. among the older discussions, Sturz, De dial. Maced. et Alexan., 1808; Lipsius, Gr. Unters. fiber die bibl. Grac., 1853; Churton, The Infl. of the LXX upon the Prog. of Chris., 1861. See also Anz, Subs. ad cognos. Graec. serm. vulg. e Pent. vers. Alexan., 1894.

[10] Disc. on the Gosp., pt. I, On the Lang. Employed by Our Lord and His Apost., 1864, p. 316; A Short Proof that Greek was the Language of Jesus (1893).

[11] On the Dial. of Palestine in the Time of Ch., Stud. Bibl., 1885.

[12] Stud. Bibl., p. 54.

little the Jews knew Greek." A. Meyer[1] urges that the vernacular of Jesus was Aramaic and shows what bearing this fact has on the interpretation of the Gospels. A. Julicher[2] indeed says: "To suppose, however (as, e.g. G. B. Winer supposes, because of Mk. 7:34; Jo. 7: 25; 12:20) that Jesus used the Greek language is quite out of the question." But Young, vol. II, *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (Hastings), article "Language of Christ," admits that Christ used both, though usually he spoke Aramaic. So Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 8. But Dalman[3] has done more than any one in showing the great importance of the Aramaic for the interpretation of the words of Jesus. He denies the use of a modernized Hebrew in Jerusalem and urges that proper names like **B**ηθεσδά, בֵּית חִזְדָּא, are Aramaic (but see J. Rendel Harris, *Side Lights on the N. T.*, p. 71 f.). Dalman further urges that "Aramaic was the mother tongue of the Galileans."[4] J. T. Marshall[5] makes out a plausible case for the idea of a primitive Aramaic Gospel before our Mark, and this would make it more probable that Jesus spoke Aramaic. E. A. Abbott[6] also attempts to reproduce the original Aramaic of the words of Jesus from the Greek. But Prof. Mahaffy[7] can still say: "And so from the very beginning, though we may believe that in Galilee and among His intimates our Lord spoke Aramaic, and though we know that some of His last words upon the cross were in that language, yet His public teaching, His discussions with the Pharisees, His talk

[1] Jesu Mutterspr.: das galilaische Aram. in seiner Bedeut. fur die Erkl. der Reden Jesu and der Evang. uberhaupt, 1896. So Deissmann (Light, etc., p. 57) says that Jesus "did not speak Gk. when He went about His public work," and, p. 1, "Jesus preaches in his Aramaic mother-tongue."

[2] Art. Hellenism in Encyc. Bibl. Canon Foakes-Jackson (Interp., July, 1907, p. 392) says: "The Jews of high birth or with a reputation for sanctity are said to have refused to learn any language but their own, and thus we have the strange circumstance in Roman Palestine of the lower orders speaking two languages and their leaders only one."

[3] The Words of Jesus considered in the Light of the post-Bibl. Jewish Writings and the Aram. Lang., 1902. Cf. also Pfannkuche (Clark's Bibl. Cab.).

[4] Ib., p. 10.

[5] Exp., ser. IV, VI, VIII. See also Brockelmann, Syrische Gr., 1904; Schwally, Idioticon des christl.-palestinischen Aramäisch, 1893; Riggs, Man. of the Chaldean Lang., 1866; Wilson, Intr. Syriac Meth. and Man., 1891; Strack, Gr. des bibl. Aramaischen.

[6] Clue, A Guide through Gk. to Heb., 1904.

[7] The Prog. of Hellen. in Alexan. Emp., 1905, p. 130 f. Hadley (Ess. Phil. and Crit., p. 413) reaches the conclusion that Jesus spoke both Gk. and Aram.

with Pontius Pilate, were certainly carried on mainly in the Greek." Zahn (*Intr. to the N. T.*) labours needlessly to show that Hebrew was no longer the language of Palestine, but he does not prove that Aramaic was everywhere spoken, nor that Jesus always spoke Aramaic. Wellhausen (*Einl. in die drei erst. Evang.*) is prejudiced in favour of the Aramaic theory. It may be admitted at once that Aramaic was known to the majority of the Jews in Palestine, particularly in Judea. Cf. Ac. 1:19: τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἀκελδαμάχ; 22:2, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ προσεφώνει αὐτοῖς μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν. There is no doubt which language is the vernacular in Jerusalem. Cf. also 26:14. Josephus confirms Luke on this point (*War*, V, 6. 3), for the people of Jerusalem cried out τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ, and Josephus also acted intermediary for Titus, τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ (*War*, VI, 2. 1). See also 2 Macc. 7: 8, 21. Josephus wrote his *War* first in Aramaic and then in Greek. The testimony of Papias that Matthew wrote his λόγια in Aramaic bears on the question because of the tradition that Mark was the interpreter of Peter. The brogue that Peter revealed (Mt. 26:73) was probably due to his Galilean accent of Aramaic. Aramaic was one of the languages for the inscription on the cross (Jo. 19:20). It is clear therefore that the Hellenizing work of Jason and Menelaus and Antiochus Epiphanes received a set-back in Palestine. The reaction kept Greek from becoming the one language of the country. Even in Lycaonia the people kept their vernacular though they understood Greek (Ac. 14:11). On the other hand Peter clearly spoke in Greek on the Day of Pentecost, and no mention is made of Greek as one of the peculiar "tongues," on that occasion. It is clear that Paul was understood in Jerusalem when he spoke Greek (Ac. 22:2). Jesus Himself laboured chiefly in Galilee where were many gentiles and much commerce and travel. He taught in Decapolis, a Greek region. He preached also in the regions of Tyre and Sidon (Phoenicia), where Greek was necessary, and he held converse with a Greek (Syro-Phcenician) woman. Near Caesarea-Philippi (a Greek region), after the Transfiguration, Jesus spoke to the people at the foot of the mountain. At the time of the Sermon on the Mount Jesus addressed people from Decapolis and Perea (largely Hellenized), besides the mixed multitudes from Galilee, Jerusalem and Judea (Mt. 4:25). Luke (6:17) adds that crowds came also from Tyre and Sidon, and Mark (3:8) gives "from Iduma." It is hardly possible that these crowds understood Aramaic. The fact that Mark

twice (5:41; 7:34) uses Aramaic quotations from the words of Jesus does not prove that He always spoke in that tongue nor that He did so only on these occasions. In Mk. 14:36, Ἀββά ὁ πατήρ, it is possible that Jesus may have used both words as Paul did (Ro. 8:15). In the quotation from Ps. 22:1, spoken on the cross, Mt. 27:46 gives the Hebrew, while Mk. 15:34 has an Aramaic adaptation. There is no reason to doubt that Jesus knew Hebrew also. But Thomson (*Temple Bible, Lang. of Palestine*) proves that Matthew gives the quotations made by Christ in the words of the LXX, while his own quotations are usually from the Hebrew. It is clear, therefore, that Jesus spoke both Aramaic and Greek according to the demands of the occasion and read the Hebrew as well as the Septuagint, if we may argue from the 0. T. quotations in the Gospels which are partly like the Hebrew text and partly like the LXX.[1] In Lu. 4:17 it is not clear whether it was the Hebrew text or the LXX that was read in the synagogue at Nazareth.[2] One surely needs no argument to see the possibility that a people may be bilingual when he remembers the Welsh, Scotch, Irish, Bretons of the present day.[3] The people in Jerusalem understood either Greek or Aramaic (Ac. 22:2).

(j) GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARIES. A word must be said Concerning the new type of commentaries which accent the grammatical side of exegesis. This is, to be sure, the result of the emphasis upon scientific grammar. The commentary must have other elements besides the grammatical. Even the historical element when added does not exhaust what is required. There still remains the apprehension of the soul of the author to which historical grammar is only an introduction. But distinct credit is to be given to those commentators who have lifted this kind of exegesis out of the merely homiletic vein. Among the older writers are to be mentioned Meyer, Ellicott, Godet, Broadus, Hackett, Lightfoot and Westcott, while among the more recent commentators stand out most of the writers in the *International*

[1] See C. Taylor, The Gospel in the Law, 1869; Boehl, Alttestamentl. Cit. im N. T., 1878; Toy, Quota. in the N. T., 1884; Huhn, Die alttestamentl. Cit. etc., 1900; Gregory, Canon and Text of the N. T., 1907, p. 394.

[2] On the Gk. in the Tal. see art. Greek in Jew. Encyc.; Krauss, Griech. and lat. Lehnw. im Tal.; Schurler, Jew. Hist., div. II, vol. I, p. 29 f.

[3] See Zahn, Einl. in das N. T., ch. 11. On the bilingual character of many of the Palestinian Jews see Schurer, Jew. Peo. in the Time of Ch., div. II, vol. I, p. 48 f.; Moulton, Prol., p. 7 f.

Critical Commentary, Holtzmann's *Hand Comm., The Expositor's Greek Test.*, Swete, Mayor, G. Milligan, Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, Zahn's *Kommentar*, The Camb. *Gk. Test*., etc. In works like these, grammatical remarks of great value are found. There has been great advance in the N. T. commentaries since Winer's day, when these comments "were rendered useless by that uncritical empiricism which controlled Greek philology."[1]

V. The New Point of View. It will hardly be denied, in view of the preceding necessarily condensed presentation of the new material now at hand that new light has been turned upon the problems of the N. T. Greek. The first effect upon many minds is to dazzle and to cause confusion. Some will not know how to assimilate the new facts and to co-ordinate them with old theories nor be willing to form or adopt new theories as a result of the fresh phenomena. But it is the inevitable duty of the student in this department to welcome the new discoveries and to attack the problems arising therefrom. The new horizon and wider outlook make possible real progress. It will not be possible to avoid some mistakes at first. A truer conception of the language is now offered to us and one that will be found to be richer and more inspiring.[2] Every line of biblical study must respond to the new discovery in language. "A new Cremer, a new Thayer-Grimm, a new Winer will give the twentieth century plenty of editing to keep its scholars busy. New Meyers and Alfords will have fresh matter from which to interpret the text, and new Spurgeons and Moodys will, we may hope, be ready to pass the new teaching on to the people."[3] The N. T. Greek is now seen to be not an abnormal excrescence, but a natural development in the Greek language; to be, in fact, a not unworthy part of the great stream of the mighty tongue. It was not outside of the world-language, but in the very heart of it and influenced considerably the future of the Greek tongue.

[1] Winer, Gr. of the N. T. Idiom, Thayer's transl., p. 7.

[2] "Nun hat man aber die Sprache der heiligen Bucher mit den Papyrusdenkmalern und den Inschriften der alexandrinischen und romischen Zeit genau verglichen, und da hat sich die gar manchen Anhanger der alten Doktrin verbluffende, in Wahrheit ganz naturliche Tatsache ergeben, dass die Sprache des N. T. nichts anderes ist als eine fur den literarischen Zweck leicht temperierte Form des volkstumlich Griechisch." Krumbacher, Das Prob. der neugr. Schriftspr., 1903, p. 27.

[3] J. H. Moulton, New Lights on Bibl. Gk., Bibl. World, March, 1902.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL METHOD

I. Language as History. The scientific grammar is at bottom a grammatical history, and not a linguistic law-book. The seat of authority in language is therefore not the books about language, but the people who use the language. The majority of well-educated people determine correct usage (the *mos loquendi* as Horace says). Even modern dictionaries merely record from time to time the changing phenomena of language. Wolff was right when he conceived of philology as the "biography of a nation." The life of a people is expressed in the speech which they use.[1] We can well agree with Benfey[2] that "speech is the truest picture of the soul of a people, the content of all that which has brought a people to self-consciousness." However, we must not think that we can necessarily argue race from language.[3] The historical conception of grammar has had to win its way against the purely theoretical and speculative notion. Etymology was the work of the philosophers. The study of the forms, the syntax, the dialects came later. The work of the Alexandrians was originally philology, not scientific grammar.[4]

(a) COMBINING THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS. It is not indeed easy to combine properly the various elements in the study of language. Sayce considers Steinthal too psychological and Schleicher too physical.[5] The historical element must be added to both. Paul[6] objects to the phrase "philosophy of language" as suggesting "metaphysical speculations of which the historical investigation

[1] See Oertel, Lect. on the Study of Lang., 1902, p. 9 f.

[2] Kleinere Schr., 1892, 2. Bd., 4. Abt., p. 51.

[3] See Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., 1875, p. 175

[4] See Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 2, 3.

[5] Prin. of Comp. Philol., p. xvi.

[6] Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., 1888, p. xxi. "The truth is that the science of which we are thinking is philosophy in the same way as physics or physiology is philosophy, neither more, nor less."

of language needs to take no count." He prefers the term "science of principles." The study of language is a true science, a real philosophy, with a psychical as well as a physical basis. It is properly related to the historical natural sciences which have been subject "to the misdirected attempt at excluding them from the circle of the sciences of culture."[1] Language is capable of almost perfect scientific treatment. Kretschmer[2] outlines as modern advances over ancient grammar the psychological treatment of language, the physiology of sound, the use of the comparative method, the historical development of the language, the recognition of speech as a product of human culture, and not to be separated from the history of culture, world-history and life of the peoples. He thinks that no language has yet received such treatment as this, for present-day handbooks are only "speech-pictures," not "speech-histories."

(b) PRACTICAL GRAMMAR A COMPROMISE. Historical practical grammars have to make a compromise. They can give the whole view only in outline and show development and interrelation in part. It is not possible then to write the final grammar of Greek either ancient or modern. The modern is constantly changing and we are ever learning more of the old. What was true of Mistriotes[3] and Jannaris[4] will be true of the attempts of all. But none the less the way to study Greek is to look at it as a history of the speech-development of one of the greatest of peoples. But it is at least possible now to have the right attitude, thanks to the books already mentioned and others by Bernhardy,[5]

[1] Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., 1888, p. xxvii. See Von Ulrich's Grundl. und Gesch. der Philol., 1892, p. 22: " Zu der wissenschaftlichen Grammatik gesellt sich die historische Betrachtung. Sie unterscheidet die Periodisierung der Satze von deren loser Verknupfung, die wechselnde Bedeutung der Partikeln, den Gebrauch der Modi und Tempora, die erfahrungsmassig festgestellten Regeln der Syntax, den Sprachgebrauch der Schriftsteller." On the scientific study of the Gk. language sketched historically see Wackernagel, Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, pp. 314-316.

[2] Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., pp. 3-5. He himself here merely outlines the historical background of the Gk. language.

[3] "**Κατὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν ἡ γραμματολογία δὲν εἶναι οὔτε ἀμιγὴς ἱστορική, οὔτε ἀμιγὴς αἰσθητικὴ ἐπιστήμη ἀλλὰ μετέχει ἀμφοτέρων.**" **Ἑλληνικὴ Γραμματολογία**, 1894, p. 6.

[4] "As a matter of course, I do not presume to have said the last word on all or most of these points, seeing that, even in the case of modern Gk., I cannot be expected to master, in all its details, the entire vocabulary and grammar of every single Neohellenic dialect." Hist. Gk. Gr., 1897, p. X.

[5] Wissensch. Synt. der griech. Spr., 1829.

Christ,[1] Wundt,[2] Johannsen,[3] Krumbacher,[4] Schanz,[5] G. Meyer,[6] I. Miller,[7] Hirt,[8] Thumb,[9] Dieterich,[10] Steinthal.[11] The Latin syntax received historical treatment by Landgraf,[12] not to mention English and other modern languages.

II. Language as a Living Organism.

(a) THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE. Speech is indeed a characteristic of man and may be considered a divine gift, however slowly the gift was won and developed by him.[13] Sayce is undoubtedly correct in saying that language is a social creation and the effort to communicate is the only true solution of the riddle of speech, whether there was ever a speechless man or not. "Grammar has grown out of gesture and gesticulation."[14] But speech has not created the capacities which mark the civilized man as higher than the savage.[15] Max Muller remarks that "language forms an impassable barrier between man and beast." Growls and signs do not constitute "intellectual symbolism."[16] Paul indeed, in opposition to Lazarus and Steinthal, urges that "every linguistic creation is always the work of a single individual only."[17] The psychological organisms are in fact the true media of linguistic

[1] Gesch. der griech. Lit., 1893.

[2] Volkerpsychol., 1900, 3. Aufl., 1911 f.

[3] Beitr. zur griech. Sprachk., 1890.

[4] Beitr. zu einer Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1885.

[5] Beitr. zur hist. Synt. der griech. Spr., Bd. I–XVII.

[6] Ess. und Stud. zur Sprachgesch. und Volksk., Bd. I, II, 1885, 1893.

[7] Handb. der Altertumswiss. He edits the series (1890—).

[8] Handb. deal griech. Laut- und Formenl. Eine Einfuhr. in das sprachwiss. Stud. des Griech., 1902, 2. Aufl., 1912.

[9] Die griech. Spr. im Zeitaltcr des Hellen., 1901.

[10] Untersuch. zur Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1898.

[11] Gesch. der Sprachwiss. bei den Griech. und Rom., Tl. I, II, 1891.

[12] Hist. Gr. der lat. Spr., 1903. Cf. Stolz und Schmalz, Lat. Gr., 4. Aufl., 1910; Draeger, Hist. Synt. der lat. Spr., Bd. I, II, 1878, 1881; Lindsay, The Lat. Lang., 1894. In Bd. III of Landgraf's Gr., Golling says (p. 2) that Latin Grammar as a study is due to the Stoics who did it "in der engsten Verbindung mit der Logik." Cf. origin of Gk. Gr.

[13] See Whitney, Lang. and the Study of Lang., 1868, p. 399.

[14] Sayce, Intr. to the Sci. of Lang., vol. II, p. 301.

[15] Whitney, Darwinism and Lang., Reprint from North Am. Rev., July, 1874.

[16] Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891, p. 9. See also The Silesian Horseherd: "Language and thought go hand in hand; where there is as yet no word, there is as yet no idea." Many of the writers on animals do not accept this doctrine.

[17] Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. xliii.

development. Self-observation and analogy help one to strike a general average and so make grammar practical as well as scientific.

(b) EVOLUTION IN LANGUAGE. Growth, then, is to be expected in a living tongue. Change is inseparable from life. No language is dead so long as it is undergoing change, and this must be true in spoken and written usage. It is not the function of the grammarian to stop change in language, a thing impossible in itself. Such change is not usually cataclysmic, but gradual and varied. "A written language, to serve any practical purpose, must change with the times, just like a living dialect."[1] In general, change in usage may be compared to change in organic structure in "greater or lesser fitness."[2] The changes by analogy in the speech of children are very suggestive on this point. The vocabulary of the Greek tongue must therefore continually develop, for new ideas demand new words and new meanings come to old words. Likewise inflections vary in response to new movements. This change brings great wealth and variety. The idea of progress has seized the modern mind and has been applied to the study of language as to everything else.

(c) CHANGE CHIEFLY IN THE VERNACULAR. Linguistic change occurs chiefly in the vernacular. From the spoken language new words and new inflections work their way gradually into the written style, which is essentially conservative, sometimes even anachronistic and purposely archaic. Much slang is finally accepted in the literary style. The study of grammar was originally confined to the artificial book-style. Dionysius Thrax expressly defined grammar as ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσιν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων. It was with him a concern for the poets and writers, not "die Sprache des Lebens."[3] Grammar (γραμματική, γράφω), then, was first to write and to understand what was written; then the scientific interpretation of this literature; later the study of literary linguistic usage. It is only the moderns who have learned to investigate the living speech for its own historical value. Before the discovery of the Greek inscriptions the distinction between the vernacular and the literary style could not be so sharply drawn for the Greek of the classical

[1] Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 481.

[2] Ib., p. 13. Kuhner speaks of "das organische Leben der Sprache" and of "ein klares, anschauliches und lebensvolles Bild des grossen und kraftig bluhenden Sprachbaums." Ausfuhrl. Gr. der griech. Spr., 1. Bd., 1890, p.

[3] Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 3-5.

period, though Aristophanes should have taught us much. We have moved away from the position of Mure[1] who said: "The distinction between the language of letters and the vulgar tongue, so characteristic of modern civilization, is imperceptible or but little defined in the flourishing age of Greece. Numerous peculiarities in her social condition tended to constitute classical expression in speaking or writing, not, as with us, the privilege of a few, but a public property in which every Hellene had an equal interest." The people as a whole were wonderfully well educated, but the educated classes themselves then, as now with us, used a spoken as well as a literary style. Jannaris[2] is clear on this point: "But, speaking of Attic Greek, we must not infer that all Athenians and Atticized Greeks wrote and spoke the classical Attic portrayed in the aforesaid literature, for this Attic is essentially what it still remains in modern Greek composition: a merely historical *abstraction*; that is, an *artistic* language which nobody spoke but still everybody understood." We must note therefore both the vernacular and the literary style and expect constant change in each, though not in the same degree. Zarncke indeed still sounds a note of warning against too much attention to the vernacular; though a needless one.[3] In the first century A.D. the vernacular Greek was in common use all over the world, the character of which we can now accurately set forth. But this non-literary language was not necessarily the speech of the illiterate. Mahaffy[4] is very positive on this point. "I said just now that the Hellenistic world was more cultivated in argument than we are nowadays. And if you think this is a strange assertion, examine, I pray you, the intellectual aspects of the Epistles of St. Paul, the first Christian writer whom we know to have been thoroughly educated in this training. Remember that he was a practical teacher, not likely to commit the fault of speaking over the heads of his audience, as the phrase is." Hatzidakis[5] laments that the monuments of the Greek since the Alexandrian period are no longer in the pure actual living speech of the time, but in the ar-

[1] A Crit. Hist. of the Lang. and Lit. of Anc. Greece, 1850, vol. I, p. 117.

[2] *Op. cit.*, 1897, p. 3 f.

[3] Die Entst. der griech. Literaturspr., 1890, p. 2: "Denn man liefe Gefahr, den Charakter der Literaturdenkmaler ganzlich zu zerstoren, indem man, ihre eigenartige Gestaltung verkennend, sie nach den Normen einer gesprochenen Mundart corrigirt." But see Lottich, De Serm. vulg. Att., 1881; and Apostolides, *op. cit.*

[4] Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., 1905, p. 137.

[5] Einleitung, p. 3.

tificial Attic of a bygone age. The modern Greek vernacular is a living tongue, but the modern literary language so proudly called καθαρεύουσα is artificial and unreal.[1] This new conception of language as life makes it no longer possible to set up the Greek of any one period as the standard for all time. The English writer to-day who would use Hooker's style would be affected and anachronistic. Good English to-day is not what it was two hundred years ago, even with the help of printing and (part of the time) dictionaries. What we wish to know is not what was good Greek at Athens in the days of Pericles, but what was good Greek in Syria and Palestine in the first century A.D. The direct evidence for this must be sought among contemporaries, not from ancestors in a distant land. It is the living Greek that we desire, not the dead.

III. Greek not an Isolated Language.

(a) THE IMPORTANCE OF COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR. Julius Caesar, who wrote a work on grammar, had in mind Latin and Greek, for both were in constant use in the Roman world.[2] Formal Sanskrit grammar itself may have resulted from the comparison of Sanskrit with the native dialects of India.[3] Hence comparative grammar seems to lie at the very heart of the science. It cannot be said, however, that Painini, the great Sanskrit scholar and grammarian of the fourth century B.C., received any impulse. from the Greek civilization of Alexander the Great.[4] The work of Panini is one of the most remarkable in history for subtle originality, "une histoire naturelle de la langue sanscrite." The Roman and Greek grammarians attended to the use of words sentences, while the Sanskrit writers analyzed words into syllables[5] and studied the relation of sounds to each other. It is not possible to state the period when linguistic comparison was first made. Max Muller in *The Science of Language* even says: "From an historical point of view it is not too much to say that the first Day of Pentecost marks the real beginning of the Science of language." One must not think that the comparative method is "more characteristic of the study of language than of other

[1] "Eine Literatursprache ist nie eine Art Normalsprache." Schwyzer, Weltspr. des Altert., 1902, p. 12.

[2] King, Intr. to Comp. Gr., p. 2.

[3] Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., p. 261.

[4] Goblet d'Alviella, Ce que 1'Inde doit a la Grece, 1897, p. 129.

[5] King, *op. cit*., p. 2 f. "The method of comparative grammar is merely auxiliary to historical grammar," Wheeler, Whence and Whither of the Mod. Sci. of Lang., p. 96.

branches of modern inquiry."[1] The root idea of the new grammar is the kinship of languages. Chinese grammar is said to be one of the curiosities of the world, and some other grammatical works can be regarded in that light. But our fundamental obligation is to the Hindu and Greek grammarians.[2]

(b) THE COMMON BOND IN LANGUAGE. Prof. Alfredo Trombetti, of Rome, has sought the connecting link in all human speech.[3] It is a gigantic task, but it is doubtless true that all speech is of ultimate common origin. The remote relationships are very difficult to trace. As a working hypothesis the comparative grammarians speak of isolating, agglutinative and inflectional languages. In the isolating tongues like the Chinese, Burmese, etc., the words have no inflection and the position in the sentence and the tone in pronunciation are relied on for clearness of meaning. Giles[4] points out that modern English and Persian have nearly returned to the position of Chinese as isolating languages. Hence it is inferred that the Chinese has already gone through a history similar to the English and is starting again on an inflectional career. Agglutinative tongues like the Turkish express the various grammatical relations by numerous separable prefixes, infixes and suffixes. Inflectional languages have made still further development, for while a distinction is made between the stem and the inflexional endings, the stems and the endings do not exist apart from each other. There are two great families in the inflexional group, the Semitic (the Assyrian, the Hebrew, the Syriac, the Arabic, etc.) and the Indo-Germanic or Indo-European (the Indo-Iranian or Aryan, the Armenian, the Greek, the Albanian, the Italic, the Celtic, the Germanic and the Balto-Slavic).[5] Ind -European also are Illyrian, Macedonian, Phrygian, Thracian and the newly-discovered Tocharian. Some of these groups, like the Italic, the Germanic, the Balto-Slavic, the Indo-Iranian, embrace a number of separate tongues which show an inner affinity, but all the groups have a general family likeness.[6]

[1] Whitney, Life and Growth of Lang., 1875—, p. 315.

[2] F. Hoffmann, Uber die Entwickel. des Begriffs der Gr. bei den Alten, 1891, p. 1.

[3] See his book, The Unity of Origin of Lang. Dr. Allison Drake, Disc. in Heb., Gaelic, Gothic, Anglo-Sax., Lat., Basque and other Caucasic Lang., 1908, undertakes to show "fundamental kinship of the Aryan tongues and of Basque with the Semitic tongues."

[4] Man. of Comp. Philol., 1901, p. 36.

[5] Brugmann, Kurze vergl. Or. der indoger. Spr., 1. Lief., 1902, p. 4.

[6] See Misteli, Characteristik der hauptsachlichsten Typen des Sprach-

(c) THE ORIGINAL INDO-GERMANIC SPEECH. It is not claimed that the original Indo-Germanic speech has been discovered, though Kretschmer does speak of "die indogermanische Ursprache," but he considers it only a necessary hypothesis and a useful definition for the early speech-unity before the Indo-Germanic stock separated.[1] Brugmann speaks also of the original and ground-speech (*Ur- and Grundsprache*) in the prehistoric background of every member of the Indo-Germanic family.[2] The science of language has as a historic discipline the task of investigating the collective speech-development of the Indo-Germanic peoples.[3] Since Bopp's day this task is no longer impossible. The existence of an original Indo-Germanic speech is the working hypothesis of all modern linguistic study. This demands indeed a study of the Indo-Germanic people. Horatio Hale[4] insists that language is the only proper basis for the classification of mankind. But this test breaks down when Jews and Egyptians speak Greek after Alexander's conquests or when the Irish and the American Negro use English. The probable home and wanderings of the original Indo-Germanic peoples are well discussed by Kretschmer.[5] It is undeniable that many of the same roots exist in slightly different forms in all or most of the Indo-Germanic tongues. They are usually words that refer to the common domestic relations, elementary agriculture, the ordinary articles of food, the elemental forces, the pronouns and the numerals. Inflexional languages have two kinds of roots, predicative (nouns and verbs) and pronominal. Panini found 1706 such roots in Sanskrit, but Edgren has reduced the number of necessary Sanskrit roots to 587.[6] But one must not suppose that these hypothetical roots ever constituted a real language, though there was an original Indo-Germanic tongue.[7]

baues, 1893. For further literature on comparative grammar see pp. 10 ff. of this book. There is an English translation of Brugmann's Bde. I and II called Elements of the Comp. Gr. of the Indo-Ger. Lang., 5 vols., 1886-97. But his Kurze vergl. Gr. (1902-4) is the handiest edition. Meillet (Intr. l'Etude Comp. etc., pp. 441-455) has a discriminating discussion of the literature.

[1] Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 7-9.
[2] Kurze vergl. Gr., 1. Lief., 1902, p. 3.
[3] Ib., p. 27.
[4] Pop. Sci. Rev., Jan., 1888.
[5] Einl. in die Gesch. etc., pp. 7-92.
[6] See Max Muller, Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891, p. 29.
[7] Sayce, Prin. of Comp. 1875, p. vi.

(d) GREEK AS A " DIALECT" OF THE INDO-GERMANIC SPEECH. Greek then can be regarded as one of the branches of this original Indo-Germanic speech, just as French is one of the descendants of the Latin,[1] like Spanish, Portuguese, Italian. Compare also the relation of English to the other Teutonic tongues.[2] To go further, the separation of this original Indo-Germanic speech into various tongues was much like the breaking-up of the original Greek into dialects and was due to natural causes. Dialectic variety itself implies previous speech-unity.[3] Greek has vital relations with all the branches of the Indo-Germanic tongues, though in varying degrees. The Greek shows decided affinity with the Sanskrit, the Latin and the Celtic[4] languages. Part of the early Greek stock was probably Celtic. The Greek and the Latin flourished side by side for centuries and had much common history. All the comparative grammars and the Greek grammars from this point of view constantly compare the Greek with the Latin. See especially the great work of Riemann and Goelzer, *Grammaire comparee du Grec et du Latin.*[5] On the whole subject of the relation of the Greek with the various Indo-Germanic languages see the excellent brief discussion of Kretschmer.[6] But the hypothesis of an original Graeco-Italic tongue cannot be considered as proved, though there are many points of contact between Greek and Latin.[7] But Greek, as the next oldest branch known to us, shows more kinship with the Sanskrit. Constant use of the Sanskrit must be made by one who wishes to understand the historical development of the Greek tongue. Such a work as Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar* is very useful for this purpose. See also J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*. I, Lautlehre (1896). II, 1, *Einleitung zur Wortlehre* (1905). So Thumb's

[1] See Meyer-Ltibke, Gr. der rom. Spr., 3 Bde., 1890, 1894, 1899.

[2] See Hirt, Handb. der griech. Laut- and Formenl., 2d ed., 1912, p. 13. Cf. Donaldson, New Crat., p. 112 (Ethn. Affin. of the Anc. Greeks).

[3] Whitney, Lang. and the Study of Lang., 1868, p. 185. See Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 5: "Die griechische, lateinische, indische u.s.w. Grammatik sind die konstitutiven Teile der indogermanischen Grammatik in gleicher Weise, wie z. B. die dorische, die ionische u.s.w. Grammatik die griechische Grammatik ausmachen."

[4] See Holder, Altcelt. Sprachsch., 1891 ff.

[5] Synt., 1897. Phonet. et Et. des Formes Grq. et Lat., 1901.

[6] Einl. in die Cesch. der griech. Spr., pp. 153-170.

[7] Prof. B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins Univ., has always taught Greek, but his Latin Grammar shows his fondness for Latin. See also Henry, A Short Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., 1890, and A Short Comp. Gr. of Eng. and Ger., 1893.

Handbuch des Sanskrit. I, *Grammatik* (1905). Max Muller[1] playfully remarks: "It has often been said that no one can know anything of the science of language who does not know Sanskrit, and that is enough to frighten anybody away from its study." It is not quite so bad, however. Sanskrit is not the parent stock of the Greek, but the oldest member of the group. The age of the Sanskrit makes it invaluable for the study of the later speech-developments.

The Greek therefore is not an isolated tongue, but sustains vital relations with a great family of languages. So important does Kretschmer consider this aspect of the subject that he devotes his notable *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* to the setting forth of "the prehistoric beginnings of the Greek speech-development."[2] This effort is, of necessity, fragmentary and partly inferential, but most valuable for a scientific treatment of the Greek language. He has a luminous discussion of the effect of the Thracian and Phrygian stocks upon the Greek when the language spread over Asia Minor.[3]

IV. Looking at the Greek Language as a Whole. We cannot indeed make an exhaustive study of the entire Greek language in a book that is professedly concerned only with one epoch of that history. As a matter of fact no such work exists. Jannaris[4] indeed said that "an 'historical' grammar, tracing in a connected manner the life of the Greek language from classical antiquity to the present time, has not been written nor even seriously attempted as yet." Jannaris himself felt his limitations when he faced so gigantic a task and found it necessary to rest his work upon the classical Attic as the only practical basis.[5] But so far

[1] Three Lect. on the Sci. of Lang., 1891, p. 72.

[2] P. 5. Prof. Burrows (Disc. in Crete, 1907, pp. 145 ff.) raises the question whether the Greek race (a blend of northern and southern elements) made the Gk. language out of a pre-existing Indo-European tongue. Or did the northerners bring the Gk. with them? Or did they find it already in the AEgean? It is easier to ask than to answer these questions.

[3] See pp. 171-243.

[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., 1897, p. v.

[5] Ib., p. xi. Thumb says: "Wir sind noch sehr weit von einer Geschichte oder historischen Grammatik der griechischen Sprache entfernt; der Versuch von Jannaris, so dankenswert er ist, kann doch nur provisorische Geltung beanspruchen, wobei man mehr die gute Absicht and den Fleiss als das sprachgeschichtliche Verstandnis des Verfassers loben muss." Die griech. Spr., etc., 1901, p. 1. Cf. also Krumbacher, Beitr. zu einer Gesch. der griech. Spr. (1884, p. 4): "Eine zusammenhangende Darstellung des Entwickelungsganges der griechischen Sprache ist gegenwartig nicht moglich." But it is more possible now than in 1884.

he departed from the pure historical method. But such a grammar will come some day.

(a) DESCRIPTIVE HISTORICAL GRAMMAR. Meanwhile descriptive historical grammar is possible and necessary. "Descriptive grammar has to register the grammatical forms and grammatical conditions in use at a given date within a certain community speaking a common language."[1] There is this justification for taking Attic as the standard for classical study; only the true historical perspective should be given and Attic should not be taught as the only real Greek. It is possible and essential then to correlate the N. T. Greek with all other Greek and to use all Greek to throw light on the stage of the language under review. If the Greek itself is not an isolated tongue, no one stage of the language can be so regarded. "Wolff[2] deprecates the restriction of grammar to a set of rules abstracted from the writings of a 'golden' period, while in reality it should comprise the whole history of a language and trace its development." H. C. Muller[3] indeed thought that the time had not arrived for a grammar of Greek on the historical plan, because it must rest on a greater amount of material than is now at hand. But since then a vast amount of new material has come to light in the form of papyri, inscriptions and research in the modern Greek. Miller's own book has added no little to our knowledge of the subject. Meanwhile we can use the historical material for the study of N. T. Greek.

(b) UNITY OE THE GREEK LANGUAGE. At the risk of slight repetition it is worth while to emphasize this point. Muller[4] is apologetic and eager to show that "the Greek language and literature is one organic, coherent whole." The dialectical variations, while confusing to a Certain extent, do not show that the Greek did not possess original and continuous unity. As early as 1000 B.C. these dialectical distinctions probably existed and the speech of Homer is a literary dialect, not the folk-speech.[5] The original sources of

[1] Paul, Prin. o the Hist. of Lang., 1888, p. 2.

[2] Oertel, Lect. bn the Study of Lang., 1902, p. 27. Thumb (Theol. Literaturzeit., 1903, p. 424) expresses the hope that in a future edition of his Gr. des N. T., Blass may do this for his book: "Die Sprache des N. T. auf dem grossen Hintergrund der hellenistischen Sprachentwicklung beschreiben zu konnen."

[3] Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr., 1891, p. 14 f.

[4] Ib., p. 16. Op "die griechische Sprache als Einheit" see Thumb's able discussion in Handb. d. griech. Dial. (pp. 1-12). With all the diversity of dialects there was essential unity in comparison with other tongues.

[5] Brugmann, Vergl. Gr., 1902, p. 8.

the Greek speech go back to a far distant time when as one single language an Asiatic idiom had taken Europe in its circle of influence.[1] The translator of Buttmann's *Greek Grammar* speaks of Homer "almost as the work of another language." This was once a common opinion for all Greek that was not classic Attic. But Thiersch entitled his great work *Griechische Grammatik vorzuglich des homerischen Dialekts*, not simply because of the worth of Homer, "but because, on the contrary, a thorough knowledge of the Homeric dialect is indispensably necessary for those who desire to comprehend, in their whole depth and compass, the Grecian tongue and literature."[2] But Homer is not the gauge by which to test Greek; his poems are invaluable testimony to the early history of one stage of the language. It is a pity that we know so little of the pre-Homeric history of Greek. "Homer presents not a starting-point, but a culmination, a complete achievement, an almost mechanical accomplishment, with scarcely a hint of *origins*."[3] But whenever Greek began it has persisted as a linguistic unit till now. It is one language whether we read the Epic Homer, the Doric Pindar, the Ionic Herodotus, the Attic Xenophon, the AEolic Sappho, the Atticistic Plutarch, Paul the exponent of Christ, an inscription in Pergamus, a papyrus letter in Egypt, Tricoupis or Vlachos in the modern time. None of these representatives can be regarded as excrescences or impertinences. There have always been uneducated persons, but the Greek tongue has had a continuous, though checkered, history all the way. The modern educated Greek has a keen appreciation of "die Schonheiten der klassischen Sprache."[4] Muller[5] complained that "almost no grammarians have treated the Greek language as a whole," but the works of Krumbacher, Thumb, Dieterich, Hatzidakis, Psichari, Jannaris, etc., have made it possible to obtain a general survey of the Greek language up to the present time. Like English,[6] Greek has emerged into a new sphere of unity and consistent growth.

[1] Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, p. 6. On the unmixed character of the Gk. tongue see Wackernagel, Die griech. Spr., p. 294, Tl. I, Abt. 8 (Die Kult. der Gegenw.). On the antiquity of Gk. see p. 292 f.

[2] Sandford, Pref. to Thiersch's Gk. Gr., 1830, p. viii.

[3] Miss Harrison, Prol. to the Study of Gk. Rel., 1903, p. vii.

[4] Hatzidakis, Einl. in die neugr. Gr., 1892, p. 4.

[5] Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr., 1891, p. 2.

[6] See John Koch, Eng. Gr., for an admirable bibliography of works on Eng. (in Ergeb. and Fortschr. der germanist. Wiss. im letzten Vierteljahrh., 1902, pp. 89-138, 325-437). The Germans have taught us how to study English!

(c) PERIODS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE. It will be of service to present a brief outline of the history of the Greek tongue. And yet it is not easy to give. See the discussion by Sophocles in his *Greek Lexicon* (p. 11f.), inadequate in view of recent discoveries by Schliemann and Evans. The following is a tentative outline: The Mycenaean Age, 1500 B.C. to 1000 B.C.; the Age of the Dialects, 1000 B.C. to 300 B.C.; the Age of the **Κοινή**, 300 B.C. to 330 A.D.; the Byzantine Greek, 330 A.D. to 1453 A.D.; the modern Greek, 1453 A.D. to the present time. The early stage of the Byzantine Greek up to 600 A.D.) is really **κοινή** and the rest is modern Greek. See a different outline by Jannaris[1] and Hadley and Allen.[2] As a matter of fact any division is arbitrary, for the language has had an unbroken history, though there are these general epoc is in that history. We can no longer call the pre-Homeric time mythical as Sophocles does.[3] In naming this the Mycenaean age we do not wish to state positively that the Mycenaeans were Greeks and spoke Greek. "Of their speech we have yet to read the first syllable."[4] Tsountas[5] and Manatt, however, venture to believe that they were either Greeks or of the same stock. They use the term "to designate all Greek peoples who share in the Mycenaean civilization, irrespective of their habitat."[6] Ohnefalsch-Richter (*Cont. Rev.*, Dec., 1912, p. 862) claims Cyprus as the purveyor of culture to the Creto-Mycenan age. He claims that Hellenes lived in Cyprus 1200 to 1000 B.C. The Mycenaean influence was wide-spread and comes "down to the very dawn of historical Greece."[7] That Greek was known and used widely during the Mycenaean age the researches of Evans at Knossos, in Crete, make clear.[8] The early linear

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. xxii. Cf. also Schuckburgh, Greece, 1906, p. 24 f. Moulton (Prol., p. 184) counts 32 centuries of the Gk. language from 1275 B.C., the date of the mention of the Achmans on an Egyptian monument.

[2] Gk. Gr., 1885, p. 1f. Deissmann indeed would have only three divisions, the Dialects up to 301 B.C., Middle Period up to 600 A.D., and Mod. Gk. up to the present time. Hauck's Realencyc., 1889, p. 630. Cf. Muller, Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr., 189 , pp. 42-62, for another outline.

[3] Gk. Lex., etc., p. 11.

[4] Tsountas and Manatt, The Mycenaean Age, 1897, p. 316.

[5] Ib., p. 335 ff.

[6] Ib., p. 235.

[7] Ib., p. 325. See also Beloch, Griech. Gesch., I., 85: "Auch sonst kann kein Zweif el sein, dass die mykendische Kultur in Griechenland bis in das VIII. Jahrhundert geherrscht." Flinders-Petrie (Jour. of Hell. Stud., xii, 204) speaks of 1100 to 800 B.C. as the "age of Mycenaean decadence."

[8] Cretan Pictographs and Pre-Phoenician Script, 1895, p. 362; cf. also

writing of the Cretans came from a still earlier pictograph. The Greek dialects emerge into light from about 1000 B.C. onward and culminate in the Attic which flourished till the work of Alexander is done. The Homeric poems prove that Greek was an old language by 1000 to 800 B.C. The dialects certainly have their roots deep in the Mycenaean age. Roughly, 300 B.C. is the time when the Greek has become the universal language of the world, a *Welt-sprache*. 330 A.D. is the date when the seat of government was removed from Rome to Constantinople, while A.D. 1453 is the date when Constantinople was captured by the Turks. With all the changes in this long history the standards of classicity have not varied greatly from Homer till now in the written style, while the Greek vernacular to-day is remarkably like the earliest known inscriptions of the folk-speech in Greece.[1] We know something of this history for about 3000 years, and it is at least a thousand years longer. Mahaffy has too poor an idea of modern Greek, but even he can say: "Even in our miserable modern pigeon-Greek, which represents no real pronunciation, either ancient or modern, the lyrics of Sophocles or Aristophanes are unmistakably lovely."[2]

(d) MODERN GREEK IN PARTICULAR. It is important to single out the modern Greek vernacular[3] from the rest of the language for the obvious reason that it is the abiding witness to the perpetuity of the vernacular Greek as a living organism. It is a witness also that is at our service always. The modern Greek popular speech does not differ materially from the vernacular Byzantine, and thus connects directly with the vernacular κοινή. Alexandria was "the great culture-reservoir of the Greek-Oriental world . . . the repository of the ancient literary treasures."[4] With this

Jour. of Hell. Stud., xiv, 270-372. See Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 22, for further proofs of the antiquity of Gk. as a written tongue. Mosso (Palaces of Crete, 1907, p. 73 f.) argues that the Mycenaean linear script was used 1900 B.C. Cf. Evans, Further Researches, 1898.

[1] Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 13. See also Hatzidakis, Einl. in die neugr. Gr., 1892, p. 3.

[2] Survey of Gk. Civiliz., 1896, p. 209. Cf. further Mosso, Dawn of Civiliz. in Crete, 1910; Baike, Kings of Crete, 1910; Firmen, Zeit und Dauer der kretisch- myken. Kult., 1909.

[3] The modern literary language (καθαρεύουσα) is really more identical with the ancient classical Gk. But it is identity secured by mummifying the dead. It is identity of imitation, not identity of life. Cf. Thumb-Angus, Handb. of Mod. Gk. Vern., Foreword (p. xi f.).

[4] Dieterich, Gesch. der byz. und neugr. Lit., 1902, p. 2.

general position Thumb heartily agrees.[1] Hatzidakis[2] even says: "The language generally spoken to-day in the towns differs less from the common language of Polybius than this last differs from the language Homer." Since this is true it at first seems odd that the students at the University of Athens should object so much to the translation of the N. T. into the modern vernacular. They forget that the N. T. is itself written in the vernacular **κοινή**. But that was so long ago that it is now classic to them. Certainly in the Gospels, as Wellhausen[3] insists, the spoken Greek became literature. Knowledge of the modern Greek[4] helps the student to escape from "the Procrustean bed of the old Greek" which he learned as a fixed and dead thing.[5] It is probable that Roger Bacon had some Byzantine manual besides the old Greek grammars.[6] "In England, no less than in the rest of Western Europe, the knowledge of Greek had died away, and here also, it was only after the conquest of Constantinople that a change was possible."[7] Western Christians had been afraid of the corruptions of paganism if they knew Greek, and of Mohammedanism if they knew Hebrew (being kin to Arabic!). But at last a change has come in favour of the modern Greek. Boltz indeed has advocated modern Greek as the common language for the scholars of the World since Latin is so little spoken.[8] There is indeed need of a new world-speech, as Greek was in the N. T. times, but there is no language that can now justly make such a claim. English comes nearer to it than any other. This need has given rise to the artificial tongues like Volaptik and Espe-

[1] "Die heutige griechische Volkssprache ist die nattirliche Fortsetzung der alten **Κοινή**." Die neugr. Spr., 1892, p. 8. See Heilmeier's book on the Romaic Gk. (1834), who first saw this connection between the mod. vern. and the vern. **κοινή**.

[2] Transl. by J. H. Moulton in Gr. of N. T. Gk., 1906 and 1908, p. 30, from Rev. des Et. Grq., 1903, p. 220. Cf. Krumbacher, Das Prob. der neugr. Scluiftspr., 1902.

[3] Einl. in die drei ersten Evang., 1905, p. 9.

[4] See Ruger, Prap. bei Joh. Antiochenus, 1896, p. 7.

[5] Thumb, Handb. der neugr. Volkspr., 1895, p. x.

[6] Roger Bacon's Gk. Gr., edited by Nolan and Hirsch, 1902, p. lx f.

[7] Ib., p. xlii.

[8] Hell. die internat. Gelehrtenspr. der Zukunft, 1888. Likewise A. Rose: "Die griechische Sprache . . . hat . . . eine glanzende Zukunft vor sich." Die Griechen and ihre Spr., 1890, p. 4. He pleads for it as a "Weltsprache," p. 271. But Schwyzer pointedly says: "Die Rolle einer Weltsprache wird das Griechische nicht wieder spielen." Weltspr. des Altert., 1902, p. 38. Cf. also A. Bolt; Die hell. Spr. der Gegenw., 1882, and Gk. the Gen. Lang. of the Future for Scholars.

ranto,[1] the latter having some promise in it. But the modern Greek vernacular has more merit than was once conceded to it. The idioms and pronunciation of the present-day vernacular are often seen in the manuscripts of the N. T. and other Greek documents and much earlier in inscriptions representing one or another of the early dialects. The persistence of early English forms is easily observed in the vernacular in parts of America or England. In the same way the late Latin vernacular is to be compared with the early Latin vernacular, not with the Latin of elegant literature. "Speaking generally, we may say that the Greek of a well-written newspaper [the literary language] is now, as a rule, far more classical than the Hellenistic of the N. T., but decidedly less classical than the Greek of Plutarch."[2] What the relation between the N. T. Greek and the modern Greek is will be shown in the next chapter. It should be noted here that the N. T. Greek had a strong moulding influence on the Byzantine, and so on the modern Greek because of the use of the Greek New Testament all over the world, due to the spread of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire.[3] The great Christian preachers did not indeed use a peculiar ecclesiastical Greek, but the N. T. did tend to emphasize the type of κοινή in which it was writter "The diction of the N. T. had a direct influence in moulding the Greek ordinarily used by Christians in the succeeding centuries."[4] Compare the effect of the King James Version on the English language and of Luther's translation of the Bible on German.

V. The Greek Point of View. It sounds like a truism to insist that the Greek idiom must be explained from the Greek point of view. But none the less the caution is not superfluous. Trained linguists may forget it and so commit a grammatical vice. Even Winer[5] will be found saying, for instance: "Appellatives which, as expressing definite objects, should naturally

[1] Cf. J. C. O'Connor, Esperanto Text-book, and Eng.-Esper. Dict.

[2] Jebb, On the Rela. of Mod. to Class. Gk., in Vincent ands Dickson's Handb. to Mod. Gk., 1887, p. 294. Blass actually says: "Der Sprachgebrauch des Neuen Testaments, der vielfaltig vom Neugriechischen her eine viel bessere Beleuchtung empfangt als aus der alten klassischen Literatur." Kuhner's Ausf. Gr. etc., 1890, p. 25. Blass also says (ib., p. 26) that "eine wissenschaftliche neugriechische Grammatik fehlt." But Hatzidakis and others have written since.

[3] See Reinhold, De Graecitate Patrum, 1898.

[4] Jebb, ib., p. 290.

[5] Gr. of the N. T. Gk., Moulton's transl., 1877, p. 147.

have the article, are in certain cases used without it." That "should" has the wrong attitude toward Greek. The appellative in Greek does not need to have the article in order to be definite. So when Winer often admits that one tense is used "for" another, he is really thinking of German and how it would be expressed in German. Each tongue has its own history and genius. Parallel idioms may or may not exist in a group of languages. Sanskrit and Latin, for instance, have no article. It is not possible to parallel the Hebrew tenses, for example, with the Greek, nor, indeed, can it be done as between Greek and English. The English translation of a Greek aorist may have to be in the past perfect or the present perfect to suit the English usage, but that proves nothing as to how a Greek regarded the aorist tense. We must assume in a language that a good writer knew how to use his own tongue and said what he meant to say. Good Greek may be very poor English, as when Luke uses ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν (Lu. 2:27). A literal translation of this neat Greek idiom makes barbarous English. The Greeks simply did not look at this clause as we do. "One of the commonest and gravest errors in studying the grammar of foreign languages is to make a half-conjectural translation, and then reason back from our own language to the meaning of the original; or to explain some idiom of the original by the formally different idiom which is our substantial equivalent."[1] Broadus was the greatest teacher of language that I have known and he has said nothing truer than this. After all, an educated Greek knew what he meant better than we do. It is indeed a great and difficult task that is demanded of the Greek grammarian who to-day undertakes to present a living picture of the orderly development of the Greek tongue "zu einem schonert and grorren Ganzen" and also show "in the most beautiful light the flower of the Greek spirit and life."[2] Deissmann[3] feels strongly on the subject of the neglect of the literary development of Primitive Christianity, "a

[1] Broadus, Comm. on Mt., 1886, p. 316. See also Gerber, Die Spr. als Kunst, 1. Bd., 18'1, p. 321: "Der ganze Charakter dieser oder jener Sprache ist der Abdruck der Natur des Landes, wo sie gesprochen wird. Die griechische Sprache ist der griechische Himmel selbst mit seiner tiefdunklen Blaue, die sick in dem sanft wogenden agaischen Meere spiegelt."

[2] Kuhner, Aus Gr. der griech. Spr., 1834, p. iv. How much more so now!

[3] Expos. Time , Dec., 1906, p. 103. Cf. also F. Overbeck, Hist. Zeitschr., neue Folge, 1882, p. 429 ff.

subject which has not yet been recognized by many persons in its full importance. Huge as is the library of books that have been written on the origin of the N. T. and of its separate parts, the N. T. has not often been studied by historians of literature; that is to say, as a branch of the history of ancient literature."

CHAPTER III

THE **ΚΟΙΝΗ**

The Greek of the N. T. has many streams that flow into it. But this fact is not a peculiarity of this phase of the language. The κοινή itself has this characteristic in a marked degree. If one needs further examples, he can recall how composite English is, not only combining various branches of the Teutonic group, but also incorporating much of the old Celtic of Britain and receiving a tremendous impress from the Norman-French (and so Latin), not to mention the indirect literary influence of Latin and Greek. The early Greek itself was subject to non-Greek influence as other Indo-Germanic tongues were, and in particular from the side of the Thracians and Phrygians in the East,[1] and in the West and North the Italic, Celtic and Germanic pressure was strong.[2]

I. The Term **Κοινή**. The word κοινή, sc. διάλεκτος, means simply common language or dialect common to all, a world-speech (*Weltsprache*). Unfortunately there is not yet uniformity in the use of a term to describe the Greek that prevailed over Alexander's empire and became the world-tongue. Kuhner-Blass[3] speak of '**ἡ κοινή** oder **ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος**." So also Schmiedel[4] follows Winer exactly. But Hellenic language is properly only Greek language, as Hellenic culture[5] is Greek culture. Jannaris[6] suggests Panhellenic or new Attic for the universal Greek,

[1] Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. der griech. Spr., 1896, pp. 171-243. But the true Phrygians were kin to the Greeks. See Percy Gardner, New Ch. of Gk. Hist., p. 84.

[2] Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-170, 244-282.

[3] Griech. Gr., Bd. I, p. 22.

[4] W.-Sch., N. T. Gr., p. 17.

[5] Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., p. 3. Mahaffy does use Hellenism like Droysen in his Hist. of Hellenism, as corresponding to Hellenistic, but he does so under protest (p. 3 f.). He wishes indeed that he had coined the word "Hellenicism." But Hogarth (Philip and Alexander, p. 277) had already used "Hellenisticism," saying: "Hellenisticism grew out of Hellenism."

[6] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 6.

the Greek *par excellence* as to common usage. Hellenistic Greek would answer in so far as it is Greek spoken also by Hellenists differing from Hellenes or pure Greeks. Krumbacher applies Hellenistic to the vernacular and **κοινή** to the "conventional literary language" of the time,[1] but this is wholly arbitrary. Krumbacher terms the Hellenistic "ein verschwommenes Idiom." Hatzidakis and Schwyzer include in the **κοινή** both the literary and the spoken language of the Hellenistic time. This is the view adopted in this grammar. Deissmann dislikes the term Hellenistic Greek because it was so long used for the supposedly peculiar biblical Greek, though the term itself has a wide significance.[2] He also strongly disapproves the terms "vulgar Greek," "bad Greek," "graecitas fatiscens," in contrast with the "classic Greek." Deissmann moreover objects to the word **κοινή** because it is used either for the vernacular, the literary style or for all the Greek of the time including the Atticistic revival. So he proposes "Hellenistic world-speech."[3] But this is too cumbersome. It is indeed the world-speech of the Alexandrian and Roman period that is meant by the term **κοινή.** There is on the other hand the literary speech of the orators, historians, philosophers, poets, the public documents preserved in the inscriptions (some even Atticistic); on the other hand we have the popular writings in the LXX, the N. T., the Apostolic Fathers, the papyri (as a rule) and the ostraca. The term is thus sufficient by itself to express the Greek in common use over the world, both oral and literary, as Schweizer[4] uses it following Hatzidakis. Thumb[5] identifies **κοινή** and Hellenistic Greek and applies it to both vernacular and written style, though he would not regard the Atticists as proper producers of the **κοινή**. Moulton[6] uses the term **κοινή** for both spoken and literary **κοινή**. The doctors thus disagree very widely. On the whole it seems best to use the term **κοινή** (or Hellenistic Greek) both for the vernacular and literary **κοινή**, excluding the Atticistic revival, which was a conscious effort to write not **κοινή**

[1] Munchener Sitzungsber., 1886, p. 435.
[2] Art. Hell. Griech., Hauck's Realencyc., p. 629.
[3] Ib., p. 630.
[4] Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 19 f. [5] Die griech. Spr. etc., p. 9.
[6] Prol., p. 23. It is not necessary to discuss here the use of "Hellenistic" Gk. as "Jewish-Gk." (see "Semitic Influence" in ch. IV), for it is absurd. The notion that the **κοινή** is Macedonian Gk. is quite beside the mark, for Mac. Gk. is too barbarous. The theory of an Alexandrian dialect is obsolete. Du Canges, in his Glossarium called Hell. Gk. "corruptissima lingua," and Niebuhr (Uber das Agyp.-Griech., Kl. Schr., p. 197) calls it "jargon."

but old Attic.[1] At last then the Greek world has speech-unity, whatever was true of the beginning of the Greek language.[2]

II. The Origin of the Κοινή.

(a) TRIUMPH OF THE ATTIC. This is what happened. Even in Asiatic Ionia the Attic influence was felt. The Attic vernacular, sister to the Ionic vernacular, was greatly influenced by the speech of soldiers and merchants from all the Greek world. Attic became the standard language of the Greek world in the fifth and the fourth centuries B.C. "The dialect of Athens, the so-called Attic— one of the Ionic group--prevailed over all other sister dialects, and eventually absorbed them. It was the Attic, because Athens, particularly after the Persian wars, rose to absolute dominion over all the other Greek communities, and finally became the metropolis of all Greek races."[3] This is rather an overstatement, but there is much truth in it. This classic literary Attic is did more and more lose touch with the vernacular. "It is one of our misfortunes, whatever be its practical convenience, that we are taught Attic as the standard Greek, and all other forms and dialects as deviations from it . . . when many grammarians come to characterize the later Greek of the Middle Ages or of to-day, or even that of the Alexandrian or N. T. periods, no adjective is strong enough to condemn this 'verdorbenes, veruneinigtes Attisch'" (S. Dickey, *Princeton Rev*., Oct., 1903). The literary Attic was allied to the literary Ionic; but even in this crowning development of Greek speech no hard and fast lines are drawn, for the artificial Doric choruses are used in tragedy and the vernacular in comedy.[4] There was loss as well as gain as the Attic was more extensively used, just as is true

[1] Blass indeed contrasts the literature of the Alex. and Rom. periods on this principle, but wrongly, for it is type, not time, that marks the difference. "If then the literature of the Alexandrian period must be called Hellenistic, that of the Roman period must be termed Atticistic. But the popular language had gone its own way." Gr. of the N. T. Gk., 1898 and 1905, p. 2. On the Gk. of Alexandria and its spread over the world see Wackernagel, Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 304 f.

[2] See Kretschmer, Einl., p. 410. Dieterich: "Das Sprachgebiet der κοινή bildet eben ein Ganzes and kann nur im Zusamrnenhang betrachtet werden." Unters., p. xvi.

[3] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., 1897, p. 3 f. On the superiority of the Attic see Wackernagel, Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 299.

[4] Rutherford, Zur Gesch. des Atticismus, Jahrb. fur class. Phil., suppl. xiii, 1884, pp. 360, 399. So Audoin says: " Ce n'est point arbitrairement que les ecrivains grecs ont employe tel ou tel dialecte." Et. sommaire des Dial, Grecs. Litt., 1891, p. 4.

of modern English. "The orators Demosthenes and AEschines may be counted in the new Attic, where other leading representatives in literature are Menander, Philemon and the other writers of the New Comedy."[1] As the literary Attic lived on in the literary κοινή, so the vernacular Attic survived with many changes in the vernacular κοινή. We are at last in possession of enough of the old Attic inscriptions and the κοινή inscriptions and the papyri to make this clear. The march of the Greek language has been steadily forward on this Attic vernacular base even to this present day.[2] In a sense, therefore, the κοινή became another dialect (AEolic, Doric, Ionic, Attic, κοινή) . Cf. Kretschmer, *Die Entstehung der κοινή*, pp. 1-37. But the κοινή was far more than a dialect. Kretschmer holds, it is fair to say, that the κοινή is "eine merkwurdige Mischung verschiedenster Dialecte" (*op. cit*., p. 6). He puts all the dialects into the melting-pot in almost equal proportions. Wilamowitz-Mollendorff considers the Ionic as the chief influence in the κοινή, while W. Schmidt denies all Doric and Ionic elements. Schwyzer rightly sees that the dialectical influences varied in different places, though the vernacular Attic was the common base.

(b) FATE OF THE OTHER DIALECTS. The triumph of the Attic was not complete, though in Ionia, at the end of the third century B.C., inscriptions in Attic are found, showing that in Asia Minor pure Ionic had about vanished. In the first century B.C. the Attic appears in inscriptions in Boeotia, but as late as the second century A.D. Ionic inscriptions are found in Asia Minor. Ionic first went down, followed by the AEllie. The Doric made a very stubborn resistance. It was only natural that the agricultural communities should hold out longest. See Thumb, *Hellen*., p. 28 f. Even to-day the Zaconian *patois* of modern Greek vernacular

[1] Simonson, Gk. Gr., Accidence, 1903, p. 6. He has a good discussion of the dialects, pp. 221-265.

[2] Riemann and Goelzer well say: "Quant au dialecte attique, grace aux grands ecrivains qui l'illustrerent, grace a la preponderance politique et commerciale d'Athenes, grace aussi a son caractere de dialecte intermediaire entre l'ionien et les dialectes en a, il se repandit de bonne heure, hors de son domaine primitif, continua a s'etendre meme apres la chute de l'empire politique d'Athenes et finit par embrasser tout le monde sur le nom de langue commune (κοινὴ διάλεκτος)" (Phonetique, p. 16). And yet the common people understood Homer also as late as Xenophon. Cf. Xenophon, Com. 3, 5, καὶ νῦν δυναίμην ἂν ᾽Ιλιάδα ὅλην καὶ ᾽Οδύσσειαν ἀπὸ στόματος εἰπεῖν. Cf. Lottich, De Serm. vulg. Attic., 1881. On the "Growth of the Attic Dialect" fee Rutherford, New Phrynichus, pp. 1-31.

has preserved the old Laconic Doric "whose broad α holds its ground still in the speech of a race impervious to literature and proudly conservative of a language that was always abnormal to an extreme."[1] It is not surprising that the Northwest Greek, because of the city leagues, became a kind of Achaean-Dorian **κοινή**[2] and held on till almost the beginning of the Christian era before it was merged into the **κοινή** of the whole Graeco-Roman world.[3] There are undoubtedly instances of the remains of the Northwest Greek and of the other dialects in the **κοινή** and so in the N. T. The Ionic, so near to the Attic and having flourished over the coast of Asia Minor, would naturally have considerable influence on the Greek world-speech. The proof of this will appear in the discussion of the **κοινή** where remains of all the main dialects are naturally found, especially in the vernacular.[4]

(c) PARTIAL KOINES. The standardizing of the Attic is the real basis. The **κοινή** was not a sudden creation. There were *quasi-koines* before Alexander's day. These were Strabo's alliance of Ionic-Attic, Doric-AEolic (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 49). It is therefore to be remembered that there were "various forms of **κοινή**" before the **κοινή** which commenced with the conquests of Alexander (Buck, Gk. Dialects, pp. 154-161), as Doric **κοινή**, Ionic **κοινή**, Attic **κοινή**, Northwest **κοινή**. Hybrid forms are not uncommon, such as the Doric future with Attic **ου** as in **ποιησοῦντι** (cf. Buck, p. 166). There was besides a revival here and there of local dialects during the Roman times.

(d) EFFECTS OF ALEXANDER'S CAMPAIGNS. But for the conquests of Alexander there might have been no **κοινή** in the sense of a world-speech. The other Greek *koines* were partial, this alone was a world-speech because Alexander united Greek and Persian, east and west, into one common world-empire. He respected the

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 32. [2] Ib., p. 37.

[3] Radermacher (NT. Gr., p. 1) puts it clearly: "Es genugt zu sagen, dass die **κοινή** starksten Zusammenhang mit dem Attischen, in zweiter Linie mit dem Ionischen, verrat. In der altesten Periode des Hellenismus zeigt sich daneben geringer Einfluss arderer Dialekte, des Dorischen and Aolischen."

[4] "Il est a peine besoin de repeter que ces caracteres s'effacenta, mesure que l'on descend vers l'ere chretienne. Sous Finfluence sans cesse grandissante de l'atticisime, il s'etablit une sorte d'uniformite." Boisacq, Les Dial. Dor., 1891, p. 204. "The Gk. of the N. T. is not, however, mere **κοινή**. In vocabulary it is fundamentally Ionic" (John Burnet, Rev. of Theol. and Phil., Aug., 1906, p. 95). "Fundamentally" is rather strong, but **ἀπόστολος**, as ambassador, not mere expedition, **εὐλογία, νηστεία**, give some colour to the statement. But what does Prof. Burnet mean by "mere **κοινή**?

customs and language of all the conquered nations, but it was inevitable that the Greek should become the *lingua franca* of the world of Alexander and his successors. In a true sense Alexander made possible this new epoch in the history of the Greek tongue. The time of Alexander divides the Greek language into two periods. "The first period is that of the separate life of the dialects and the second that of the speech-unity, the common speech or κοινή" (Kretschmer, *Die Entst. d.* ***Κοινή***, p. 1).

(e) THE MARCH TOWARD UNIVERSALISM. The successors of Alexander could not stop the march toward universalism that had begun. The success of the Roman Empire was but another proof of this trend of history. The days of ancient nationalism were over and the κοινή was but one expression of the glacial movement. The time for the world-speech had come and it was ready for use.

III. The Spread of the Κοινή.

(a) A WORLD-SPEECH. What is called ἡ κοινή was a world-speech, not merely a general Greek tongue among the Greek tribes as was true of the Achaean-Dorian and the Attic. It is not speculation to speak of the κοινή as a world-speech, for the inscriptions in the κοινή testify to its spread over Asia, Egypt, Greece, Italy, Sicily and the isles of the sea, not to mention the papyri. Marseilles was a great centre of Greek civilization, and even Cyrene, though not Carthage, was Grecized.[1] The κοινή was in such general use that the Roman Senate and imperial governors had the decrees translated into the world-language and scattered over the empire.[2] It is significant that the Greek speech becomes one instead of many dialects at the very time that the Roman rule sweeps over the world.[3] The language spread by Alexander's army over the Eastern world persisted after the division of the kingdom and penetrated all parts of the Roman world, even Rome itself. Paul wrote to the church at Rome in Greek, and Marcus Aurelius, the Roman Emperor, wrote his *Meditations* (τῶν εἰς ἑαυτόν) in Greek. It was the language not only of letters, but of commerce and every-day life. A common language for all

[1] See Churton, Infl. of the LXX Vers., 1861, p. 14.

[2] Viereck, Sermo Graecus quo Senatus Popul. Rom. etc., 1888, p. xi.

[3] See Wilamowitz-Mollendorff: "In demselben Momente, wo die casarische Weltmonarchie alle Strome hellenischer and italischer Kultur in einem Bette leitet, kommt die griechische Kunst auf alien Gebieten zu der Erkenntnis, dass ihre Kreise erftillt sind, das einzige das ihr bleibt, Nachahmung ist." Uber die Entst. der griech. Schriftspr., Abhandl. deuts. Phil., 1878, p. 40.

men may indeed be only an ideal norm, but "the whole character of a common language may be strengthened by the fact of its transference to an unquestionably foreign linguistic area, as we may observe in the case of the Greek **κοινή**."[1] The late Latin became a **κοινή** for the West as the old Babylonian had been for the East, this latter the first world-tongue known to us.[2] Xenophon with the retreat of the Ten Thousand[3] was a forerunner of the **κοινή**. Both Xenophon and Aristotle show the wider outlook of the literary Attic which uses Ionic words very extensively. There is now the "Gross-Attisch." It already has **γίνομαι, ἕνεκεν, —τωσαν, εἶπα** and **ἧνεγκα, ἐδώκαμεν** and **ἔδωκαν, βασίλισσα, δεικνύω σσ, ναός**. Already Thucydides and others had borrowed *σσ* from the Ionic. It is an easy transition from the vernacular Attic to the vernacular **κοινή** after Alexander's time. (Cf. Thumb's *Handbuch*, pp. 373-380, "Entstehung der **Κοινή**.") On the development of the **κοινή** see further Wackernagel, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 301 ff.; Moulton, Prol., ch. I, II; Mayser, *Gr. d. griech. Pap*., Iap. I. But it was Alexander who made the later Attic the common language of the world, though certainly he had no such purpose in view. Fortunately he had been taught by Aristotle, who himself studied in Athens and knew the Attic of the time. "He rapidly established Greek as the *lingua franca* of the empire, and this it was which gave the chief bond of union to the many countries of old civilizations, which had hitherto been isolated. This unity of culture is the remarkable thing in the history of the world."[4] It was really an epoch in the world's history when the babel of tongues was hushed in the wonderful language of Greece. The vernaculars of the eastern Roman provinces remained, though the Greek was universal; so, when Paul came to Lystra, the people still spoke the Lycaonian speech

[1] Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 496. See also Kaerst, Gesch. d. hellenist. Zeitalt., 101, p. 420: "Die Weiterentwicklung der Geschichte des Altertums, so weit sie fur unsere eigene Kultur entscheidende Bedeutung erlangt hat, beruht auf einer fortschreitenden Occidentalisierung; auch das im Oriente emporgekommene Christentum entfaltet sich nach dem Westen zu and gelangt hier zu seiner eigentlich weltgeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit."

[2] Schwyzer, Die Weltspr. etc., p. 7.

[3] See Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., p. 7; cf. also Rutherford New Phrynichus, 1881, p. 160 f.; Schweizer, Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 16. Moulton (Prol., p. 31) points out that the vase-inscriptions prove the statement of the Const. of Athens, 11. 3, that the Athenians spoke a language compounded of all Greek and barbarian tongues besides.

[4] Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen., etc., p. 40.

of their fathers.[1] The papyri and the inscriptions prove beyond controversy that the Greek tongue was practically the same whether in Egypt, Herculaneum, Pergamum or Magnesia. The Greeks were the school-teachers of the empire. Greek was taught in the grammar schools in the West, but Latin was not taught in the East.

(b) VERNACULAR AND LITERARY.

1. *Vernacular*. The spoken language is never identical with the literary style, though in the social intercourse of the best educated people there is less difference than with the uncultured.[2] We now know that the old Attic of Athens had a vernacular and a literary style that differed considerably from each other.[3] This distinction exists from the very start with the κοινή, as is apparent in Pergamum and elsewhere.[4] This vernacular κοινή grows right out of the vernacular Attic normally and naturally.[5] The colonists, merchants and soldiers who mingled all over Alexander's world did not carry literary Attic, but the language of social and business intercourse.[6] This vernacular κοινή at first differed little from the vernacular Attic of 300 B.C. and always retained the bulk of the oral Attic idioms. "Vulgar dialects both of the ancient and modern times should be expected to contain far more archaisms than innovations."[7] The vernacular is not a variation from the literary style, but the literary language is a development from the vernacular.[8] See Schmid[9] for the relation between the literary and the vernacular κοινή. Hence if the vernacular is the normal speech of the people, we must look to the inscriptions and the papyri for the living idiom of the common Greek or κοινή. The pure Attic as it was spoken in Athens is preserved only in

[1] Schwyzer, Weltspr., p. 29. [2] Schweizer, Gr. der perg. etc., p. 22.

[3] See Kretschmer, Die griech. Vaseninschr. and ihre Spr., 1894; and Meisterhans, Gr. der att. Inschr., 1900. Cf. Lottich, De Serm. vulg. Attic., 1881.

[4] Schweizer, Gr., p. 27.

[5] Thumb, Griech. Spr. im Zeitalter etc., p. 208 f. Lottich in his De Serm. vulg. Attic. shows from the writings of Aristophanes how the Attic vernacular varied in a number of points from the literary style, as in the frequent use of diminutives, desiderative verbs, metaphors, etc.

[6] Schweizer, Gr., p. 23.

[7] Geldart, Mod. Gk. Lang. in its Rela. to Anc. Gk., 1870, p. 73. See also Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 10, who calls "die κοινή weniger ein Abschluss als der Anfang einer neuen Entwicklung." On the older Gk. κοινή see Wackernagel, Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 300 f.

[8] Deissmann, Hell. Griech., Hauck's Realencyc., p. 633.

[9] Atticismus, Bd. IV, pp. 577-734. A very important treatment of the whole question is here given.

the inscriptions.[1] In the Roman Empire the vernacular κοινή would be understood almost everywhere from Spain to Pontus. See IV for further remarks on the vernacular

2. *Literary*. If the vernacular κοινή was the natural development of the vernacular Attic, the literary κοινή was the normal evolution of the literary Attic. Thumb well says, "Where there is no development, there is no life."[2] "In style and syntax the literary Common Greek diverges more widely from the colloquial."[3] This is natural and in harmony with the previous removal of the literary Attic from the language of the people.[4] The growth of the literary κοινή was parallel with that of the popular κοινή and was, of course, influenced by it. The first prose monument of literary Attic known to us, according to Schwyzer, is the Constitution of Athens[5] (before 413), falsely ascribed to Xenophon. The forms of the literary κοινή are much like the Attic, as in Polybius, for instance, but the chief difference is in the vocabulary and meaning of the same words.[6] Polybius followed the general literary spirit of his time, and hence was rich in new words, abstract nouns, denominative verbs, new adverbs.[7] He and Josephus therefore used Ionic words found in Herodotus and Hippocrates, like ἔνδεσις, παραφυλακή, not because they consciously imitated these writers, but because the κοινή, as shown by papyri and inscriptions, employed them.[8] For the same reason Luke and Josephus[9] have similar words, not because of use of one by the other, but because of common knowledge of literary terms, Luke also using many common medical terms natural to a physician of culture. Writers like Polybius aimed to write without pedantry and without vulgarism. In a true sense then the literary κοινή was a "compromise between the vernacular κοινή and the literary Attic," between "life and school."[10] There is indeed no Chinese

[1] Hirt, Handb. der griech. Laut- und Formenl., 1902, p. 41.

[2] Griech. Spr., p. 251. [3] Moulton, Prol., p. 26.

[4] Jannaris, Hist. C-k. Gr., p. 5. Deissmann (New Light on the N. T., 1907, p. 3 f.) shows that part of Norden's criticism of Paul's Gk. is nothing but the contrast between literary κοινή and vernacular κοινή; cf. Die ant. Kunstpr.

[5] Schwyzer, Die Weltspr. der Alt., p. 15. See also Christ, Gesch. der griech. Lit., p. 305. See Die pseudoxenophontische Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, von E. Kalinka, 1913.

[6] Schweizer, Gr., p. 21. [7] Christ, *op. cit.*, p. 588.

[8] Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 213. See also Goetzeler, De Polyb. Floc., 1887, p. 15.

[9] Thumb, ib., p. 225 f. See also Krenkel, Josephus und Lukas, 1894, pp. 283 ff. [10] Thumb, ib., p. 8.

wall between the literary and the vernacular κοινή, but a constant inflow from the vernacular to the written style as between prose and poetry, though Zarncke[1] insists on a thorough-going distinction between them. The literary κοινή would not, of course, use such dialectical forms as τοὺς πάντες, τοῖς πραγμάτοις, etc., common in the vernacular κοινή.[2] But, as Krumbacher[3] well shows, no literary speech worthy of the name can have an independent development apart from the vernacular. Besides Polybius and Josephus, other writers in the literary κοινή were Diodorus, Philo, Plutarch, though Plutarch indeed is almost an "Anhanger des Atticismus "[4] and Josephus was rather self-conscious in his use of the literary style.[5] The literary κοινή was still affected by the fact that many of the writers were of "un-Greek or half Greek descent," Greek being an acquired tongue.[6] But the point must not be overdone, for the literary κοινή "was written by cosmopolitan scholars for readers of the same sort," and it did not make much difference "whether a book was written at Alexandria or Pergamum."[7] Radermacher[8] notes that, while in the oldest Greek there was no artificiality even in the written prose, yet in the period of the κοινή all the literary prose shows "eine Kunstsprache." He applies this rule to Polybius, to Philo, to the N. T., to Epictetus. But certainly it does not hold in the same manner for each of these.

(c) THE ATTICISTIC REACTION. Athens was no longer the centre of Greek civilization. That glory passed to Alexandria, to Pergarnum, to Antioch, to Ephesus, to Tarsus. But the great creative epoch of Greek culture was past. Alexandria, the chief seat of Greek learning, was the home, not of poets, but of critics of style who found fault with Xenophon and Aristotle, but could not produce an *Anabasis* or a *Rhetoric*. The Atticists wrote, to be sure, in the κοινή period, but their gaze was always backward to the pre-κοινή period. The grammarians (Dionysius, Phryni-

[1] Zarncke in Griech. Stud., Hermann Lipsius, 1894, p. 121. He considers the Homeric poetry a reflection of the still older historical prose and the epic the oldest literary form. See his Die Entst. der griech. Literaturspr., 1896. Cf. Wilamowitz-Mollendorff, Die Entst. der griech. Schriftspr., Verhandl. d. Phil., 1878, p. 36 f. [2] Hatzidakis, Einl. in die neugr. Spr., p. 6.

[3] Das Prob. der neugr. Schriftspr., 1903, p. 6. A valuable treatment of this point.

[4] Weissenberger, Die Spr. Plut. von Charonea, 1895, pp. 3, 11.

5 Jos., Ant., XIV, t, 1.

[6] Susemihl, Gesch. der griech. Lit. in der Alexandrienzeit, 1. Bd., 1891, p. 2.

[7] Croiset, An Abr. Hist. of Gk. Lit., 1904, p. 425. [8] N. T. Gr., p. 2.

thus, Moeris) set up Thucydides and Plato as the standards for pure Greek style, while Aratus and Callimachus sought to revive the style of Homer, and Lucian and Arrian[1] even imitated Herodotus. When they wished to imitate the past, the problem still remained which master to follow. The Ionic revival had no great vogue, but the Attic revival had. Lucian himself took to Attic. Others of the Atticists were Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dio Chrysostom, Aristides, Herodes Atticus, AElian, etc. "They assumed that the limits of the Greek language had been forever fixed during the Attic period."[2] Some of the pedantic declaimers of the time, like Polemon, were thought to put Demosthenes to the blush. These purists were opposed to change in language and sought, to check the departure from the Attic idiom. "The purists of to-day are like the old Atticists to a hair."[3] The Atticists were then archaic and anachronistic. The movement was rhetorical therefore and not confined either to Alexandria or Pergamum. The conflict between the **κοινή** (vernacular and literary) and this Atticistic reaction affected both to some extent.[4] This struggle between "archaism and life" is old and survives to-day.[5] The Atticists were in fact out of harmony with their time,[6] and not like Dante, who chose the language of his people for his immortal poems. They made the mistake of thinking that by imitation they could restore the old Attic style. "The effort and example of these purists, too, though criticized at first, gradually became a sort of moral dictatorship, and so has been tacitly if not zealously obeyed by all subsequent scribes down to the present time."[7] As a result when one compares N. T. Greek,[8] one

[1] A sharp distinction as a rule must be made between the language of Arrian and Epict. The Gk. of Epict. as reported by Arrian, his pupil, is a good representative of the vern. **κοινή** of an educated man. Arrian's introduction is quite Atticistic, but he aims to reproduce Epictetus' own words as far as possible.

[2] Sophocles, Lex., p. 6. Athenaeus 15. 2 said: **Εἰ μὴ ἰατροὶ ἦσαν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἦν τῶν γραμματέων μωρότερον**.

[3] Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 180. On Atticism in the **κοινή** see Wackernagel, Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 309.

[4] Norden, Die griech. Kunstpr. bis Aug., Bd. I, 1898, p. 150. Thumb, ib., p. 8.

[6] Ib., p. 252 f. [7] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 7.

[8] Moulton, Prol., p. 26. The diction of Aristophanes is interesting as a specimen of varieties of speech of the time. Cf. Hope, The Lang. of Parody; a Study in the Diction of Aristophanes (1906). Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p. 3) holds that we must even note the "barbarisches Griechisch" of writers like John Philoponos and Proclos.

must be careful to note whether it is with the book Greek (καθαρεύουσα) or the vernacular (ὁμιλουμένη). This artificial reactionary movement, however, had little effect upon the vernacular κοινή as is witnessed by the spoken Greek of to-day. Consequently it is a negligible quantity in direct influence upon the writers of the N. T.[1] But the Atticists did have a real influence upon the literary κοινή both as to word-formation[2] and syntax.[3] With Dionysius of Halicarnassus beauty was the chief element of style, and he hoped that the Attic revival would drive out the Asiatic influence.[4] The whole movement was a strong reaction against what was termed "Asianism" in the language.[5] It is not surprising therefore that the later ecclesiastical literary Greek was largely under the influence of the Atticists. "Now there was but one grammar: Attic. It was Attic grammar that every freeman, whether highly or poorly educated, had learned."[6] "This purist conspiracy" Jannaris calls it. The main thing with the Atticists was to have something as old as Athens. Strabo said the style of Diodorus was properly "antique."[7]

IV. The Characteristics of the Vernacular Κοινή.

(a) VERNACULAR ATTIC THE BASE. One must not feel that the vernacular Greek is unworthy of study. "The fact is that, during the best days of Greece, the great teacher of Greek was the common people."[8] There was no violent break between the vernacular Attic and the vernacular κοινή, but the one flowed into the other as a living stream.[9] If the reign of the separated dialects was over, the power of the one general Greek speech had just begun on the heels of Alexander's victories. The battle of Chaeronea broke the spirit of the old Attic culture indeed, but the Athenians

[1] Schmid, Der Atticismus etc., Bd. IV, p. 578. [2] Ib., p. 606 f.

[3] Troger, Der Sprachgeb. in der pseudolong. Schr., 1899, Tl. I, p. 61.

[4] Schmid, ib., Bd. I, pp. 17, 25. See Bd. IV, pp. 577-734, for very valuable summary of this whole subject.

[5] Norden, Die griech. Kunstpr., 1898. 1. Bd., p. 149. So Blass calls it "gleichzeitige atticistische Reaction gegen die asianische Beredsamkeit." Die griech. Beredsamkeit etc. von Alex. bis Aug., 1865, p. 77.

[6] Jannaris, *op. cit.*, p. 11. See also Fritz, Die Briefe des Bischofs Synesius von Kyrene. Ein Beitr. zur Gesch. des Att. im 4. and 5. Jahrh., 1898. Strabo, 13. 4, 9.

[8] Sophocles, Lex. of Rom. and Byz. Period, p. 11.

[9] Deissmann, Die sprachl. Erforsch. etc., p. 11. Rutherford (New Phryn., p. 2) says that "the debased forms and mixed vocabulary of the common dialect would have struck the contemporaries of Aristophanes and Plato as little better than jargon of the Scythian policemen." On the form of the κοινή see Wackernagel, Kult. etc., Tl. I, Abt. 8, p. 305.

gathered up the treasures of the past, while Alexander opened the flood-gates for the change in the language and for its spread over the world.[1] "What, however, was loss to standard Attic was gain to the ecumenical tongue. The language in which Hellenism expressed itself was eminently practical, better fitted for life than for the schools. Only a cosmopolitan speech could comport with Hellenistic cosmopolitanism. Grammar was simplified, exceptions decreased or generalized, flexions dropped or harmonized, construction of sentences made easier" (Angus, *Prince. Rev.*, Jan., 1910, p. 53). The beginning of the development of the vernacular **κοινή** is not perfectly clear, for we see rather the completed product.[2] But it is in the later Attic that lies behind the **κοινή**. The optative was never common in the vernacular Attic and is a vanishing quantity in the **κοινή**. The disappearance of the dual was already coming on and so was the limited use of the superlative, **--τωσαν** instead of **—ντων**, and **–σθωσαν** instead of **–σθων**, **γίνομαι, σσ, εἶπα, τίς** instead of **πότερος, ἕκαστος** and not **ἑκατερος**.[3] But while the Attic forms the ground-form[4] of the **κοινή** it must not be forgotten that the **κοινή** was resultant of the various forces and must be judged by its own standards.[5] There is not complete unanimity of opinion concerning the character of the vernacular **κοινή**. Steinthal[6] indeed called it merely a levelled and debased Attic, while Wilamowitz[7] described it as more properly an Ionic popular idiom. Kretschmer[8] now (wrongly, I think) contends that the Northwest Greek, Ionic and Boeotian had more influence on the **κοινή** than the Attic. The truth seems to be the position of Thumb,[9] that the vernacular **κοινή** is the result of the mingling with all dialects uponl the late Attic vernacular as the base. As between the Doric **α** and the Ionic **η** the vernacular **κοινή** follows the Attic

[1] Christ, Gesch. der griech. Lit., 1905, p. 509 f. For "the Attic ground-character of the **κοινή**" see Mayser, Gr. der griech. Pap. (1906, p. 1).

[2] Kaibel, Stil and Text der **Ἀθναίων Πολιτεία**, p. 37.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 3. Even in the literary **κονή** the dual is nearly gone, as in Polybius and Diodorus Siculus; cf. Schmidt, De Duali Graec. et Emor. et Reviv., 1893, pp. 22, 25.

[4] Gott. Gel.-Anz., 1895, p. 30 f.; Hatzidakis, Einl. in die neugr. Gr., p. 168 f.; Krumbacher, Byz. Lit., p. 789.

[5] "Die Erforschung der **κοινή** hat lange genug unter dem Gesichtswinkel des 'Klassicismus' gestanden." Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 10.

[6] Gesch. der Sprachw., p. 37f.

[7] Verhandl. der 32. phil. Versamml.; p. 40.

[8] Wochenschr. fur klass. Philol., 1899, p. 3; Die Entst. der **κοινή**, 1900.

[9] *Op. cit*., pp. 53-101, 202f.

usage, and this fact alone is decisive.[1] Dieterich[2] indeed sums up several points as belonging to the "Attic **κοινή**" such as verbs in **–υω** instead of **–υμι**, in **–ωσαν** instead of **–ων**, in contract imperfects, disuse of the temporal and the syllabic augment in composition, disuse of reduplication, **—ην** instead of **--η** in acc. sing. of adjs. in **–ής, --ου** instead of **–ους** in gen. sing. of third declension, **–α** instead of **–ου** in proper names, disuse of the Attic declension, **–ες** for **–ας** in accusative plural, **τόν** as relative pronoun, **ἴδιος** as possessive pronoun. But clearly by "Attic **κοινή**" he means the resultant Attic, not the Attic as distinct from the other dialects.

Besides the orthography is Attic (cf. **ἵλεως**, not **ἵλαος**) and the bulk of the inflections and conjugations likewise, as can be seen by comparison with the Attic inscriptions.[3] Schlageter[4] sums the matter up: "The Attic foundation of the **κοινή** is to-day generally admitted."

(b) THE OTHER DIALECTS IN THE **Κοινή**. But Kretschmer[5] is clearly wrong in saying that the **κοινή** is neither Attic nor decayed Attic, but a mixture of the dialects. He compares the mixture of dialects in the **κοινή** to that of the high, middle and low German. The Attic itself is a **κοινή** out of Ionic, AEolic and Doric. The mixed character of the vernacular **κοινή** is made plain by Schweizer[6] and Dieterich.[7] The Ionic shows its influence in the presence of forms like **ἰδίη, σπείρης, εἰδυῖα, --υίης, καθ' ἕτος** (cf. *vetus*), **ὀστέα, χειλέων, βλαβέων, χρυσέον, --ᾶς, --ᾶδος**; absence of the rough breathing (psilosis or de-aspiration, AEolic also); dropping of **μι** in verbs like **διδῶ; κιθών (χιτών), τέσσερα, πράσσω** for **πράττω** (Attic also), etc. Ionic words like **μον-όφθαλμος** (Herod.) instead of Attic **ἑτερ-όφθαλμος** occur. Conybeare and Stock (*Sel. from LXX*, p. 48) suggest that Homer was used as a text-book in Alexandria and so caused Ionisms like **σπείρης** in the **κοινή**. The spread of the Ionic over the East was to be expected. In Alexander's army many of the Greek dialects were represented.[8] In the Egyptian army of the Ptolemies nearly all the dialects were spoken.[9] The Ionians were, besides, part of the Greeks who settled in Alex-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 33 f.
[2] Unters. zur Gesch. griech. Spr., 1898, p. 258 f.
[3] Meisterhans, Gr. der Att. Inschr.
[4] Der Wortsch. der ausserhalb Attikas gefundenen att. Inschr., 1912.
[5] Wochenschr. fur klass. Phil., 1899, p. xvii.
[6] Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 201 f.
[7] Unters. zur Gesch. etc., p. 259 f.
[8] Arrian, II, 20. 5.
[9] Myer, Das Heerwesen der Ptolemaer und Romer in Agypten, 1900.

andria.[1] Besides, even after the triumph of the Attic in Greece the Ionic had continued to be spoken in large parts of Asia Minor. The Ionic influence appears in Pergamum also. The mixing of the Attic with foreign, before all with Ionic, elements, has laid the foundation for the **κοινή**.[2] The AEolic makes a poor showing, but can be traced especially in Pergamum, where. Schweizer considers it one of the elements of the language with a large injection of the Ionic.[3] AEolic has the α for η in proper names and forms in ας. Boeotian-AEolic uses the ending **–οσαν**, as **εἶχοσαν**, so common in the LXX. Moulton[4] points out that this ending is very rare in the papyri and is found chiefly in the LXX. He calls Boeotian-AEolic also "the monophthongizing of the diphthongs." In the Attic and the Ionic the open sound of η prevailed, while in the Boeotian the closed. In the **κοινή** the two pronunciations existed together till the closed triumphed. Psilosis is also Ionic. The *Doric* appears in forms like **λαός (λεώς), ναός (νεώς), πιάζω (πιέζω), ἐσπούδαξα, ἡ λιμός, τό πλοῦτος, ἀλέκτωρ, κλίβανος (κρίβανος)**; and in the pronunciation perhaps β, γ, δ had the Doric softer sound as in the modern Greek vernacular. But, as Moulton[5] argues, the vernacular **κοινή** comes to us now only in the written form; and that was undoubtedly chiefly Attic. *The Arcadian* dialect possibly contributes **ἀφέωνται**, since it has **ἀφεώσθη,** but this form occurs in Doric and Ionic also.[6] Cf. also the change of gender **ἡ λιμός** (Luke) and **τὸ πλοῦτος** (Paul). The Northwest Greek contributed forms like **ἀρχόντοις, τοὺς λέγοντες, ἦται (ἦμην** cf. Messenian and Lesbian also), **ἠρώτουν** (like Ionic), **εἶχοσαν** (cf. Boeotian), **λέλυκαν**. The accusative plural in —**ες** is very common in the papyri, and some N. T. MSS. give **τέσσρες** for **τέσσαρας**.[7] The Achaen-Dorian **κοινή** had resisted in Northwest Greece the inroads of the common Greek for a century or so. *The Mace-*

[1] H. Anz, Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graec. Serm. vulg. etc., 1894, p. 386. Mayser, Gr., pp. 9-24, finds numerous Ionic peculiarities in the Ptolemaic pap. far more than AEolic and Doric. He cites **–τωσαν, μαχαίρης, ἔσω, ἕνεκεν, ὀρέων, γογγύζω, παραθήκη, τέσσερες, ἔκπτωμα**, etc. On the Ionic and other non-Attic elements in the **κοινή** see Wackernagel, Kult., p. 306 f.

[2] Kaibel, Stil Lnd Text etc., p. 37. [3] Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 202.

[4] Prol., p. 33. The caution of Psichari (Essais de Gr. Hist. Neo-grq., 2eme ed., 1889, p. cxlix) is to be noted, that the vernacular is not necessarily dialectical, but "des tinee au peuple et venait du peuple." Cf. on AEolic elements, Mayser, p. 9. He cites **ἡ λιμός** in the pap.; **Λαός** is also AEolic.

[5] Prol., p. 34.

[6] Moulton, ib., p. 38, n. 3. For Doric elements in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., p. 5 f. [7] W. H., Intr. to the Gk. N. T., App., p. 150.

donian Greek, spoken by many of Alexander's soldiers, naturally had very slight influence on the **κοινή.** We know nothing of the old Macedonian Greek. Polybius[1] says that the Illyrians needed an interpreter for Macedonian. Sturz[2] indeed gives a list of Macedonian words found in the **κοινή**, as **ἄσπιλος, κοράσιον, παρεμβολή, ῥύμη**. But he also includes **ἀγγέλλω**! The Macedonians apparently used **β** instead of **φ** as **βίλιππος**, **δ=θ** as **δάνατος, σ=β** as **σέρεθρον**. Plutarch[3] speaks of Alexander and his soldiers speaking to each other **Μακεδονιστί**. For full discussion of the Macedonian dialect see 0. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und Volkstuni*, 1906, pp. 232-255.

(C) NON—DIALECTICAL CHANGES. It is not always possible to separate the various peculiarities of the **κοινή** into dialectical influences. "Where Macedonian, Spartan, Boeotian, Athenian and Thessalian were messmates a **κοινή** was inevitable. Pronounced dialecticisms which would render unintelligible or ludicrous to others were dropped" (see Angus, *Prince. Theol. Rev*., Jan., 1910, p. 67). The common blood itself went on changing. It was a living whole and not a mere artificial mingling of various elements. There is less difference in the syntax of the **κοινή** and that of the earlier Greek than in the forms, though the gradual disappearance of the optative, use of **ἵνα** and finite verb in the non-final sense rather than the infinitive or even **ὅτι**, the gradual disuse of the future part. may be mentioned. It was in the finer shades of thought that a common vernacular would fail to hold its own. "Any language which aspires to be a *Weltsprache* (world-language), as the Germans say, must sacrifice much of its delicacy, its shades of meaning, expressed by many synonyms and particles and tenses, which the foreigner in his hurry and without contact with natives cannot be expected to master."[4]

[1] Polybius, 28. 8, 9.

[2] De Dial. Alexan. etc., 1786, p. 56 f.; see also De Dial. Macedonica et Alexan., 1808, pp. 37, 42; Maittaire, Graecae Ling. Dial. Sturzii, 1807, p. 184; Sophocles, Lex. of Rom. and Byz. Period, p. 3. Schweizer, Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 27, sees very little in the Macedonian influence.

[3] I, 592 B, 694 C. Kennedy (Sources of N. T. Gk., p. 17) says: "In any case, the Macedonian type of Greek, whether or not it is admissible to call it a special *dialect*, was so far removed from ordinary Attic as to make it certain that the latter on Macedonian lips must soon and inevitably suffer thorough-going modification."

[4] Mahaffy, Survey of Gk. Civilization, p. 220. Cf. Geldart, Mod. Gk. Lang. in its Rela. to Anc. Gk., p. 73, for discussion of "the levelling tendency common to all languages."

(d) NEW WORDS, NEW FORMS OR NEW MEANINGS TO OLD WORDS. Naturally most change is found either in new words or in new meanings in old words, just as our English dictionaries must have new and enlarged editions every ten years or so. This growth in the vocabulary is inevitable unless the life of a people stops. A third-century inscription in Thera, for instance, shows **συναγωγή** used of a religious meeting, **πάροικος** (not the Attic **μέτοικος**) for stranger, **ἀπόστολος** and **κατήχησις** in their old senses like those Americanisms which preserve Elizabethan English (" fall" for "autumn," for instance).[1] Here are some further examples. It is hard to be sure that all of these are words that arose in the **κοινή**, for we cannot mark off a definite line of cleavage. We mention **ἀγάπη, ἁγιότης, ἁγνότης, ἄθεσμος, ἀθέτησις, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ἀκατάλυτος, ἀκροατήριον, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, ἀντίλυτρον, ἀνακαινόω** (and many verbs in —**οω**, **--άζω, --ίζω**), **ἀναγεννάω, βάπτισμα** (many words in **--μα**), **βαπτισμός, βαπτιστής, γρηγορέω** (cf. also **στήκω**), **δεισιδαιμονία, δηνάριον, δικαιοκρισία, ἐλεημοσύνη, ἐκκακέω, ἐκμυκτηρίζω, θειότης, θεόπνευστος, λογία, κατηχέω, κράβαττος, μαθητεύω, οἰκοδεσπότης, ὀρθρίζω, ὀψάριον, ὀψώνιον, πρόσκαιρος, ῥομφαία, συμβούλιον, τελώνιον, υἱοθεσία, ὑποπόδιον, φιλαδελφία, ὠτίον,** etc. Let these serve merely as examples. For others see the lists in Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, *Light from the Ancient East,* Moulton and Milligan's "Lexical Notes on the Papyri" (Expositor, 1908--), Winer-Schmiedel (p. 22), Thayer's *Lexicon*, (p. 691 f.), Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*, and the indices to the papyri collections. One of the pressing needs is a lexicon of the papyri and then of the **κοινή** as a whole. Many of these words were already in ithe literary **κοινή**, though they probably came from the vernacular.[2] Some old words received slightly new forms, like **ἀνάθεμα** 'curse' (**ἀνάθημα** 'offering'), **ἀπάντησις** (**ἀπάντημα**), **ἀποστασία** (**ἀπόστασις**), **ἀροτριάω** (**ἀρόω**), **βασίλισσα** (**βασίλεια**), **γενέσια** (**γενέθλια**), **δεκατόω** (**δεκατεύω**), **λυχνία** (**λυχνίον**), **μισθαποδοδια** (**μισθοδοσία**), **μονόφθαλμος** (**ἑτερόφθαλμος**), **νουθεσία** (**νουθέτησις**), **οἰκοδομή** (**οἰ-**

[1] Hicks, St. Paul. and Hellen., in Stud. Bibl. et Eccl., 1896, p. 5. Mayser (Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 24-35) gives an interesting list of words that were chiefly "poetical" lin the classic literature, but are common in the papyri. The poets often use the vernacular. Some of these words are **ἀλέκτωρ, βιβρώσκω, δέσμιος, δῶμα, ἐκτινάσσω, ἐντρέπομαι, ἐπαιτέω, ἐπισείω, θάλπω, καταστέλλω, κοιμάομαι, κόπος, λαοί** = people, **μέριμνα, νήπιος, οἰκητήριον, περίκειμαι, προσφωνέω, σκύλλω, στέγη, συναντάω, ὑετός**. New forms are given to old words as **λιμπάνω**," from **λείπω**, etc. Ramsay (see The Independent, 1913, p. 376) finds **ἐμβατεύω** (cf. Col. 2:18) used in the technical sense of *entering in* on the part of initiates in the sanctuary of Apollos at Claros in an inscription there.

[2] See W.-Sch., p. 19, n. 8.

κοδόμησις), ὀνειδισμός (ὄνειδος), ὀπτασία (ὄψις), πανδοχεύς (πανδοκεύς), παραφρονία (παραφροσύνη), ῥαντίζω (ῥαίνω, cf. **βαπτιζω, βάπτω), στήκω (ἕστηκα), ταμεῖον (ταμιεῖον), τεκνίον** (and many diminutives in **–ίον** which lose their force), **παιδάριον** (and many diminutives in **–άριον**), **φυσιάομαι (φυσάομαι)**, etc.

Words (old and new) receive new meanings, as **ἀνακλίνω** ('recline at table'). Cf. also **ἀναπίπτω, ἀνάκειμαι, ἀντιλέγω**) ('speak against'), **ἀποκριθῆναι** (passive not middle, 'to answer'), **δαιμόνιον** ('evil spirit,' 'demon'), **δῶμα** ('house-top'), **ἐρωτάω** ('beg'), **εὐχαριστέω** ('thank'), **ἐπιστέλλω** ('write a letter'), **ὀψάριον** ('fish'), **ὀψώνιον** ('wages'), **παρακαλέω** ('entreat'), **παρρησία** ('confidence'), **περισπάομαι** ('distract'), **παιδεύω** ('chastise'), **πτῶμα** ('corpse'), **συγκρίνω** ('compare'), **σχολή** ('school'), **φθάνω** ('come'), **χορτάζω** ('nourish'), **χρηματίζω** ('be called').[1] This is all perfectly natural. Only we are to remember that the difference between the **κοινή** vocabulary and the Attic literature is not the true standard. The vernacular **κοινή** must be compared with the Attic vernacular as seen in the inscriptions and to a large extent in a writer like Aristophanes and the comic poets. Many words common in Aristophanes, taboo to the great Attic writers, reappear in the **κοινή**. They were in the vernacular all the time.[2] Moulton[3] remarks that the vernacular changed very little from the first century A.D. to the third. "The papyri show throughout the marks of a real language of daily life, unspoilt by the blundering bookishness which makes the later documents so irritating." It is just in the first century A.D. that the **κοινή** comes to its full glory as a world-language. "The fact remains that in the period which gave birth to Christianity there was an international language" (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 59). It is not claimed that all the points as to the origin of the **κοινή** are now clear. See Hesseling, *De koine en de oude dialekten van Griechenland* (1906). But enough is known to give an intelligible idea of this language that has played so great a part in the history of man.

(e) PROVINCIAL INFLUENCES. For all practical purposes the Greek dialects were fused into one common tongue largely as a result of Alexander's conquests. The Germanic dialects have gone farther and farther apart (German, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, English), for no great conqueror has arisen to

[1] Schlageter (Wortsch. etc., pp. 59-62) gives a good list of words with another meaning in the **κοινή**.

[2] Cf. Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., pp. 70 f., 147,

[3] Cl. Quar., April, 1908, p. 137,

bind them into one. The language follows the history of the people. But the unification of the Greek was finally so radical that "the old dialects to-day are merged into the general mass, the modern folk-language is only a continuation of the united, Hellenistic, common speech."[1] So completely did Alexander do his work that the balance of culture definitely shifted from Athens to the East, to Pergamum, to Tarsus, to Antioch, to Alexandria.[2] This "union of oriental and occidental was attempted in every city of Western Asia. That is the most remarkable and interesting feature of Hellenistic history in the Greco-Asiatic kingdoms and cities."[3] Prof. Ramsay adds: "In Tarsus the Greek qualities and powers were used and guided by a society which was, on the whole, more Asiatic in character." There were thus non-Greek influences which also entered into the common Greek life and language in various parts of the empire. Cf. K. Holl, "Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in nachchristlicher Zeit" (Hermes, 1908, 43, p. 240). These non-Greek influences were especially noticeable in Pergamum, Tarsus and Alexandria, though perceptible at other points also. But in the case of Phrygia long before Alexander's conquest there had been direct contact with the Arcadian and the AEolic dialects through immigration.[4] The Greek inscriptions in the Hellenistic time were first in the old dialect of Phrygia, then gliding into the κοινή then finally the pure κοινή.[5] Hence the κοινή won an easy victory in Pergamum, but the door for Phrygian influence was also wide open. Thus, though the κοινή rests on the foundation of the Greek dialects, some non-Greek elements were intermingled.[6] Dieterich[7] indeed gives a special list of peculiarities that belong to the κοινή of Asia Minor, as, for instance, –αν instead of –α in the accus. sing. of 3d decl., proper names in ᾶς, τίς for ὅστις, ὅστις for ὅς, εἶμαι for εἰμί, use of θέλω rather than future tense. In the case of Tarsus "a few traces of the Doric

[1] Kretschmer, Einl. in die Gesch. etc., p. 417.

[2] Jannaris, Hit. Gk. Gr., p. 6. The multitudinous mod. Gk. *patois* illustrate the κοινή.

[3] W. M. Ramsay, Tarsus, Exp., Mar., 1906, p. 261.

[4] Schweizer, dr. der perg. Inschr., pp. 15 ff. [5] Ib., p. 25.

[6] Bruns, Die att. Bestrebungen in der griech. Lit., 1896,1p. 12, says: "Statt ihrer (classische attische Sprache) regiert ein gemeines Kebsweib, das aus irgend einer phrygischen Spelunke stammt — das ist der hellenistische Stil"! A slight exaggeration. Cf. Brugmann, Vergl. Gr., p. 9.

[7] Untersuch. zur Gesch. etc., pp. 258 ff. The speech of Asia Minor has indeed close affinity with that of Paul and Luke and with all the N. T. writers. Cf. Thieme, Die Inschr. von Magn. am Maander und das N. T., 1906.

dialect may perhaps have lingered" in the κοινή, as Ramsay suggests (*Expositor*, 1906, p. 31), who also thinks that ναοκόρος for νεωκόρος in Ac. 19:35 in D may thus be explained.

But no hard and fast distinction can be drawn, as –αν for --ν as accusative appears in Egypt also, e.g. in θυγατέραν. Is it proper to speak of an Alexandrian dialect? Blass[1] says so, agreeing with Winer-Schmiedel[2] (ἡ Ἀλεξανδρέων διάλεκτος). This is the old view, but we can hardly give the name dialect to the Egyptian Greek. Kennedy[3] says: "In all probability the language of the Egyptian capital had no more right to be called a dialect than the vernacular of any other great centre of population." Schweizer[4] likewise refuses to consider the Alexandrian κοινή as a dialect. Dieterich[5] again gives a list of Egyptian peculiarities such as οἱ instead of αι, –α instead of —ας in nominatives of third declension, adjectives in –η instead of —α, ἐσοῦ for σοῦ, καθεῖς for ἕκαστος, imperfect and aorist in —α, ἤμην for ἦν, disuse of augment in simple verbs, indicative instead of the subjunctive. Mayser (Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 35-40) gives a list of "Egyptian words" found in the Ptolemaic papyri. They are words of the soil, like πάπυρος itself. But Thumb[6] shows that the majority of the so-called Alexandrian peculiarities were general in the κοινή like ἦλθοσαν, εἶχαν, γέγοναν, ἑώρακες, etc. "There was indeed a certain unwieldiness and capriciousness about their language, which displays itself especially in harsh and fantastic word-composition." As examples of their words may be mentioned κατανωτιζόμενος, παρασυγγράφειν, φιλανθρωπεῖν, etc. It is to be observed also that the κοινή was not the vernacular of all the peoples when it was spoken as a secondary language. In Palestine, for instance, Aramaic was

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., 1905, p. 3 note.

[2] Gr. des neut. Sprachid., § 3. 1, n. 4.

[3] Sour. of N. T. Gk., 1895, p. 23. Irenaeus (Minucius Pacatus) and Demetrius Ixion wrote treatises on "the dialect of Alexandria" (Swete, Intr. to the 0. T. in Gk., p. 289). But they probably did not understand that the vernacular κοινή, which differed from the literary κοινή, was international (Thackeray, Gr. of the 0. T. in Gk., vol. I, p. 19). "It is certain that many forms of this later language were specially *characteristic* of Alexandria" (ib.).

[4] Gr. der perg. Inschr., p. 27. [5] Unters. zur Gesch. etc., pp. 258 ff.

[6] Die griech. Spr. etc., p. 168 ff. See also Anz, Subs. ad cognos. Graec. Serm. vulg. etc., 1891, p. 262. "Nec quae Apostolides homo doctus Alexandrinus nuperrime protulit omnes caligines propulsaverunt. Certe nemo jam existet qui cum Sturzio Macedonicam dialectum ibi quaerat, sed altera e parte neminem puto judicare illam quae vulgo appellatur dialectum Alexandrinam solis vindicandam esse Alexandrinis." Cf. Susemihl, Lit. der Alexandrinerzeit.

the usual language of the people who could also, most of them, speak Greek. Moulton's parallel of the variations in modern English is not therefore true, unless you include also peoples like the Welsh, Scotch, Irish, etc.

But as a whole the vernacular **κοινή** was a single language with only natural variations like that in the English of various parts of the United States or England.[1] Thumb perhaps makes too much of a point out of the use of **ἐμός** rather than **μου** in Asia Minor in its bearing on the authorship of the Gospel of John where it occurs 41 times, once only in 3 Jo. and Rev. (34 times elsewhere in the N. T.), though it is interesting to note, as he does, that the infinitive is still used in Pontus. But there were non-Greek influences here and there over the empire as Thumb[2] well shows. Thumb[3] indeed holds that "the Alexandrian popular speech is only one member of a great speech-development."

(f) THE PERSONAL EQUATION. In the vernacular **κοινή**, as in the literary language, many variations are due to differences in education and personal idiosyncrasies. "The colloquial language in its turn went off into various shades of distinction according to the refinement of the speaker" (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 59). The inscriptions on the whole give us a more formal speech, sometimes official decrees, while the papyri furnish a much wider variety. "The papyri show us the dialect of Greek Egypt in many forms, — the language of the Government official, of the educated private person, of the dwellers in the temples, of the peasantry in the villages."[4] We have numerous examples of the papyri through both the Ptolemaic and the Roman rule in Egypt. All sorts of men from the farm to the palace are here found writing all sorts of documents, a will or a receipt, a love-

[1] Sir Jonathan Williams, an Eng. savant, is quoted in the Louisville Courier-Journal (May 9, 1906) as saying: "I have found in the city of Louisville a pronunciation and a use of terms which is nearer, to my mind, to Addison and the English classicists than anything which the counties of England, the provinces of Australia, or the moors of Scotland can offer." He added that the purest English known to him is spoken in Edinburgh and Louisville. These two cities, for geographical reasons, are not provincial.

[2] Griech. Spr. etc., pp. 102-161; Theol. Literaturzeit., 1903, p. 421; cf. also Moulton, Pro:. p. 40. Moulton sets over against **ἐμός** the fact that John's Gospel uses **ἵνα** rather than the infinitive so often. Much of the force of such an argument vanishes also under the personal equation.

[3] Griech. Spr. etc., p. 171. Cf. also Zahn, Einleitung in das N. T., I, 38.

[4] Kenyon, ext. vol. of Hast. D. B., art. Papyri, p. 355[b]. See also id., Palaeog. of the Gk. Pap., 1899.

letter or a dun, a memorandum or a census report, a private letter or a public epistle. "Private letters are our most valuable sources; and they are all the better for the immense differences that betray themselves in the education of the writers. The well-worn epistolary formulae show variety mostly in their spelling; and their value for the student lies primarily in their remarkable resemblances to the conventional phraseology which even the N. T. letter-writers were content to use."[1] Deissmann[2] has insisted on a sharp distinction between letters and epistles, the letter being private and instinct with life, the epistles being written for the public eye, an open letter, a literary letter. This is a just distinction. A real letter that has become literature is different from an epistle written as literature. In the papyri therefore we find all grades of culture and of illiteracy, as one would to-day if one rummaged in the rubbish-heaps of our great cities. One need not be surprised at seeing **τὸν μήτρως, τὸν θέσιν**, and even worse blunders. As a sample Jannaris[3] gives **ἀξειωθεὶς ὑπαιρατῶν γράμματα μεὶ εἰδώτων**, for **ἐξιωθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτῶν γράμματα μὴ εἰδότων**. Part of these are crass errors, part are due to identity of sounds in pronunciation, as **ο** and **ω**, **ει** and **η**, **ει** and **ι.** Witkowski[4] properly insists that we take note of the man and the character of work in each case.

It is obvious that by the papyri and the inscriptions we gain a truer picture of the situation. As a specimen of the vernacular **κοινή** of Egypt this letter of the school-boy Theon to his father has keen interest (see 0. P. 119). It belongs to the second century A.D. and has a boy's mistakes as well as a boy's spirit. The writing is uncial.

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 27 f.

[2] B. S., 1901, pp. 3-59. "The distinction holds good, even if we cannot go all the way with Deissmann in pronouncing all the Pauline writings 'letters' rather than 'Epistles.'" G. Milligan, Gk. Pap., p. xxxi.

[3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 7. Quoted from Griech. Urk., Berlin, 13 [2], belonging to year 289 A.D.

[4] The papyri contain "exempla ex vita deprompta, cum sermo scriptorum ut solutae ita poeticae orationis nullo modo veram nobis imaginem sermonis illius aetatis praebeat. Etenim sermo, quem apud auctores hellinisticos deprehendimus, arti, non vitae, debetur." Witkowski Prodr. gr. pap. Graec., etc., 1898, p. 197. He urges that in case of variations in forms or syntax one must inquire "utrum ab alia qua dialecto petita sit an in Aegypto nata, utrum ab homine Graeco an barbaro formata." Ib., p. 198. He thinks it is necessary that we have "librum de sermone papyrorum, librum de sermone titulorum, librum de sermone auctorum poeticae et pedestris orationis illius aetatis, librum de dialecto Macedonica tractantem." Ib.

θέων θέωνι τῷ πατρὶ χαίρειν.
καλῶς ἐποίησες. οὐκ ἀπένηχές με μετ᾽ ἐ-
σοῦ εἰς πόλιν. ἡ οὐ θέλις ἀπενέκκειν με-
τ᾽ ἐσοῦ εἰς ᾽Αλεξανδρίαν οὐ μὴ γράψω σε ἐ-
πιστολὴν οὔτε λαλῶ σε, οὔτε υἱγένω σε,
εἶτα. ἂν δὲ ἔλθῃς εἰς ᾽Αλεξανδρίαν, οὐ
μὴ λάβω χεῖραν παρά (σ)ου οὔτε πάλι χαίρω
σε λυπόν. ἂμ μὴ θέλῃς ἀπενέκαι μ[ε]
ταῦτα γε(ί)νετε. καὶ ἡ μήτηρ μου εἶπε ᾽Αρ-
χελάῳ ὅτι ἀναστατοῖ με· ἄρρον αὐτόν.
καλῶς δὲ ἐποίησες. δῶρά μοι ἔπεμψε[ς]
μεγάλα ἀράκια. πεπλάνηκαν ἡμῶς ἐκε[ῖ],
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ιβ᾽ ὅτι ἔπλευσες. λυπὸν πέμψον εἰ[ς]
με, παρακαλῶ σε. ἂμ μὴ πέμψῃς οὐ μὴ φά-
γω, οὐ μὴ πείνω· ταῦτα.
ἐρῶσθέ σε εὔχ(ομαι).

Τῦβι ιη᾽.

On the other side:

ἀπόδος θέωνι [ἀ]πὸ θεωνᾶτος υἱῶ.

Milligan (*Greek Papyri*, p. xxxii) admits that there may be now a temptation "to exaggerate the significance of the papyri." But surely his book has a wonderful human, not to say linguistic, interest. Take this extract from a letter of Hilarion to his wife Alis (P. Oxy. 744 B.C. 1): ᾽Εὰν πολλαπολλῶν τέκῃς, ἐὰν ἦν ἄρσενον, ἄφες, ἐὰν ἦν θήλεα, ἔκβαλε.

(g) RESUME. To all intents and purposes the vernacular κοινή is the later vernacular Attic with normal development under historical environment created by Alexander's conquests. On this base then were deposited varied influences from the other dialects, but not enough to change the essential Attic character of the language. There is one κοινή everywhere (cf. Thumb, *Griech. Spr.*, p. 200). The literary κοινή was homogeneous, while the vernacular κοινή was practically so in spite of local variations (cf. Angus, *The Koine*: "The Language of the N. T.," *Prince. Theol. Rev.*, Jan., 1910, p. 78 f.). In remote districts the language would be Doric-coloured or Ionic-coloured.

Phonetics and Orthography. It is in pronunciation that the most serious differences appear in the κοινή (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 5). We do not know certainly how the ancient Attic was pronounced, though we can approximate it. The modern Greek vernacular pronunciation is known. The κοινή stands along the path of progress, precisely where it is hard to tell. But we know enough

not to insist too strongly on "hair-splitting differences hinging on forms which for the scribe of our uncials had identical value phonetically, e.g. **οι, η, ῃ, υ, ι**=ee in feet, or **αι**=**ε** (Angus, *op. cit.*, p. 79). Besides itacisms the **ι**-monophthongizing is to be noticed and the equalizing of **ο** and **ω**. The Attic **ττ** is *σσ* except in a few instances (like),(**ἐλάττων, κρείττων**). The tendency is toward de-aspiration except in a few cases where the reverse is true as a result of analogy (or a lost digamma). Cf. **ἐφ' ἐλπίδι**. Elision is not so common as in the Attic, but assimilation is carried still further (cf. **ἐμμέσῳ**). There is less care for rhythm in general, and the variable final consonants **ν** and **ς** appear constantly before consonants. The use of **–ει–** for **–ιει–** in forms like **πεῖν**, and **ταμεῖον** probably comes by analogy. **Οὐθείς** and **μηθείς** are the common forms till 100 B.C. when **οὐδείς** and **μηθείς** begin to regain their ascendency.

Vocabulary. The words from the town-life (the stage, the market-place) come to the front. The vocabulary of Aristophanes is in point. There was an increase in the number of diminutive forms. The **κοινή** was not averse to foreign elements if they were useful. Xenophon is a good illustration of the preparation for the **κοινή**. Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 8.

Word-Formation. There is the natural dropping of some old suffixes and the coining of new suffixes, some of which appear in the modern Greek vernacular. The number of compound words by juxtaposition is greatly increased, like **πληρο-φορέω**, **χειρό-γραφον**. In particular two prepositions in compounds are frequent, like **συν-αντι-λαμβάνομαι**. New meanings are given to old words.

Accidence. In substantives the Ionic **–ρης**, not **–ρας**, is common, bringing nouns in **–ρα** into harmony with other nouns of the first declension (Thackeray, *Gr. of the 0. T. in Gk.*, p. 22). The Attic second declension disappears. Some feminine nouns in **–ος** become masculine. The third declension is occasionally assimilated to the first in forms like **νύκραν, θυγατέραν**. Contraction is absent sometimes in forms like **ὀρέων**. Both **χάριν** and **χάριτα** occur. Adjectives have forms like **ἀσφαλῆν, πλήρης** indeclinable, **πᾶν** for **πάντα** (cf. **μέγαν**), **δυσί** for **δυοῖν**. The dual, in fact, has disappeared in all inflections and conjugations. Pronouns show the disappearance of the dual forms like **ἑκάτερος** and **πότερος**. **Τίς** is used sometimes like **ὅστις**, and **ὃς ἐάν** is more frequent than **ὃς ἄν** about A.D. 1. Analogy plays a big part in the language, and this is proof of life. In the verb there is a general tendency toward simplification, the two conjugations blending into one (**μι** verbs going).

New presents like ἀποκτέννω, ὀπτάνω, are formed. There is confusion in the use of —άω and –έω verbs. We find γίνομαι, γινώσκω. The increase of the use of first aorist forms like ἔσχα (cf. εἶπον and εἶπα in the older Greek). This first aorist termination appears even in the imperfect as in εἶχα. The use of —οσαν (εἶχοσαν, ἔσχοσαν) for —ον in the third plural is occasionally noticeable. The form —αν (δέδωκαν) for —ασι may be due to analogy of this same first aorist. There is frequent absence of the syllabic augment in the past perfect, while in compound verbs it is sometimes doubled like ἀπεκατέστησαν. The temporal augment is often absent, especially with diphthongs. We have —τωσαν rather than —ντων, —σθωσαν rather than —σθων.

Syntax. There is in general an absence of many Attic refinements. Simplicity is much more in evidence. This is seen in the shorter sentences and the paratactic constructions rather than the more complex hypotactic idioms. The sparing use of particles is noticeable. There is no effort at rhetorical embellishment. What is called "Asianism" is the bombastic rhetoric of the artificial orators. Atticism aims to reproduce the classic idiom. The vernacular κοινή is utterly free from this vice of Asianism and Atticism. Thackeray (op. cit., p. 23) notes that "in the breach of the rules of concord is seen the widest deviation from classical orthodoxy." This varies a great deal in different writers as the papyri amply testify. The *nominativus pendens* is much in evidence. The variations in case, gender and number of substantives, adjectives and verbs are frequent κατὰ σύνεσιν. The neuter plural is used with either a singular or plural verb. The comparative does duty often for the superlative adjective. The superlative form usually has the elative sense. Πρῶτος is common (as sometimes in older Greek) when only two are compared. Ἑαυτῶν occurs for all three persons. The accusative is regaining its old ascendency. There is an increase in the use of the accusatives with verbs and much freedom in the use of transitive and intransitive verbs. The growth in the use of prepositions is very marked both with nouns and in composition, though some of the old prepositions are disappearing. Few prepositions occur with more than two cases. Phrases like βλέπω ἀπό show a departure from the old idiom. New adverbial and prepositional phrases are coming into use. The cases with prepositions are changing. The instrumental use of ἐν is common. The optative is disappearing. The future participle is less frequent. The infinitive (outside τοῦ, ἐν τῷ, εἰς τό and the inf.) is receding before

ἵνα, which is extending its use very greatly. There is a wider use of ὅτι. Everywhere it is the language of life and not of the books. The N. T. use of expressions like **εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, δύο δύο**, once cited as Hebraisms, is finding illustration in the papyri (cf. Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 123 f.). **Μή** begins to encroach on **οὐ**, especially with infinitives and participles. The periphrastic conjugation is frequently employed. The non-final use of ἵνα is quite marked. Direct discourse is more frequent than indirect. Clearness is more desired than elegance. It is the language of nature, not of the schools.

V. The Adaptability of the Κοινή to the Roman World. It is worth while to make this point for the benefit of those who may wonder why the literary Attic could not have retained its supremacy in the Graeco-Roman world. That was impossible. The very victory of the Greek spirit made necessary a modern common dialect. Colonial and foreign influences were inevitable and the old classical culture could not be assimilated by the Jews and Persians, Syrians, Romans, Ethiopians. "In this way a Panhellenic Greek sprang up, which, while always preserving all its main features of Attic grammar and vocabulary, adopted many colonial and foreign elements and moreover began to proceed in a more analytical spirit and on a simplified grammar."[1] The old literary Attic could not have held its own against the Latin, for the Romans lamented that they were Hellenized by the Greeks after conquering them.[2] Spenserian English would be an affectation to-day. The tremendous vitality of the Greek is seen precisely in its power to adjust itself to new conditions even to the present time. The failure of the Latin to do this not only made it give way before the Greek, but, after Latin became the speech of the Western world during the Byzantine period, the vernacular Latin broke up into various separate tongues, the modern Romance languages. The conclusion is irresistible therefore that the **κοινή** possessed wonderful adaptability to the manifold needs of the Roman world.[3] It was the international language. Nor must one think that it was an ignorant age. What we call the "Dark Ages" came long afterwards. "Let me further insist that this civilization was so perfect that, as far as it reached, men were

[1] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 6.

[2] Cf. Sharp, Epictetus and the N. T. (1914), for useful comparison of language and thought of Epictetus and the N. T.

[3] Lafoscade, Infl. du Lat. sur le Grec, pp. 83-158, in Biblioth. de 1'Ecole des hautes et., 1892.

more cultivated in the strict sense than they ever have been since. We have discovered new forces in nature; we have made new inventions; but we have changed in no way the methods of thinking laid down by the Greeks . . . The Hellenistic world was more cultivated in argument than we are nowadays."[1] Moulton[2] cannot refrain from calling attention to the remarkable fact that the new religion that was to master the world began its career at the very time when the Mediterranean world had one ruler and one language. On the whole it was the best language possible for the Groeco-Roman world of the first century A.D.

[1] Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Ernp., 1905, p. 137. He adds (p. 111): "The work of Alexandria was a permanent education to the whole Greek-speaking world; and we know that in due time Pergamum began to do similar work."

[2] Prol., p. 6. See also Breed, Prep. of the World for Chr., 1904, ch. IX, The Hellenizing of the Nations, and ch. XI, The Unification of the World. Jannaris (*op. cit*., p. 8) indeed puts the LXX, N. T. and many pap. into "the Levantine group" of the literary language, but this is a wrong assignment for both the LXX and the N. T.

CHAPTER IV

THE PLACE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE KOINH

I. The New Testament Chiefly in the Vernacular Κοινή. Observe "chiefly," for not quite all the N. T. is wholly in the vernacular **κοινή** as will be shown.[1] But the new point, now obvious to every one, is just this, that the N. T. is in the normal **κοινή** of the period. That is what one would have looked for, when you come to think of it. And yet that is a recent discovery, for the Purists held that the N. T. was in pure Attic, while the Hebraists, explained every peculiarity as a Hebraism. The Purists felt that revelation could only come in the "best" Greek, and hence it had to be in the Attic. This, as we now know, could only have been true if the N. T. writers had been Atticistic and artificial stylists. So the Hebraists got the better of the argument and then overdid it. The most popular language in the N. T. is found in the Synoptic Gospels. Even Luke preserves the words of Jesus in colloquial form. The Epistle of James and the Johannine writings reflect the vernacular style very distinctly. We see this also in the Epistles of Peter (Second Peter is very colloquial) and Jude. The colloquial tone is less manifest in Acts, some of Paul's Epistles and Hebrews. Cf. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 63f. Wellhausen (Einl., p. 9) stresses the fact that in the Gospels the Greek spoken by the people makes its entry into literature.[2]

(a) NOT A BIBLICAL GREEK. As late as 1893 Viteau[3] says: "Le grec du N. T. est une variete du grec hebraisant." Again: "C'est par le grec des LXX qu'il faudrait expliquer, le plus souvent, le grec du N. T."[4] Viteau is aware of the inscriptions and the papyri and even says: "The Greek of the N. T. must be compared continually with the post-classical Greek in its various branches: with the Greek of the profane writers, the Greek of the inscrip-

[1] Cf. Deissmann, Light, pp. 55, 69.

[2] Cf. Moulton, N. T. Gk. (Camb. Bibl. Ess., pp. 488 ff.) who notes a special deficiency in Gk. culture in Mark's Gospel and the Apocalypse.

[3] Etude sur le Grec du N. T., Le Verbe, p. liv. [4] Ib., p. lv.

tions of the Alexandrian and Graeco-Roman periods, the Hebraizing Greek, finally the Christian Greek."[1] But he labours under Hatch's false idea of a distinct biblical Greek of which the N. T. is a variety; both of these ideas are erroneous. There is no distinct biblical Greek, and the N. T. is not a variety of the LXX Greek. Jowett[2] over forty years ago said: "There seem to be reasons for doubting whether any considerable light can be thrown on the N. T. from inquiry into language." That prophecy is now almost amusing in the light of modern research. Simcox[3] admitted that "the half-Hebraized Greek of the N. T. is neither a very elegant nor a very expressive language," but he found consolation in the idea that "it is a many-sided language, an eminently translatable language." Dr. Hatch[4] felt a reaction against the modern Atticistic attitude toward the N. T. language: "In almost every lexicon, grammar and commentary the words and idioms of the N. T. are explained, not indeed exclusively, but chiefly, by a reference to the words and idioms of Attic historians and philosophers." In this protest he was partly right, but he went too far when he insisted that[5] "biblical Greek is thus a language which stands by itself. What we have to find in studying it is what meaning certain Greek words conveyed to a Semitic mind."

Dr. Hatch's error arose from his failure to apply the Greek influence in Palestine to the language of Christianity as he had done to Christian study. Judea was not an oasis in the desert, but was merged into the Graeco-Roman world. Rothe[6] had spoken "of a language of the Holy Ghost. For in the Bible it is evident that the Holy Spirit has been at work, moulding for itself a distinctively religious mode of expression out of the language of the country." Cremer,[7] in quoting the above, says; "We have a very clear and striking proof of this in N. T. Greek:" Winer[8] had indeed seen that “the grammatical character of the N. T. language has a very slight Hebrew colouring,” but exactly how slight he could not tell. Winer felt that N. T. Greek was "a species of a species," "a variety of later Greek," in a word, a sort of dialect. In this he was wrong, but his notion (*op. cit*., p. 3) that a grammar of the N. T. should thus presuppose a grammar of the later

[1] Ib., p.
[2] Ess. and Rev., P. 477.
[3] Lang. of the N. T., 1890, p. 20.
[4] Ess. in Bibl. Gk., 1889, p. 2.
[5] Ib., p. 11.
[6] Dogmatik, 1863, p. 238.
[7] Biblico-Theol. Let. of N. T. Gk., 1892, p. iv.
[8] W.-M., 1877, p. 38. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 28.

Greek or κοινή is quite right, only we have no such grammar even yet. Winer made little use of the papyri and inscriptions (p. 21 ft. n.). We still sigh for a grammar of the κοινή though Thumb has related the κοινή to the Greek language as a whole. Kennedy[1] contended that there was "some general characteristic" about the LXX and N. T. books, which distinctly marked them off from the other Greek books; but "they are both children of the same parent, namely, the colloquial Greek of the time. This is the secret of their striking resemblance." Even in the Hastings' *Dictionary* Thayer[2] contends for the name "Hellenistic Greek" as the proper term for N. T. Greek. That is better than "biblical" or "Jewish" Greek, etc. But in simple truth we had better just call it N. T. Greek, or the Greek of the N. T., and let it go at that. It is the Greek of a group of books on a common theme, as we would speak of the Greek of the Attic orators, the Platonic Greek, etc. It is not a peculiar type of Greek except so far as that is due the historical conditions, the message of Christianity, and the peculiarities of the writers. Deissmann,[3] however, is the man who has proven from the papyri and inscriptions that the N. T. Greek is not a separate variety of the Greek language. He denies that the N. T. is like the LXX Greek, which was "a written Semitic-Greek which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after."[4] Blass[5] at first stood out against this view and held that "the N. T. books form a special group--one to be primarily explained by study," but in his *Grammar of N. T. Greek* he changed his mind and admitted that "a grammar of the popular language of that period written on the basis of all these various authorities and remains" was better than limiting oneself "to the language of the N. T."[6] So Moulton[7] concludes: "The disappearance of that word 'Hebraic' from its prominent place in our delineation of N. T. language marks a change in our conceptions of the subject nothing less than revolutionary." The new knowledge of the κοινή has buried forever the old controversy; between Purists and Hebraists.[8] The men who wrote the N. T.

[1] Sour. of N. T. Gk., 1895, p. 146.
[2] Art. Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B., 1900.
[3] B. S., 1901; Hell. Griech., Hauck's Realencyc. etc.
[4] B. S., p. 67.
[5] Theol. Literaturzeit., 1895, p. 487.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 2.
[7] Prol., p. 1.
[8] Thumb, Griech. Spr. etc., p. 120. It lasted "solange die biblische citat als etwas isoliertes betrachtet wurde." Thumb attacks the idea of N. T. dialect or a peculiar biblical variety of the κοινή, pp. 162-201. For history of the Purist controversy see W.-Th. § 1, W.-Sch. § 2.

were not aloof from the life of their time. "It embodied the lofty conceptions of the Hebrew and Christian faith in a language which brought them home to men's business and bosoms."[1] Wackernagel understates the matter: "As little as the LXX does the N. T. need to be isolated linguistically."[2]

(b) PROOF THAT N. T. GREEK IS IN THE VERNACULAR **Κοινή**. The proof is now at hand. We have it in the numerous contemporary Greek inscriptions already published and in the ever-increasing volumes of papyri, many of which are also contemporary. As early, as 1887 a start had already been made in using the inscriptions to explain the N. T. by E. L. Hicks.[3] He was followed by W. M. Ramsay,[4] but it is Deissmann who has given us most of the proof that we now possess, and he has been ably seconded by J. Hope Moulton. Deissmann[5] indeed insists: "If we are ever in this matter to reach certainty at all, then it is the inscriptions and the papyri which will give us the nearest approximation to the truth." Hear Deissmann[6] more at length: "Until the papyri were discovered there were practically no other contemporary documents to illustrate that phase of the Greek language which comes before us in the LXX and N. T. In those writings, broadly, what we have, both as regards vocabulary and morphology, and not seldom as regards syntax as well, is the Greek of ordinary intercourse as spoken in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, not the artifilcial Greek of the rhetoricians and litterateurs, strictly bound as it was by technical rules. This language of ordinary life, this cosmopolitan Greek, shows unmistakable traces of a process of development that was still going on, and in many respects differs from the older dialects as from the classical

[1] Thayer, Hast. D.. BL, art. Lang. of the N. T., III, p. 366.

[2] Die griech. Spr. (Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8), p. 309.

[3] Cl. Rev., 1887.

[4] Exp. Times, vol. X, pp. 9 ff.

[5] B. S., p. 81. Deissmann calls attention also to a booklet by Walch, Observ. in Matthaeun graecis inscr., 1779. So in 1850, Robinson in the Pref. to his N. T. Lex. says: "It was, therefore, the spoken language of common life, and not that of books, with which they became acquainted"; cf. also the works of Schweizer, Nachmanson, Dittenberger, etc.

[6] Encyc. Bibl., art. Papyri. "At the time when the ancient Greek culture was in conflict with Christianity, the assailants pointed sarcastically at the boatman's idiom of the N. T., while the defenders, glorying in the taunt, made this very homeliness their boast. Latin apologists were the first to make the hopeless attempt to prove that the literary form of the Bible as a whole, and of the N. T. in particular, was artistically perfect." Deissmann, Exp. Times, Nov., 1906, p. 59; cf. also Norden, Kunstpr., II, pp. 512 f., 526 f.

Attic." As Moulton[1] puts it, "the Holy Ghost spoke absolutely in the language of the people."

The evidence that the N. T. Greek is in the vernacular **κοινή** is partly lexical and partly grammatical, though in the nature of the case chiefly lexical. The evidence is constantly growing. See Deissmann, *Bible Studies, Light from the Ancient East*; Moulton and Milligan's "Lexical Notes on the Papyri" (*The Expositor*, 1908). We give first some examples of words, previously supposed to be purely "biblical," now shown to be merely popular Greek because of their presence in the papyri or inscriptions: **ἀγάπη, ἀκατάγνωστος, ἀναζάω, ἀναστατόω, ἀντιλήμπτωρ, ἀλλογενής, ἀφιλάργυρος, αὐθεντέω,** βροχή, **ἔναντι, ἐνδιδύσκω, ἐνώπιον, ἐπικατάρατος, ἐπισυναγωγή, εὐάρεστος, εὐπροσωπέω, ἱερατεύω, ἱματίζω, καταπέτασμα, καταγγελεύς, κατήγωρ, καθαρίζω, κόκκινος, κυριακός,** λειτουργικός, λογεία, **νεόφυτος, ὀφειλή,** παραβολεύομαι, **περισσεία,** πληροφορέω, **προσκαρτέρησις, προσκυνητής, προσευχή, πρωτότοκος, σιτομέτριον, συναντιλαμβάνομαι, φιλοπρωτεύω, φρεναπάτης,** etc. For a lively discussion of these words see Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, pp. 198-247; *Light*, etc., pp. 69-107). The recovery of the inscription on the marble slab that warned the gentiles from the **ἱερόν** is very impressive. **Μηθένα ἀλλογονῆ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τρυφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου. ὃς δ' ἂν ληφθῇ ἑαυτῶι αἴτιος ἔστιν διὰ τὸ ἐξακολουθεῖν θάνατον**. The words above are no longer biblical ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. But this is not all. Many words which were thought to have a peculiar meaning in the LXX or the N. T. have been found in that very sense in the inscriptions or papyri, such as **ἀδελφός** in the sense of 'common brotherhood,' **ἀθέτησις, ἀμετανόητος, ἀμφότεροι**= πάντες, **ἀναστρέφομαι, ἀναφέρω, ἀντίλημψις, ἀπέχω, ἀπόκριμα, ἀποτάσσομαι, ἀρετή, ἀρκετός, Ἀσιάρχης, ἄσημος, ἀπάζομαι, ἄτοπος,** βαστάζω, **βεβαίωσις,** βιάζομαι, **βούλομαι, γένημα,** γογγύζω, **γραμματεύς,** γράφω, **δειπνέω, δέον ἐστί, διαβάλλω, διασείω, δίκαιος, διότι** = ὅτι, **διχοτομέω, δοκίμιος, δόκιμος, δῶμα, ἐάν** = ἄν, **εἰ μήν, εἶδος, εἰς, ἐκτένεια, ἐκτός, ἐκτινάσσω, ἐν, ἐνεδρεύω, ἔνοχος, ἐντυγχάνω, ἐπιβαλών ἐπίσκοπος, ἐρωτάω, εὐσχήμων, ἐπιούσιος, εὐχαριστέω, ἕως, ἡγοῦμαι, ἡλικία, ἡσυχία, θεμέλιον,** θεωρέω, **ἴδιος, ἱλαστήριον, ἵλεως, ἱστορέω,** καθαρίζω, **καθαρός, καινός, κακοπάθεια, κατά, κατάκριμα, καταντάω, κλίνη, κολάζομαι,** κολλάω, **κολαφίζω, κόπος, κοράσιν, κτάομαι, κύριος,** λικμάω, λίψ, **λούομαι, μενοῦνγε, μαρτυροῦμαι, μειζότερος, μικρός, μογιλάλος, μονή, ναῦς, νεκροί, νή, νομός, οἰκίας, ὁμολογέω, ὄνομα, ὀψώνιον,** παρά, **παράδεισος, παραθήκη, παρακύπτω, παρεισφέρω, παρεπίδημος, πάρεσις, πάροικος, παροξύνομαι, πατροπαράδοτος, περισπάω, περιτέμνω, πῆχυς, πλεονεκτέω, πλῆθος,** πληροφορέω, **πράγμα,**

[1] Prol., p. 5.

πράκτωρ, πρεσβύτερος, πρόθεσις, προσέχω, προσκαρτερέω, προφήτης, σαπρός, σκύλλω, σκόλοψ, σμαράγδινος, σουδάριον, σπεκουλάτωρ, στράσις, στρατεύομαι, σφραγίζω, σφυρίς, συγγενής, συμβούλιον, συνείδησις, συνέχω, συνευδοκέω, συνευωχέομαι, συνίστημι, σῶμα, σωτήρ, τήρησις, τόπος, υἱός, υἱὸς θεοῦ, υἱοθεσία, ὑποζύγιον, ὑποπόδιον, ὑπόστασις, φάσις, φέρω, φθάνω, φίλος, φιλοστοργία, φιλοτιμέομαι, χάραγμα, χάρις τῷ θεῷ χρεία, χρόνος, ψωμίον, ψυχὴν σῶσαι. This seems like a very long list, but it will do mere than pages of argument to convince the reader that the vocabulary of the N. T. is practically the same as that of the vernacular κοινή in the Roman Empire in the first century A.D.[1] This is not a complete list, for new words will be added from time to time, and all that are known are not here included. Besides neither Deissmann nor Moulton has put together such a single list of words, and Kenyon's in Hastings' *D. B*. (Papyri) is very incomplete. After compiling this list of words I turned to the list in the Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* by Thayer (art. "Language of the N. T.") where are found some thirty new words common to the N. T. and the vernacular κοινή, words not common in the classic Greek. Thayer's list is entirely different save a half-dozen In his list are comprised such interesting words as ἀλληγορέω, ἀντοφθαλμέω, ἀποκαραδοκία, δεισιδαιμονία, ἐγχρίω, ἐγγίζω, ἐπιχορηχέω, εὐδοκέω, εὐκαιρέω, θριαμβεύω, etc. This list can be largely increased also by the comparison between words that are common to the N. T. and the comic poets (Aristophanes, Menander, etc.) who used the language of the people. See Kennedy's lists in *Sources of N. T. Greek* (ch. VI). Many of these, as Kennedy shows, are theological terms, like αἰσθητήριον, ἀρραβών, βαπτίζω, εὐχαριστία, κυρία, μυστήριον, φιλαδελφία. The Christians found in common use in the Roman Empire terms like ἀδελφός, ἐπιφάνεια, ἐπιφανής, κύριος, λειτουργία, παρουσία, πρεσβύτερος, προγράφω, σωτήρ, σωτηρία, υἱὸς θεοῦ. They took these words with the new popular connotation and gave them " the deeper and more spiritual

[1] It is not meant, or course, that the bulk of the N. T. words are new as compared with the old Gk. Far from it. Of the 4829 words in the N. T. (not including proper names) 3933 belong to older classic language (literary and vernac.) while 996 are late or foreign words. See Jacquier, Hist. des Livres du N. T., tome l^{er}, 1006, p. 25. Thayer's Lex. claimed 767 N. T. words, but Thayer considered 89 as doubtful and 76 as late. Kennedy (Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 62) found about 550 "biblical" words. But now Deissmann admits only about 50, or one per cent. of the 5000 words in the N. T. (Light, etc., p. 72 f.). Findlay (Exp. Gk. T., 1 Cor., p. 748) gives 5594 Greek words in the N. T. (whole number), while Viteau (Syntaxe des Prop., p. xxx) gives 5420.

sense with which the N. T. writings have made us familiar" (Milligan, *Greek Papyri,* p. xxx). They could even find **τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐεργέτου καὶ** *σωτῆρος* (GH 15, ii/B.C.). Cf. Tit. 2:13; 2 Pet. 1:1.[1] The papyri often show us how we have misunderstood a word. So **ἀπογραφή** (Lu. 2:2) is not "taxing," but "enrolling" for the census (very common in the papyri). But this is not all, for the modern Greek vernacular will also augment the list of N. T. words known to belong to the oral speech. When this much is done, we are ready to admit the vernacular character of all the words not known to be otherwise. The N. T. Greek is like the **κοινή** also in using many compounded ("sesquipedalian") words like **ἀνεκδιήγητος, ἀνεξεραύνητος, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, ὑπερεντυγχάνω**, etc. There is also the same frequency of diminutives, some of which have lost that significance, as **πλοιάριον, ὠτάριον, ὠτίον**, etc. The new meanings to old words are well illustrated in the list from the papyri, to which may be added **ἀνλύω, ἐντροπή, ζωοποιέω, σχολή, χορτάζω**, etc.

As to the forms we need say less, but the evidence is to the same effect. The papyri show examples of **Ἀκύλα** (and **–ου**) for genitive, **δυῶν** and **δυσί**, **ἐγενάμην, ἔλαβα, ἔλεγας, ἔλειψα, ἦλθα, ἠνοίγην, ἠρπάγην, ἦξα, δέδωκες, οἶδες, ἔγραψες, τιθῶ, σπείρης**; the imperative has only the long forms **—τωσαν**, **—σθωσαν**, etc. The various dialects are represented in the forms retained in the N. T., as the Attic in **βούλει, διδόασι, ἤμελλε**, etc.; the Ionic in **μαχαιρης, γίνομαι, γινώσκω**, etc.; the Doric in **ἀφέωνται, ἤτω**, etc.; the AEolic in **ἀποκτέννω**, 3d plural in **—σαν**, etc.; the Northwest Greek in accusative plural in **—ες**, perfect in **—αν** (3d plural), confusion of **—αω** and **--εω** verbs, etc.; the Arcadian-Cyprian group in accusative singular in **—αν, ἀφέωνται** (also). It is curious that Thayer in Hastings' D. B., follows Winer's error in giving **ἐδίδοσαν** as an example of a form like **εἶχοσαν**, for the present stem is **δίδο–**, and **σαν** is merely the usual **μι** ending. See Mayser, *Gr. d. griech. Pap*., pp. 4-20.

Among the syntactical peculiarities of N. T. Greek which are less numerous, as in the **κοινή**, the following are worthy of note and are found in the **κοινή**: the non-final use of **ἵνα**; the frequent use of the personal pronoun; the decreased use of the possessive pronouns; disuse of the optative; increased use of **ὅτι**; disuse of the future participle; use of participle with **εἰμί**; article with the infinitive (especially with **ἐν** and **εἰς**); **ἄφες** and **βλέπε** with subjunctive without conjunction; the absence of the dual; use of **ὄφελον** as conjunction; frequency of **ἐάν**; **ὅταν**, etc., with indicative;

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 84; Wendland, Hell.-rom. Kult., p. 100.

interchange of ἐάν and ἄν; μή increasing upon οὐ; decreased use of indirect discourse; εἷς=τις; disuse of some interrogative particles; use of ἴδιος as possessive pronoun; παρά and ὑπέρ with comparatives; disappearance of the superlative; frequency of prepositions; vivid use of present tense (and perfect); laxer use of particles; growth of the passive over the middle, etc.

Various phrases are common both to the N. T. and to the papyri, like δεξιὰν δίδωμι, ἐν τοῖς = 'in house of,' ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, καθὼς γέγραπται, ἐκ συμφώνου, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, κατ᾽ ὄναρ, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, οὐχ ὁ τυχών, παρέχομαι ἐμαυτόν, τὸ αὐτό φρονεῖν. "There is placed before us in the N. T. neither a specific speech-form nor a barbaric Jewish-Greek, but a natural phase of the Hellenistic speech-development."[1] Deissmann (*Exp. Times,* 1906, p. 63) properly holds the N. T. to be the Book of Humanity because it "came from the unexhausted forces below, and not from the feeble, resigned culture of a worn-out upper class." Swete (*0. T. in Gk.*, pp. 295 ff.) shows how the LXX is influenced by the vernacular κοινή. As early as 1843 B. Hase (Wellhausen, *Einl.*, p. 14) explained the LXX as "Volkssprache." Thackeray (*Grammar*, pp. 22 ff.) gives a good summary of "the κοινή basis of LXX Greek."

II. Literary Elements in the New Testament Greek. It is true then, as Blass[2] sums it up, that "the language employed in the N. T. on the whole, such as was spoken in the lower circles of society, not such as was written in works of literature." The N. T. writers were not Atticists with the artificial straining after the antique Attic idiom. But one must not imagine that they were mere purveyors of slang and vulgarisms. Freudenthal[3] speaks of the Hellenistic Jews as "one of those societies without a mother-tongue which have never attained to any true excellence in literature." And even Mahaffy[4] speaks of the Greek learned by the Jews as "the new and artificial idiom of the trading classes" which had neither "traditions nor literature nor those precious associations which give depth and poetry to words." That is a curious mistake, for it was the Atticistic revival that was artificial. The κοινή had all the memories of a

[1] Thumb, Die sprachgesch. Stell. des bibl. Griech., Theol. Runds., 1902, p. 93. Cf. also Arnaud, Essai sur le caractere de la langue grecque du N. T., 1899. Viteau (Et. sur le Grec du N. T., 2 vols., 1893, 1896) insists on the distinction between the lit. and the vernac. elements in the N. T.

[2] Gr. of the N. T. Gk., p. 1.

[3] Hell. Stud., 1875.

[4] Gk. Life and Thought, 1896, p. 530.

people's life. Instance Robert Burns in Scotland. It is to be said for Mahaffy, however, that he changed his mind, for he later[1] wrote: "They write a dialect simple and rude in comparison with Attic Greek; they use forms which shock the purists who examine for Cambridge scholarships. But did any men ever tell a great story with more simplicity, with more directness, with more power? . . . Believe me against all the pedants of the world, the dialect that tells such a story is no poor language, but the outcome of a great and a fruitful education." The N. T. uses the language of the people, but with a dignity, restraint and pathos far beyond the trivial nonentities in much of the papyri remains. All the N. T. Greek is not so vernacular as parts of the LXX.[2] The papyri often show the literary **κοινή** and all grades of variation, while the lengthy and official inscriptions[3] "often approximate in style to the literary language." Long before many words are used in literature they belong to the diction of polite speech.[4] In a word, the N. T. Greek "occupies apparently an intermediate position between the vulgarisms of the populace and the studied style of the litterateurs of the period. It affords a striking illustration of the divine policy of putting honour on what man calls common.'"[5] It would indeed have been strange if men like Paul, Luke and the author of Hebrews had shown no literary affinities at all. Prof. J. C. Robertson (*The Classical Weekly*, March 9, 1912, 139) in an article entitled "Reasons for Teaching the Greek N. T. in Colleges" says: "Take the parable of the Prodigal Son, for instance. In literary excellence this piece of narrative is unsurpassed. Nothing more simple, more direct, more forceful can be adduced from among the famous passages of classical Greek literature. It is a moving tragedy of

[1] Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., 1905, p. 114 f. Cf. Schurer, Jew. Peo. in Time of Jes. Ch., div. II, vol. I, pp. 11 ff., Hellen. in the Non-Jew. Regions, Hellen. in the Jew. Regions. He shows how Gk. and Lat. words were common in the Aram. and how thoroughly Gk. the Jews of the Dispersion were. On this point see Schurer, Diaspora, in ext. vol. of Hast. D. B. "Greek was the mother-tongue of the Jews" all over the gentile world. Susemihl holds that in Alexandria the Jews gave "quite a considerable Hebraic tinge" to the **κοινή,** Gesch. der griech. Lit., Bd. II, 1892, p. 602. An excellent discussion of the literary elements in the Gk. N. T. is to be found in Heinrici's Der lit. Charakter der neutest. Schr. (1908). He shows also the differences between Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism.

[2] Cf. Geldart, Mod. Gk. in its Rela. to Anc. Gk., 1870, p. 180. Cf. also Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 65; Frankel, Altert. von Perg., 1890, p. xvii.

[3] Deissmann, B. S., p. 180. [4] Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 77.

[5] Thayer, art. Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B., III, 36[b].

reconciliation. Yet its literary excellence is not accidental. The elements of that excellence can be analyzed." In an age of unusual culture one would look for some touch with that culture. "I contend, therefore, that the peculiar modernness, the high intellectual standard of Christianity as we find it in the N. T., is caused by its contact with Greek culture."[1] In his helpful article on N. T. Times Buhl[2] underrates, as Schurer[3] does, the amount of Greek known in Palestine. It is to be remembered also that great diversity of culture existed among the writers of the N. T. Besides, the educated men used much the same vernacular all over the Roman world and a grade of speech that approached the literary standard as in English to-day.[4] One is not to stress Paul's language in 1 Cor. 2:1-4 into a denial that he could use the literary style. It is rather a rejection of the bombastic rhetoric that the Corinthians liked and the rhetorical art that was so common from Thucydides to Chrysostom.[5] It is with this comparison in mind that Origen (*c. Celsus*, vii, 59 f.) speaks of Paul's literary inferiority. It is largely a matter of standpoint. Deissmann[6] has done a good service in accenting the difference between letters and epistles. Personal letters not for the public eye are, of course, in the vernacular. Cicero's *Letters* are epistles written with an eye on posterity. "In letters one does not look for treatises, still less for treatises in rigid uniformity and proportion of parts."[7] There may be several kinds of letters (private, family, pastoral or congregational, etc.). But when a letter is published consciously as literature, like Horace's *Ars Poetica*, for instance, it becomes a literary letter or epistle. Epistles may be either genuine or unauthentic. The unauthentic may be either merely

[1] Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen., p. 139. [2] Ext. vol. of Hast. D. B.

[3] Jew. Peo. in Time of Jes. Ch., div. II, vol. I, p. 47 f. He admits a wide diffusion of a little knowledge of and easy use of Gk. among the educated classes in Palestine.

[4] Cf. Norden, Ant. Kunstpr., Bd. II, pp. 482 ff., for discussion of literary elements in N. T. Gk. Deissmann makes "a protest against overestimating the literary evidence" (Theol. Runds., 1902, pp. 66 ff.; Exp. Times, 1906, p. 9) and points out how Norden has missed it in contrasting Paul and that ancient world, merely the contrast between non-literary prose and artistic lit. prose.

[5] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 15.

[6] B. pp. 16 ff. However, one must not think that the N. T. Epistles always fall wholly in one or the other category. Ramsay calls attention to the "new category" in the new conditions, viz., a general letter to a congregation Let. to the Seven Chur., p. 24).

[7] Ib., p. 11. See also Walter Lock, The Epistles, pp. 114 ff., in The Bible and Chr. Life, 1905.

pseudonymous or real forgeries. If we examine the N. T. Letters or Epistles in the light of this distinction, we shall see that Philemon is a personal letter. The same is true of the Pastoral Epistles; but Ephesians is more like an epistle from its general nature. The Thessalonian, Corinthian, Galatian, Colossian, Philippian writings are all congregational and doctrinal letters. Romans partakes of the nature of a letter and an epistle. Jacquier, however (*Histoire des Livres du N. T.*, 1906, tome 1er, p. 66), remarks that "The Pauline Epistles are often more discourse than letter." It will thus be seen that I do not agree with Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 3 f.) in calling all the Pauline writings "letters" as opposed to "epistles." Milligan (*Greek Papyri*, p. xxxi) likewise protests against the sweeping statement of Deissmann. Deissmann gives a great variety of interesting letters from the papyri in his *Light from the Ancient East*, and argues here (pp. 224-234) with passion that even Romans is just "a long letter." "I have no hesitation in maintaining the thesis that all the letters of Paul are real, non-literary letters." Hebrews is more like an epistle, as are James, 1 John, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, Jude while 2 and 3 John are again letters. The Letters to the Seven Churches again are epistles. This is a useful distinction and shows that the N. T. writers knew how to use one of the favourite literary methods of the Alexandrian period. Dr. Lock concludes: "*Letters* have more of historic and literary interest, *epistles* more of central teaching and practical guidance."[1] That Paul could use the more literary style is apparent from the address on Mars Hill, the speech before Agrippa,[2] and Ephesians and Romans. Paul quotes Aratus, Menander and Epimenides and may have been acquainted with other Greek authors. He seems also to have understood Stoic philosophy. We cannot tell how extensive his literary training was. But he had a real Hellenic feeling and outlook. The introduction to Luke's Gospel and the Acts show real literary skill. The Epistle to the Hebrews has oratorical flow and power with traces of Alexandrian culture. Viteau[3] reminds

[1] Bible and Chr. Life, p. 117. For the history and literature of ancient letters and epistles see Deissmann, B. S.; Susemihl, Gesch. der griech. Lit.; Overbeck, Uber die Anf. der patrist. Lit. The oldest known Gk. letter was written on a lead tablet and belongs to the iv/B.C. and comes from near Athens. It was discovered by Prof. Wunsch of Giessen. See art. by Dr. Wilhelm of Athens in Jahresh. des osterreich. archaeol. Inst. (1904, vii, pp. 94 ff.).

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 5. [3] Le Verbe: Synt. des Prop., p. xxx.

us that about 3000 of the 5420 words in the Greek N. T. are found in ancient Attic writers, while the syntax in general "obeys the ordinary laws of Greek grammar."[1] These and other N. T. writers, as James, occasionally use classic forms like ἴσμεν, ἴστε, ἴασι, ἐξῆεσαν, etc. Konig[2] in his discussion of the Style of Scripture finds ample illustration in the N. T. of the various literary linguistic devices, though in varying degree. See "Figures of Speech" (ch. XXII). But the literary element in the N. T. is subordinate to the practical and is never artificial nor strained. We have the language of spirit and life. The difference between the old point of view and the new is well illustrated by Hort's remark (*Notes on Orthography*, p. 152 f.) when he speaks of "the popular Greek in which the N. T. is to a certain extent written." He conceives of it as literary κοινή with some popular elements. The new and the true view is that the N. T. is written in the popular κοινή with some literary elements, especially in Luke, Paul, Hebrews and James.

Josephus is interesting as a background to the N. T. He wrote his *War* in Aramaic and secured the help of Greek writers to translate it, but the *Antiquities* was composed in Greek, probably with the aid of similar collaborateurs) for parts of Books XVII-XIX copy the style of Thucydides and are really Atticistic.[3] It is interesting to take a portion of 1 Maccabees as we have it translated from the Hebrew original and compare it with the corresponding portion of Josephus. The Greek of 1 Macc. is, like the LXX, translation Greek and intensely Hebraistic, while Josephus smooths out all the Hebraistic wrinkles and shifts it into the rolling periods of Thucydides. The N. T. has slight affinities in vocabulary, besides Josephus, with Philo, Plutarch, Polybius, Strabo, Diodorus and a few other writers in the literary κοινή.[4]

Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 64) holds that Paul's "Greek never becomes literary." "It is never disciplined, say, by the canon of the Atticists, never tuned to the Asian rhythm:

[1] W.-M., p. 37. Kennedy indeed (Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 134) says that 80 per cent. of the N. T. words date from before 322 B.C.

[2] Hast. D. B., ext. vol.

[3] See Thackeray, art. Josephus in ext. vol. of Hast. D. B.; cf. also Schmidt, De Flavii. Jos. Eloc., 1893. Thumb (Die griech. Spr., p. 125) and Moulton (Prol., p. 233) accent the fact that Josephus has only one Hebraism, προστίθεσθαι with infinitive = הוֹסִיף לְ. Cf. also Raab, De Fl. Jos. Eloc. Quest., 1890.

[4] Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., pp. 50 ff. Hoole, The Class. Elem. in the N. T., 1888, gives an interesting list of Gk. and Rom. proper names that occur in the N. T.

it remains non-literary." But has not Deissmann given a too special sense to "literary"? If 1 Cor. 13 and 15, Ro. 8 and Eph. 3 do not rise to literary flavour and nobility of thought and expression, I confess my ignorance of what literature is. Harnack (*Das hohe Lied des Apostels Paulus von der Liebe und seine religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung*, 1911) speaks of the rhythm, the poetic form, the real oratory, the literary grace of 1 Cor. 13. The best literature is not artificial nor pedantic like the work of the Atticists and Asian stylists. That is a caricature of literature. We must not forget that Paul was a man of culture as well as a man of the people. Deissmann (*Light*, p. 64 f.) does admit the literary quality of Hebrews. This epistle is more ornate as Origen saw (Eus., *Eccl. Hist*., VI, xxv, 11).

III. The Semitic Influence. This is still the subject of keen controversy, though not in the same way that the Purists and the Hebraists debated it. Now the point is whether the N. T. Greek is wholly in the κοινή or whether there is an appreciable Semitic colouring in addition. There is something to be said on both sides of the question.

(a) THE TRADITION. See I, (a), for proof of the error of this position. It is certain that the idea of a special Hebraic Greek for the N. T. is gone. Schaff[1] said that the Greek spoken by the Grecian Jews "assumed a strongly Hebraizing character," and the N. T. Greek shared in this "sacred and Hebraizing character." According to Hatch[2] " the great majority of N. T. words . . . express in their biblical use the conceptions of a Semitic race." Viteau[3] calls it "Hebraizing Greek," while Simcox[4] speaks of "the half-Hebraized Greek of the N. T." Reuss[5] calls it "the Jewish-Greek idiom." Hadley[6] considered the "Hellenistic dialect, largely intermixed with Semitic idioms." Westcott[7] spoke of "the Hebraic style more or less pervading the whole N. T." But Westcott[8] admitted that "a philosophical view of the N. T. language as a whole is yet to be desired," as Hatch[9] lamented that the N. T. Greek "has not yet attracted the attention of any considerable scholar." That cannot now be said after the work of Blass, Deissmann, Moulton, Radermacher and others, and was an overstatement then. And yet the old view of "biblical Greek"

[1] Comp. to the Gk. Test., 1885, pp. 22, 25.
[2] Ess. in Bibl. Gk., p. 34.
[3] Synt. des Prop., p. xxxvi.
[4] Lang. of the N. T., p. 20.
[5] list. of the N. T., 1885, p. 36.
[6] Lang. of the N. T., Smith's B. D.
[7] Art. N. T., Smith's B. D.
[8] Ib.
[9] Ess. in Bibl. Gk., p. 1.

for both N. T. and LXX is still championed by Conybeare and Stock in their grammar of the Septuagint (*Selections from the Sept*., 1905,, p. 22 f.). They insist, against Deissmann, on the "linguistic unity" of the LXX and of the N. T. as opposed to the vernacular κοινή. They admit, of course, that the LXX is far more Hebraic than the N. T. This sturdy contention for the old view is interesting, to say the least. Wellhausen (*Einl. in die drei ersten Evangelien*) is rather disposed to accent the "Semiticisms" (Aramaisms) in the Synoptic Gospels in contrast with the Attic Greek. Nobody now, claims the N. T. Greek to be Attic in purity. "No one denies the existence of Semiticisms; opinions are only divided with reference to the relative proportion of these Semiticisms" (Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 65). The old view is dead beyond recall.

(b) THE VIEW OF DEISSMANN AND MOULTON. Over against the old conceptio stands out in sharp outline the view of Deissmann[1] who says: "The linguistic unity of the Greek Bible appears only against the background of classical, not of contemporary 'profane' Greek." Note the word "only." Once more[2]: "The few Hebraizing expressions in those parts of the N. T. which were in Greek from the first are but an *accidens* which does not essentially alter the fundamental character of its language." The portions of the Synoptic Gospels which were either in Aramaic or made use of Aramnic originals he considers on a par with the LXX. They use *translation* Greek. No one "ever really spoke as he may have translated the Logia-collection, blessed — and cramped — as he was by the timid consciousness of being permitted to convey the sacred words of the Son of God to the Greeks."[3] Thumb[4] accepts the view of Deissmann and admits "Hebraisms in a few cases" only and then principally the meaning of words. In 1879 Guillemard[5] disclaimed any idea of being able to give "an *exhaustive* exhibition of *all* the Hebraisms," but he "put forward only a *few specimens*"! Moulton[6] admits practically no Hebraisms nor Aramaisms outside of "translation Greek." "Between these two extremes the N. T. writers lie; and of them all

[1] B. S., 1901, p. 66. [2] Ib., p. 177.

[3] Ib., p. 76. "What would we give if we could recover but one papyrus book with a few leaves containing genuine Aramaic sayings of Jesus! For those few leaves we would, I think, part willingly with the theological output of a whole century" (Deissmann, Light, p. 57).

[4] Griech. Spr. etc., p. 121.

[5] Hebraisms iii the Gk. Test., Pref. [6] Prol., p. 10.

we may assert with some confidence that, where translation is not involved, we shall find hardly any Greek expression used which would sound strangely to speakers of the κοινή in Gentile lands." Once more[1]: "What we can assert with assurance is that the papyri have finally destroyed the figment of a N. T. Greek which in any material respect differed from that spoken by ordinary people in daily life." Moulton[2] realizes "the danger of going too far" in summing up thus the issue of the long strife over N. T. Hebraisms. According to Moulton (p. 18) the matter is complicated only in Luke, who, though a gentile, used Aramaic sources in the opening chapters of the Gospel and Acts.' This new and revolutionary view as to Semitisms is still challenged by Dalman[3] who finds many more Aramaisms in the Synoptic Gospels than Moulton is willing to admit. Deissmann indeed is not disposed in his later writings to be dogmatic on the subject. "The last word has not yet been said about the proportion of Semiticisms" (*Expositor*, Jan., 1908, p. 67). He is undoubtedly right in the idea that many so-called Semiticisms are really "international vulgarisms." Schurer, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1908, p. 555, criticizes Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, 1908, p. 35) for running the parallel too close between the N. T. and the unliterary scriptions. Both the Purists and the Hebraists were wrong. The old view cannot stand in the light of the papyri and in- papyri. It is truer of the LXX than of the N. T.

Many words and idioms heretofore claimed as Hebraisms are shown to be current in the vernacular κοινή. As specimens[4] one can mention ἐνώπιον (לִפְנֵי; according to Winer-Liinemann, p. 201, and "biblical" according to Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek,* p. 90) as found in the papyri; πρεσβύτερος in the official sense occurs in the papyri of Egypt in combinations like πρεσβύτεροι ἱερεῖς; ἐρωτάω= 'to beg' is in the papyri; εἷς in sense of πρῶτος also;

[1] Prol., p. 18.

[2] Ib., p. 18. He quotes approvingly Deissmann's remark that "Semitisms which are in common use belong mostly to the technical language of religion" and they do not alter the scientific description of the language. Moulton (Interp., July, 1906, p. 380) says: "Suffice it to say that, except so far as the N. T. writers are quoting baldly literal translations from the LXX, or making equally literal translations from the Aramaic in which the Lord and His disciples usually spoke, we have no reason whatever to say that the N. T. was composed in a Greek distinguishable from that spoken all over the Roman Empire."

[3] Wds. of Jes., 1902.

[4] See Deissmann (B. S. and Light) and Moulton (Prol.).

προσευχή can no longer be regarded as a word of Jewish formation for a Jewish place of prayer, since it appears in that sense in a Ptolemaic inscription in Lower Egypt in the III cent. B.C.; ὄνομα occurs also in the sense of "person"; expressions like υἱὸς θανάτου are found in the papyri; βλέπειν ἀπό occurs in a papyrus letter; εἰς ὄνομα is in inscriptions, ostraca, papyri; δύο δύο is matched in the papyri by τρία τρία (this idiom has been traced in Greek for 2500 years.); the instrumental use of ἐν as ἐν μαχαίρῃ is common; the use of ἐν τῷ and the infinitive so common in Luke appears in the papyri; and even εἰς ἀπάντησιν meets us in the papyri (Tebt. Pap. 43, II cent. B.c.). Certainly a full list of the words and phrases that can no longer be called Hebraisms would be very formidable. Besides, the list grows continually under the researches of Deissmann, Moulton, Mayser, Thumb, Kalker, Witkowski, Milligan and other scholars. The presumption is now clearly against a Hebraism. The balance of evidence has gone over to the other side. But after all one has the conviction that the joy of new discovery has to some extent blurred the vision of Deissmann and Moulton to the remaining Hebraisms which do not indeed make Hebraic Greek or a peculiar dialect. But enough remain to be noticeable and appreciable. Some of these may vanish, like the rest, before the new knowledge. The LXX, though "translation Greek," was translated into the vernacular of Alexandria, and one can but wonder if the LXX did not have some slight resultant influence upon the Alexandrian κοινή itself. The Jews were very numerous in Alexandria. "Moreover, it remains to be considered how far the quasi-Semitic colloquialisms of the papyri are themselves due to the influence of the large Greek-speaking Jewish population of the Delta" (Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 1906, p. cxx). Thackeray (*Gr. of the O. T. in Gk.*, vol. I, p. 20) Uses the small number of Coptic words in the Greek papyri against the notion of Hebrew influence on the κοινή in Egypt. However, Thackeray (p. 27) notes that the papyri so far discovered tell us little of the private life of the Jews of Egypt and of the Greek used by them specifically. The marshes of the Delta were not favourable for the preservation of the papyri. The κοινή received other foreign influences we know. The Jews of the Dispersion spoke the vernacular κοινή everywhere, but they read the LXX, "a written Semitic Greek which no one ever spoke, far less used for literary purposes, either before or after."[1] And yet

[1] Deissmann, B. S., p. 67. See also Angus, N. T. Philol., Harv. Theol. Rev., July, 1909, p. 453. The LXX, though translation Greek (see above),

the Hellenistic Jews all over the world could not read continually the LXX and not to some extent feel the influence of its peculiar style. No one to-day speaks the English of the King James Version, or ever did for that matter, for, though like Shakespeare, it is the pure Anglo-Saxon, yet, unlike Shakespeare, it reproduces to a remarkable extent the spirit and language of the Bible. As Luther's German Bible largely made the German language, so the King James Version has greatly affected modern English (both vernacular and literary). The situation is not the same, but there is enough of truth to justify the comparison. There are fewer details that preserve the Semitic character, but what does not disappear is the Hebrew cast of thought in a writer like John, for instance. No papyrus is as much a parallel to John's Gospel as the Book of Job, for instance. Westcott[1] has true insight when he says of N. T. Greek: "It combines the simple directness of Hebrew thought with the precision of Greek expression. In this way the subtle delicacy of Greek expression in some sense interprets Hebrew thought." What is true of John's Gospel is true also of James. The numerous quotations both from the LXX and the Hebrew in the N. T. put beyond controversy the constant use of the 0. T. in Greek on the part of the N. T. writers. Besides, with the possible exception of Luke and the author of Hebrews, they all knew and used Aramaic as well as Greek. The point is that the N. T. writers were open to Semitic influence. How great that was must be settled by the facts in the case, not by presumptions for or against. Dr. George Milligan (*Greek Papyri*, p. xxix f.) says: "In the matter of *language*, we have now abundant proof that the so-called 'peculiarities' of biblical Greek are due simply to the fact that the writers of the N. T. for the most part made use of the ordinary colloquial Greek, the **κοινή** of their day. This is not to say that we are to disregard altogether the influence of 'translation Greek,' and the consequent presence of undoubted Hebraisms, both in language and grammar. An overtendency to minimize these last is probably the most pertinent

is in the vern. **κοινή**, and thus the N. T. writers had a double point of contact with the **κοινή**. Cf. Wackernagel, Theol. Lit., 1908, p. 38; Milligan, Epis. to the Th., p. lv.

[1] Exp., 1887, p. 241. Thumb (Griech. Spr. etc., p. 132) denies any influence on the development of the Gk. But Thayer (Hast. D. B., Lang. of the N. T., III, 40[a]) is not surprised to find "idioms having a distinctly Hebraistic flavour even in native Greek circles." Cf. also Reuss, Hist. of the N. T., 1884, vol. I, p. 33.

criticism that can be directed against Dr. J. H. Moulton's *Prolegomena* do his *Grammar of N. T. Greek*." So Dr. Swete "deprecates the induction which, as it seems to him, is being somewhat hastily based upon them (the papyri), that the Greek of the N. T. has been but slightly influenced by the familiarity of the writers with Hebrew and Aramaic" (*Apocalypse of St. John*, p. cxx).

Von Soden[1] sums up the whole matter as follows: "It was unavoidable but that the primitive Christian writers often used compulsion with the Greek tongue and offended against its genius. They wished to bring to expression things which, up to that time, were foreign to the Greek spirit and only found expression in Semitic languages. And besides, it is only natural that the phraseology of the Greek translation of the 0. T., to which they were habituated from their youth, should unconsciously flow from their pens, and still more, that when their subject-matter brought them into close contact with the 0. T. or when they translated from the Aramaic dialect of Palestine, their Greek should receive a foreign tinge." This by no means makes a special N. T. dialect or even Jewish-Greek, but it admits a real, though slight, Semitic influence even where it is not "translation Greek." This position is more nearly in accord with all the facts as we now know them. It is pleasing to find Deissmann (*Expositor*, Oct., 1907, "Philology of the Greek Bible," p. 292) rather reacting a bit from the first extreme position. He accents here strongly the influence of the LXX on the N. T. "It is one of the most painful deficiencies of biblical study at the present day that the reading of the LXX has been pushed into the background, while its exegesis has been scarcely even begun." (*Ib*., p. 293) : "A single hour lovingly devoted to the text of the Septuagint will further our exegetical knowledge of the Pauline Epistles more than a whole day spent over a commentary." (*Ib*., p. 294): "This restoration of the Greek Bible to its own epoch is really the distinctive feature of the work of modern scholarship." That hits the point. We cordially agree with his remark (*Expositor,* Nov., 1907, p. 435) that the Semiticisms of the Greek Bible do not place the N. T. outside of the scope of Greek philology, but are merely its birth-marks. In the Dec. (1907) Expositor (p. 520) Deissmann comments feelingly on the fact that the LXX "has served the Christian Church of Anatolia in unbroken continuity down to the present day."

[1] Early Chr. Lit., 1906, p. 11 f.

(C) LITTLE DIRECT HEBREW INFLUENCE. The Hebrew was not a living language any longer. Less than half of the 0. T. quotations[1] in the N. T. are from the Hebrew text. It was still read in most of the synagogues of Palestine and it is possible that a modernized Hebrew was in use to some extent for literary purposes.[2] Perhaps the Hebrew text was consulted by the N. T. writers who used it much as a modern minister refers to his Greek Testament. The reading of the Hebrew 0. T. would give one dignity of style and simplicity of expression. The co-ordination of clauses so common in the Hebrew is not confined to the Hebrew, but is certainly in marked contrast with the highly developed system of subordinate sentences of the Greek. But this paratactic construction is partly Hebraic and partly colloquial. The total absence of extended indirect discourse is a case in point also. Compare the historical books of the N. T. with Xenophon and Thucydides. Likewise the frequent use of καί and the sparing use of particles may be mentioned. The pleonastic use of pronouns like ἣν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι αὐτήν (Rev. 3:8) finds an occasional parallel (Moulton) in the papyri, but none the less its frequency in the N. T. is due to the Hebrew. The same remark applies to the effort to express in Greek the Hebrew infinitive absolute by the participle, as βλέποντες βλέψετε (Mt. 13:14), or the instrumental, as χαρᾷ χαίρει (Jo. 3:29). Both of these constructions are found in the Greek, but with far less frequency. The use of προστίθημι with an infinitive for repetition, as προσέθετο τρίτον πέμψαι. (Lu. 20:12) is in evident imitation of the Hebrew Εἰ= אִם does not mean οὐ as in εἰ δοθήσεται σημεῖον (Mk. 8:12), but is aposiopesis, the apodosis not being expressed. This use is in the papyri. Οὐ-πᾶς in the sense of οὐδείς is due to the LXX translation of לֹא־כֹל though Moulton (p. 246) has found in the papyri ἄνευ and χωρίς so used with πᾶς.

The use of ῥῆμα, in the sense of דָּבָר 'thing' is a Hebraism after the LXX. The classic Greek already has λόγος in this sense. Πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, פָּנִים נָשָׂא is a clear Hebraism. Προσωπολημπτέω first appears in the N. T. So also is ἀρέσκειν ἐνώπιού τινος rather than ἀρέσκειν τινί a Hebraism. Cf. the circumlocutions πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ (Acts 13:24) rather than the simple πρὸ αὐτοῦ. The frequent use of the article in address, though occasional in Greek,

[1] Swete, Intr. to the 0. T. in Gk., 1900, pp. 381-405.

[2] Schurer, Jew. Peo. in Times of Ch., div. II, vol. I, p. 10. "Hebrew also continued to be the language of the learned, in which even the legal discussions of the scribes were carried on."

is like the Hebrew and Aramaic vocative. The common use of ἦν or ἐστί and the participle suits both the Hebrew and the analytic tendency of the κοινή. Cf. the more frequent use of the instrumental ἐν the frequent construction εἶναι εἰς is due to ל in Hebrew, though in itself not out of harmony with the Greek genius. It occurs in the papyri. Ἀπὸ προσώπου=מִפְּנֵי and πρὸ προσώπου=לִפְנֵי are both Hebraisms. The use of διδόναι in the sense of τιθέναι, is due to נָתַן having both senses (Thackeray, *Gr. of the 0. T. in Gk*., p. 39); cf. Deut. 28:1, δώσει σε ὑπεράνω. So ἡμέραι takes the flavour of the Hebrew יָמִים, and εἰρήνη is used in salutation like שָׁלוֹם. The superfluous pronoun calls for notice also. The frequency of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive is due to בְּ. So also υἱός occurs in some Hebraistic senses like בֶּן, but the papyri have some examples of υἱός for 'quality,' 'characteristic.' Thackeray (p. 42) notes the Hebrew fondness for "physiognomical expressions" like ὀφθαλμός, πρόσωπον, στόμα, χείρ, πούς, etc. The increased use of ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος like אִישׁ rather than τὶς, πᾶς, ἕκαστος must be observed. The very extensive use of prepositions is accented by the Hebrew. Καὶ ἐγένετο translates וַיְהִי. The use of a question to express wish is like the Hebrew idiom (cf. 2 Kgs. 18:33). But these constructions are doubtless due to the LXX rather than to Hebrew itself. It is not possible to give in clear outline the influence of the Hebrew Bible on the N. T. apart from the LXX and the Aramaic, though there was a little of just that kind. Kennedy[1] gives thirteen words common to the LXX and the N. T. (Thackeray, *Gr*., pp. 31 ff., gives a list of "Hebraisms in Vocabulary") and counts "twenty Hebrew and Aramaic words which do not occur in the LXX, e.g. ζιζάνιον, μαμωνᾶς, ῥακά, ὡσαννά." The words in the N. T. known to be Hebrew and not Aramaic are as follows: ἀβαδδών=אֲבַדּוֹן; ἀλληλουιά=הַלְלוּ־יָהּ; ἀμήν = אָמֵן; ἁρμαγεδδών=הַר מְגִדּוֹן; ἀρραβών=עֵרָבוֹן; βάτος=בַּת; βεελζεβούβ = בַּעַל זְבוּב; βοανηργές=בְּנֵי רֶגֶשׁ (cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 49); βύσσος=בּוּץ (cf. also βύσσινος); ἑβραϊστί from עִבְרִי; ἠλεί=אֵלִי (MSS. Mt. 27:46); κάμηλος= גָּמָל; ἰουδΐζω, ἰουδαϊσμός, ἰουδαϊκός, ἰουδαῖος=יְהוּדָה; κορβᾶν=קָרְבָּן; κύμινον=כְּמוֹן; λίβανος=לְבוֹנָה; μάννα = מָן; μωρέ= מֹרֶה; πάσχα= פֶּסַח (LXX, but same for Aramaic פַּדְהָא); ῥαββι(εί)=רַבִּי; σαβαώθ= צְבָאוֹת; σάββατον=שַׁבָּת; σατανᾶς=שָׂטָן; σάπφειρος=סַפִּיר; ὡσαννά=הוֹשַׁע נָא (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 222). Some Of these were already in classical Greek (βύσσος,

[1] Sour. of the N. T. Gk., p. 110 f. Cf. Gregory, Prol., etc., p. 102 f., for foreign words in the N. T.

λίβανος, σάπφειρος). Of doubtful origin are νάρδος, νίτρον (Jer. 2:22), συκάμινος. This is a fairly complete list of the Hebrew words in the N. T. The Aramaic words will be given later. There are to be added, however, the very numerous Hebrew proper names, only a few samples of which can be given, as Μαριάμ=מִרְיָם; Μελχισεκέκ=מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק; Σαούλ=שָׁאוּל; Σαμουήλ= שְׁמוּאֵל; κτλ. Deissmann is correct in saying ("Papyri," *Encyc. Bibl.*) that lexical Hebraisms "must be subjected to careful revision," but these remain.

Certain it is that the bulk of the examples of Hebraisms given by Guillemard vanish in the light of the papyri and inscriptions. He feared indeed that his book was "a return to old exploded methods." It is indeed "exploded" now, for the N. T. is not "unlike any other Greek, with one single exception, and absolutely unique in its peculiarities."[1] There are three ways of giving these Semitic words: mere transliteration and indeclinable, transliteration and declinable, Greek endings to Aramaic words.

(d) A DEEPER IMPRESS BY THE LXX. It is true that the N. T. at many points has affinities with the LXX, the "single exception" of Guillemard, but the LXX is not "the basis of the Christian Greek."[2] In his second volume Viteau began to see that he had been too extreme in his notion that the N. T. was Hebraized Greek: "The language of the N. T. is not derived from that of the LXX; it is its sister. It is the same familiar Greek language which one finds employed in the one or the other. But the Greek of the LXX has exercised a considerable influence upon that of the N. T."[3] But even in this volume Viteau overestimates the influence of the LXX on the N. T. Westcott[4] had the old idea that the N. T. language, "both as to its lexicography and as to its grammar, is based on the language of the LXX." It is undoubtedly true[5] that a very large proportion of the N. T.

[1] Hebr. in the N. T., 1879, p. ix f.

[2] Schaff, Comp. to the Gk. Test., p. 23.

[3] Sujet, Compl. et Attr., 1896, p. ii.

[4] Art. N. T., Smith's B. D. Helbing in his Gr. der LXX (1907) promises to investigate the Hebraisms in the second volume (p. iv). But he already sees that προστιθέναι occurs in the papyri as well as constructions like ἐξ ὧν ἐξ αὐτῶν. In general (p. vii) the LXX shows the same tendency as the rest of the κοινή towards uniformity (the disappearance of the opt., the superl., the 2d aorist, the middle, etc.). Cf. also Sel. from the LXX by C. S. (1905) with a brief Gr. of the LXX; Deissmann, Die Anf. der Sept.-Gr., Intern. Wochenschr., Sept. 26, 1908.

[5] Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 142 f. Cf. Brockelmann, Grundr. der vergl. Gr. der semit. Spr. (1907).

words are found in the LXX, but there are very few words that are found in the N. T. and the LXX and nowhere else.[1] Both the LXX and the N. T. use the current vocabulary. There are indeed numerous theological terms that have a new meaning in the LXX, and so in the N. T., like ἁγιάζειν, ἄφεσις, γέεννα, ἐκκλησία, κύριος, λόγος, λυτρόω, μονογενής, πνεῦμα, σωτηρία, χριστός, κτλ. (See longer list in Swete, *Introduction to 0. T. in Greek*, p. 454.) So also many N. T. phrases are found in the LXX, like εἰκὼν θεοῦ, ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας, πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον, ἡ διασπορά κτλ. (*ib*.). The 0. T. apocryphal books also are of interest on this point. We have a splendid treatment of the LXX Greek by Thackeray. He shows "the κοινή basis of LXX Greek," as to vocabulary, orthography, accidence and syntax (pp. 16-25). He notes σσ, τεσσεράκοντα, finds ν movable before consonants, ναός, νύκταν, πλήρης indeclinable, ἀσεβῆν, disappearance of μι-verbs, ἦλθοσαν, ἦλθα, ἀνέβαιναν, ἑώρακαν, ὃς ἐάν, οὐθείς, *nominativus pendens*, even in apposition with genitive (cf. Apocalypse), *constructio ad sensum*, λέγων and λέγοντες with construction like ἀπηγγέλη λέγοντες, recitative on, neuter plurals with plural verb, partial disappearance of the superlative and usually in elative sense, πρῶτος instead of πρότερος, ἑαυτούς, -ῶν, --οῖς, for all three persons, disappearance of the optative, great increase of τοῦ and the infinitive, co-ordination of sentences with καί, genitive absolute when noun in another case is present, blending of cases, increase of adverbial phrases and prepositions, εἰμί εἰς, interchange between ἐν and εἰς (increase of εἰς), etc. See also Psichari (*Revue des etudes juives*, 1908, pp. 173-208) for a discussion of the Semitic influence on the N. T. Greek. The use of εἰμί occurs occasionally in the papyri, the inscriptions and κοινή writers, but it is extremely common in the LXX because of the Hebrew ל. In the realm of syntax the LXX is far more Hebraistic than the N. T., for it is a translation by Jews who at many points slavishly follow the Hebrew either from ignorance of the Hebrew or the Greek, perhaps sometimes a little of both. B in Judges, Ruth, 2-4 Kings, has ἐγώ εἰμι with indicative, as ἐγώ εἰμι καθίσομαι (Judges 6: 18).[2] BA in Tobit 5:15 have ἔσομαι διδόναι. B in Eccl. 2:17 has ἐμίσησα σὺν τὴν ζωήν=אֶת־הַחַיִּים.

[1] The 150 words out of over (?) 4800 (not counting proper names) in the N. T. which Kennedy (Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 88) gives as "strictly peculiar to the LXX and N. T." cut a much smaller figure now. New pap. may remove many from the list that are still left.

[2] Cf. Swete, Intr. to 0. T. in Gk., p. 308.

Swete[1] finds this misunderstanding of אֶת common, in A in Ecclesiastes and six times in 3 Kings. It is the characteristic of Aquila.[2] No such barbarisms as these occur in the N. T., though the "wearisome iteration of the oblique cases of personal pronouns answering to the Hebrew suffixes" finds illustration to some extent in the N. T. books, and the pleonastic use of the pronoun after the Greek relative is due to the fact that the Hebrew relative is indeclinable.[3] The N. T. does not have such a construction as ἤρξατο τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν (2 Chron. 3:1), though τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν with ἐγένετο (Ac. 10:25) is as awkward an imitation of the Hebrew infinitive construct. The LXX translators had great difficulty in rendering the Hebrew tenses into Greek and were often whimsical about it. It was indeed a difficult matter to put the two simple Hebrew timeless tenses into the complicated and highly developed Greek system, and "Vav conversive" added to the complexity of the problem. Conybeare and Stock, *Selections from the LXX*, p. 23, doubt if the LXX Greek always had a meaning to the translators, as in Num. 9:10; Deut. 33:10. The LXX Greek is indeed "abnormal Greek,"[4] but it can be understood. Schurer[5] is wrong when he calls it "quite a new language, swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it." It is indeed in places "barbarous Greek," but the people who spoke the vernacular κοινή could and did make it out. Many of the Hellenistic Jews knew no Hebrew or Aramaic but only the κοινή. The Greek proselyte, like the Ethiopian eunuch, could read it, if he did need a spiritual interpreter. Schurer,[6] who credits the Palestinian Jews with very little knowledge of the current Greek, considers "the ancient anonymous Greek translation of the Scriptures" to be "the foundation of all Judae-Hellenistic culture." He is indeed right in contrasting the hardness of Palestinian Pharisaism with the pliable Hellenistic Judaism on the soil of Hellenism.[7] But the Jews felt the Greek spirit (even if they could not handle easily *oratio obliqua*) not only in the Diaspora, but to a large extent in the cities of Palestine, especially along the coast, in Galilee and in the Decapolis.

[1] Intr. to 0. T. in Gk., p. 308.

[2] Use should be made of the transl..of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus, though they are of much less importance. Cf. Swete, p. 457 f.

[3] Swete, ib., p. 307.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 13.

[5] Hist. of Jew. Peo. in Time of Ch., div. II, vol. III, p. 163.

[6] Ib., vol. I, p. 47 f., and div. II, vol. III, p. 159.

[7] Ib., p. 157.

On the spread of Greek in Palestine see Milligan, N. T. Documents, pp. 39 ff. The prohibition,[1] about the time of the siege of Jerusalem, against a Jew teaching his son Greek, shows that it had previously been done. The quotations in the N. T. from the 0. T. show the use of the LXX more frequently than the Hebrew, sometimes the text quoted in the Synoptics is more like that of A than B, sometimes more like Theodotion than the LXX.[2] In the Synoptic Gospels the quotations, with the exception of five in Matthew which are more like the Hebrew, closely follow the LXX. In John the LXX is either quoted or a free rendering of the Hebrew is made. The Acts quotes from the LXX exclusively. The Catholic Epistles use the LXX. The Epistle to the Hebrews "is in great part a catena, of quotations from the LXX."[3] In Paul's Epistles more than half of the direct quotations follow the LXX. Here also the text of A is followed more often than the text of B. Swete[4] even thinks that the literary form of the N. T. would have been very different but for the LXX. The Apocalypse indeed does not formally quote the 0. T., but it is a mass of allusions to the LXX text. It is not certain[5] that the LXX was used in the synagogues of Galilee and Judea, but it is clear that Peter, James, Matthew and Mark, Jewish writers, quote it, and that they represent Jesus as using it. In the Hellenistic synagogues of Jerusalem it would certainly be read. It would greatly facilitate a just conclusion on the general relation of the N. T. Greek to the LXX Greek if we had a complete grammar and a dictionary of the LXX, though we are grateful for the luminous chapter of Swete on the Greek of the Septuagint in his *Introduction to the 0. T. in Greek*; to Kennedy for his *Sources of N. T. Greek*; to Hatch for his Essays in *Biblical Greek*; to Deissmann for his *Bible Studies* and his *Philology of the Greek Bible* (1908); to Helbing for his very useful *Grammatik*, and especially to Thack-

[1] Megilla, I, 8. Cf. Hamburger, Realencyc., art. Griechentum; R. Meister, Prol. zu einer Gr. der Sept., (Wiener Stud., xxix, 27).

[2] Swete, Intr. to 0. T. in Gk., p. 395. Cf. Deissmann in Exp. Times, Mar., 1906, p. 254, who points out that Pap. Heid. (cf. Deissmann, Die Sept. Pap., 1905) "assimilates such passages as are cited in the N. T., or are capable of a Christian meaning, as far as possible, to their form in the N. T. text, or to the sphere of Christian thought." Heinrici shows the same thing to be true of Die Leip. Pap. frag. der Psalmen, 1903.

[3] Swete, Intr., etc., p. 402. All these facts about LXX quotations come from Swete.

[4] Ib., p. 404. See ib., p. 404 f., for bibliography on N. T. quotations.

[5] Ib., pp. 29 ff.

eray for vol. I of his *Grammar*. It is now possible to make intelligent and, to a degree, adequate use of the LXX in the study of N. T. Greek. The completion of Helbing's *Syntax* and of Thackeray's *Syntax* will further enrich N. T. students. The Oxford *Concordance* of Hatch and Redpath and the larger Cambridge *Septuagint* are of great value. Swete[1] laments that the N. T. grammars have only "incidental references to the linguistic characteristics of the Alexandrian version."

The translation was not done all at once, and not by men of Jerusalem, but by Jews of Alexandria who knew "the *patois* of the Alexandrian streets and markets."[2] One doubts, however, if these translators spoke this mixture of Egyptian κοινή and Hebrew. On this point Swete[3] differs from most scholars and insists that " the translators write Greek largely as they doubtless spoke it." They could not shake off the Hebrew spell in translation. In free Greek like most of the N. T. the Semitic influence is far less. Mahaffy was quick to see the likeness between the papyri and the LXX.[4] But one must not assume that a N. T. word necessarily has the same sense that it has either in the LXX or the κοινή. The N. T. has ideas of its own, a point to be considered later. We agree with Swete[5] that the LXX is "indispensable to the study of the N. T." Nestle[6] justly remarks that the Greek of the LXX enjoys now a much more favourable judgment from philologists than some twenty years ago. Conybeare and Stock (*Sel. from the LXX*, p. 22) observe that, while the vocabulary of the LXX is that of the market-place of Alexandria, the syntax is much more under the influence of the Hebrew original. The LXX does, of course, contain a few books like 4 Maccabees, written in Greek originally and in the Greek spirit, like Philo's works. Philo represents the Atticistic revival in Alexandria that was a real factor with a few. But the "genitivus hebraicus," like ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, is paralleled in the papyri and the inscriptions, though not so often as in the LXX. Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Greek*, p. 19. So also .(p. 21) τοῖς ἐξ ἐριθείας (Ro. 2:8) is like ἐκ πλήρους in the papyri and already in the tragic poets. Thumb[7] properly takes the side of Deissmann against Viteau's exaggerated

[1] Intr., p. 289.
[2] BD., p. 9.
[3] Ib., p. 299.
[4] Exp. Times, iii, p. 291.
[5] Intr. to 0. T. in Gk., p. 450 f. Hitzig, of Heidelberg, used to open his lectures on 0. T. by asking: "Gentlemen, have you a LXX? If not, sell whatever you have and buy a LXX." Nestle, LXX, in Hast. D. B., p. 438.
[6] LXX, Hast. D. B., p. 451.
[7] Griech. Spr. etc., pp. 128-132.

idea of LXX influence (following Hatch). It is not always easy to decide what is due to the use of the LXX and what to the development of the κοινή vernacular. One must have an open mind to light from either direction. Deissmann[1] is clearly right in calling for a scientific investigation of the Hebraisms of the LXX. Even the LXX and N. T. use of ἀρετή (Is. 42:8, 12; 1 Pet. 2: 9; 2 Pet. 1:3) is paralleled by an inscription in Caria.[2] We are not then to think of the Jews or the Christians as ever using in, speech or literature the peculiar Greek used in the translation of the Hebrew 0. T., which in itself varied much in this respect in different parts. The same intense Hebraistic cast appears in the 0. T. apocryphal books which were originally in Hebrew and then translated, as Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, 1 Maccabees, etc. Contrast with these the Greek of the Wisdom of Solomon, 2 Maccabees and the Prologue to the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus, and the difference is at once manifest.[3] The Wisdom of Solomon is of special interest, for the author, who wrote in Greek and revealed knowledge of Greek culture, art, science and philosophy, was yet familiar with the LXX and imitated some of its Hebraisms, being a Jew himself. Cf. Siegfried, "Book of Wisdom," Hastings' D. B. It must never be forgotten that by far the greatest contribution of Alexandrian prose to the great literature of the world is this very translation of the 0. T."[4] The name Christ (**Χριστός**) is found in the LXX "and so the very terms Christian and Christianity arose out of the language employed by the Alexandrian interpreters."[5] The only Bible known to most of the Jews in the world in the first Christian century was the LXX. The first complete Bible was the Greek Bible. The LXX was the "first Apostle to the Gentiles" and was freely used for many centuries by the Christians. Conybeare and Stock (*Sel. from the LXX*, p. 24) go so far as to say that the N. T. itself would not have been but for the LXX. Certainly it would not

[1] Hell.-Griech., Hauck's Realencyc., p. 638.

[2] Deissmann, B. S., pp. 95 f., 360 ff. Cf. Gautzschius, Spec. Exercit. Gr., 1778, p. 23. H. Anz, Subs. ad cognos. Graec. Serm. etc., 1894, p. 385, points out that poetic words are in the LXX also through the common speech. Cf. Lipsius, Gr. Unters. Uber die bibl. Grac., 1863, p. vii.

[3] Deissmann, B. S., p. 76 f. He rightly calls attention to the fact that many of the Ptolemaic pap. are contemporary with the LXX and bristle with proof that the LXX on the whole is in the vernac. κοινή of Egypt The Hebraisms came from the Hebrew itself in the act of translating.

[4] Mahaffy, Prog. of Hellen. in Alex. Emp., p. 80.

[5] Churton, Intl. of the LXX Vers., 1861, p. 1.

have been what it is. "The Bible whose God is Yahweh is the Bible of one people, the Bible whose God is **Κύριος** is the Bible of the world" (Deissmann, *Die Hellen. des Semit. Mon.*, p. 174).

Thackeray (*Grammar of the 0. T. in Greek*, pp. 25-55) gives a careful survey of the "Semitic Element in the LXX Greek." He admits that the papyri have greatly reduced the number of the Hebraisms heretofore noted in the LXX. He denies, however (p. 27), that the Greek of the LXX gives "a true picture of the language of ordinary intercourse between Jewish residents in the country." He denies also any influence of the Hebrew on the vernacular Greek of the Jews in Alexandria outside of the vocabulary of special Jewish words like ἀκροβυστία. He thinks (p. 28) the Book of Tobit the best representative of the vernacular Greek of the Jews. There are more transliterations like γειώρας for Aramaic גִּיּוֹרָא (Heb. גֵּר) in the later books where the early books had πάροικος or προσήλυτος. The fact of a translation argues for a fading of the Hebrew from the thought of the people. In the early books the translation is better done and "the Hebraic character of these books consists in the *accumulation* of a number of just tolerable Greek phrases, which nearly correspond to what is normal and idiomatic in Hebrew" (p. 29). But in the later books the Hebraisms are more numerous and more marked, due to "a growing reverence for the letter of the Hebrew" (p. 30). We cannot follow in detail Thackeray's helpful sketch of the transliterations from the Hebrew, the Hellenized Semitic words, the use of words of like sound, Hebrew senses in Greek words like δίδωμι= τίθημι after נָתַן, **υἱὸς ἀδικίας, ὀφθαλμός, πρόσωπον, στόμα,** χείρ, the pleonastic pronoun, extensive use of prepositions, **καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν** accompaniment or instrument, etc.

(e) ARAMAISMS. N. T. grammars have usually blended the Aramaic with the Hebrew influence. Schmiedel[1] complains that the Aramaisms have received too little attention. But Dalman[2] retorts that Schmiedel himself did not do the matter justice, and still less did Blass. Moulton[3] recognizes the distinction as just and shows that Aramaisms are found chiefly in Mark and Matthew, but does not point out the exact character of the Aramaisms in question. We take it as proved that Jesus and the Apostles, like most of their Jewish contemporaries in Palestine who moved in public life, spoke both Aramaic and Greek and read Hebrew

[1] W.-Sch., Gr., § 2, 1 c. And Dalman (Words of Jesus, p. 18 f.) criticizes Schmiedel for not distinguishing Aramaisms from Hebraisms.

[2] Words of Jesus, p. 18. [3] Prol., p. 8.

(cf. Lu. 4 : 17). Even Schurer[1] admits that the educated classes used Greek without difficulty. There is no doubt about the Aramaic. Jerome says that all the Jews of his time knew the Hebrew 0. T. The LXX disproves that, but Hebrew was used in the schools and synagogues of Palestine and was clearly read by many. The discourses of Jesus do not give the impression that he grew up in absolute seclusion, though he undoubtedly used the Aramaic in conversation and public address on many occasions if not as a rule.[2] The Aramaic tongue is very old and its use as a diplomatic tongue (Is. 36:11) implies perhaps a previous Aramaic leadership.[3] There was a literary as well as a vernacular Aramaic. The Aramaic portions of Daniel, Ezra, the Targum of Onkelos are in the literary Aramaic.[4] Dalman[5] suggests that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in the Judean literary Aramaic rather than the Galilean vernacular, but the reason is not very apparent. Zahn[6] doubts the validity of Dalman's distinction between a Judean and a Galilean Aramaic, but Peter was recognized in Jerusalem by the Galilean pronunciation (Mt. 26: 73). The Galileans[7] had difficulty with the gutturals and ּ. This Aramaic is not to be confounded with the later Christian Aramaic or Syriac into which the N. T. was translated. The Aramaic spoken in Palestine was the West Aramaic,[8] not the East Aramaic (Babylonia). So keenly does Dalman[9] feel the difference between Hebraisms and Aramaisms that he avers that "the Jewish Aramaic current among the people was considerably freer from Hebrew influence than the Greek which the Synoptists write." Not many can go with him in that statement. But he is right in insisting on a real difference, though, as a matter of fact, no great point was made about it at the time. With Josephus ἡ πάτριος γλῶσσα was the Aramaic (B. J. pr. § 1; v. 6, § 3;

[1] Hist. of the Jew. Peo. in Time of Ch., div. II, vol. I., p. 48. On the Gk. of the Mishna see Fiebig, Zeitschr. fur neutest. Wiss., 190S, 4. Heft.

[2] Dalman, Words of Jesus, pp. 9, 11; Ch. I, § IV, (i) 4, for full discussion.

[3] D. S. Margoliouth, Lang. of the 0. T., Hast. D. B.

[4] Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 80. [5] Ib., p. 81.

[5] Einl. in das N. T., I, 1897, p. 19.

[7] See Neubauer, Stud. Bibl., 1885, p. 51.

[8] Meyer, Jesu Mutterspr., 1896, p. 58 f. Some of the Lat. monks actually thought that Jesus spoke Lat. and that the N. T. was written in that tongue! But Meyer (ib., p. 63 f.) will not allow that Jesus knew Gk. Chase, on the other hand, shows that Peter necessarily spoke Gk. on the Day of Pentecost (Credibility of the Acts, 1902, p. 114).

[9] Words of Jesus, p. 42.

v. 9, § 2). He wrote his *War* originally in the native tongue for τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις. John (5:2; 19:13, 17, 20; Rev. 9:11; 16:16) uses Ἑβραϊστί in the sense of the Aramaic. So Luke has Ἑβραΐς διάλεκτος (Ac. 21:40; 22:2; 26:14). The people understood Paul's Greek, but they gave the more heed when he dropped into Aramaic. 4 Macc. (12:7; 16:15) likewise employs Ἑβραΐς φωνή. The two kinds of Jewish Christians are even called (Ac. 6:1) Ἑλληνισταί and Ἑβραῖοι, though Ἑλληνισταί and Συρισταί would have been a more exact distinction.[1] It is beyond controversy that the gospel message was told largely in Aramaic, which to some extent withstood the influx of Greek as the vernacular did in Lycaonia[2] (Ac. 14:11). One cannot at this point discuss the Synoptic problem. It is not certain that Luke, probably a gentile, knew either Aramaic or Hebrew, though there is a real Semitic influence on part of the Gospel and Acts, due, Dalman[3] holds, to the LXX example and a possible Aramaic or Hebrew original for the opening chapters of the Gospel, already put into Greek. Mark was probably written in Rome; not Palestine. Hence the Aramaic original of Mark, Bousset argues, cannot be considered as proved.[4] He rightly insists, as against Wellhausen,[5] that the question is not between the classic Greek and Aramaic, but between the vernacular κοινή and Aramaic. But whatever is or is not true as to the original language of Mark and of Matthew, the gospel story was first told largely in Aramaic. The translation of the Aramaic expressions in Mark proves this beyond all doubt, as ταλειθά, κούμ by τό κοράσιον, ἔγειρε (Mk. 5:41). Dalman[6] indeed claims that every Semitism in the N. T. should first be looked upon as an Aramaism unless it is clear that the Aramaic cannot explain it. The Mishna (Neo-Hebraic) was not itself unaffected by the Greek, for the Mishna has numerous

[1] Dalman, Words of Jesus, p. 7. [2] Schwyzer, Weltspr. etc., p. 27.

[3] Words of Jesus, p. 38. Dalman doubts the Heb. document, but admits a "wealth of Hebraisms" in Lu. Vogel (Zur Charac. des Lu., p. 32 f.) argues for a "special source" for these opening chapters. Blass, Philol. of the Gosp., p. 195, denies that Luke knew Hebrew.

[4] Theol. Runds., Jan., 1906, pp. 2-4, 35 f.

[5] Einl. in die drei Evang., §§ 2-4.

[6] Words of Jesus, p. 19; cf. also Schaff, Comp. to the Gk. N. T., p. 28. In 1877 Dr. John A. Broadus said in lecture (Sum. of the Leading Peculiarities of N. T. Gk. Gr., Immer's Hermen., p. 378) that the N. T. Gk. had a "Hebrew and Aramaic tinge which arises partly from reading Hebrew and chiefly (so his own correction) from speaking Aramaic." If instead of Hebrew he had said LXX, or had added LXX to Hebrew, he would not have missed it far.

Greek words and phrases that were current in the Aramaic.[1] The Aramaisms of vocabulary that one can certainly admit in the N. T. are the following words: ἀββά= **אַבָּא**; **Ἀκελδαμάχ=חֲקַל דְּמָא**; all words beginning with βαρ= **בַּר** like **Βαρνάβας; βεεζεβούλ=בְּעִיל**, **זְבוּל**; **Βηθεσδά=בֵּית חִסְדָּא**; **Βηζαθά=בֵּית זַרְתָא**; **Γαββαθά= גַּבְּתָא**; **γέεννα=גֵּא הִנֹּם**; **Γολγοθά=גָּלְגָּלְתָּא**; **ἐλωΐ ἐλωΐ, λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί** (or probably Heb. **אֵלִי=ἠλεί**, and the rest Aramaic, Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 53 f.)= **אֱלָהִי אֱלָהִי לְמָא שְׁבַקְתַּנִי**; **ἐφφαθά= אִתְפַּתַּח**; **κορβανᾶς=קוּרְבָּנָא**; **μαμωνᾶς=מָאמוֹנָא**; **μαρανά, θά=תָּא מָרָנָא**[2]; **Μεσσίας=מְשִׁיחָא**; **πάσχα=פַּסְחָא**; **φαρισαῖοι=פְּרִישַׁיָּא**; **ῥαββο(ου)νί(εί)= רִבּוֹנִי**; **ῥακά=רֵיקָא**; **σάββατα=שַׁבְּתָא**; **σατανᾶς=סָטָנָא**; **σάτον=סָאתָא**; **σίκερα=שִׁכְרָא**; **ταλειθά, κούμ=טְלִיתָא קוּמִי**; names of persons like **Κηφᾶς=כֵּיפָא**; **Ταβειθά=טָבִיתָא**, etc.

Aramaisms of syntax are seen in the following. The expression **γεύεσθαι θανάτου** seems to be in imitation of the Aramaic. Wellhausen (*Einl. in die drei Evang*., pp. 31 ff.) suggests that **εἷς καθ' εἷς** (Mk. 14: 19) is a hybrid between the Aramaic **εἷς εἷς** (but this is, an old Greek idiom) and the vernacular (**κοινή**) **καθ' εἷς.** He suggests also that Aramaic meanings are found in such words as **σώζειν, ποινεῖν καρπόν, συμβούλιον ποινεῖν (διδόναι), εἰρήνη, εἰρήνην διδόναι, ὁδὸς θεοῦ, πλήρωμα,** etc. As already explained, apart from the question of a possible original Aramaic Mark and an original Aramaic Matthew and Aramaic sources for the early chapters of Luke and the first twelve chapters of Acts,[3] many of the discourses of Christ were undoubtedly in Aramaic. There was translation then from this Aramaic spoken (or written) gospel story into the vernacular **κοινή** as we now have it in large portions of the Synoptic Gospels and possibly part of Acts. The conjectural efforts to restore this Aramaic original of the words of Jesus are suggestive, but not always convincing. On the whole subject of Semitic words in the Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser, *Grammatik*, pp. 40-42. The list includes **ἀρ(ρ) αβών, βύσσος, κύμινον, λίβανος, συκάμινος, χιτών**. It is not a very long list indeed, but shows that the Orient did have some little influence on the Greek vocabulary. These words occur in older Greek writers.

[1] Schurer, Hist. of the Jew. Peo., etc., div. II, vol. I, pp. 29-50. Cf. mod. Yiddish.

[2] Cf. Bickel, Zeitschr. fur Cath. Theol., viii, 43. This would then mean, "Lord, come." Cf. Rev. 22:20. W. H. give it **μαρὰν ἀθά**.

[3] See Blass, Philol. of the Gosp., ch. XI; Dalman, Words of Jesus, pp. 17-78; Wellhausen, Einl. in die drei Evang. (Die aram. Grundl. der Evang., pp. 14-43).

(f) VARYING RESULTS. It is natural that different writers in the N. T. should diverge in the amount of Semitic influence manifest in their writings. They all used the vernacular κοινή which in itself may have had a very faint trace of Semitic influence. But of the nine authors of the N. T. six were probably Palestinian Jews.[1] Now these six writers (Mark, Matthew, James, Peter, Jude, John) are just the very ones who reveal the Semitic mould of thought. It is often merely the Hebrew and Aramaic spirit and background. In Mark the Aramaic influence appears; in Matthew[2] the LXX is quoted along with the Hebrew, and Aramaisms occur also; in James there is the stately dignity of an 0. T. prophet with Aramaic touches (cf. his address and letter in Ac. 15) but with many neat turns of Greek phrase and idiom; Peter's two letters present quite a problem and suggest at least an amanuensis in one case or a different one for each letter (cf. Biggs, *Int. and Crit. Comm*.); Jude is very brief, but is not distinctly Hebraic or Grecian; John in his Gospel is free from minor Semitisms beyond the frequent use of καί like ו, but the tone of the book is distinctly that of a noble Jew and the sum total of the impression from the book is Semitic, while the Apocalypse has minor Hebraisms and many grammatical idiosyncrasies to be discussed later, many of which remind one of the LXX. If the absence of the optative be taken as a test, even when compared with the vernacular κοινή, Matthew, James and John do not use it at all, while Mark has it only once and Jude twice. Peter indeed has it four times and Hebrews only once, but Luke uses the optative 28 times and Paul 31. The remaining three writers (Paul, Luke, author of Hebrews) were not Palestinian Jews. Paul was a Hellenistic Jew who knew his vernacular κοινή well and spoke Aramaic and read Hebrew. His Epistles are addressed. chiefly to gentile Christians and naturally show little Semitic flavour, for he did not have to translate his ideas from Aramaic into Greek. In some of his speeches, especially the one delivered in Aramaic, as reported by Luke in Ac. 22, a trace of the Semitic point of view is retained. In contrast with Ac. 22 note Paul's address on the Areopagus in 17. The author of Hebrews makes abundant use of the LXX but exhibits possible Alexandrian origin or training, and it is not clear that he knew either

[1] Swete, Intr. to the 0. T. in Gk., p. 381.

[2] Dalman (Wds. of Jes., p. 42) thinks that the Heb. of Mt. are due to the LXX.

Hebrew or Aramaic.[1] Luke presents something of a problem, for he seems to have had Aramaic sources in Lu. 1 and 2 (possibly also Ac. 1-12), while it is uncertain whether he was familiar with the Aramaic. There seems little evidence that he knew Hebrew. Blass[2] thinks that he may have read his Aramaic sources or had them translated for him. Curiously enough, though a gentile and capable of writing almost classic Attic (Lu. 1:1-4), yet Luke uses Semitisms not common elsewhere in the N. T. Dalman[3] shows that the genuine Hebraisms in Luke like λόγους in sense of things (9:28 but classical authority for this exists), διὰ στόματος (1:70) are due to the LXX, not the Hebrew. The use of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive occurs 34 times in Luke, 8 in Acts, twice in Mark, thrice in Matthew, 4 in Paul, 4 in Heb.[4] See ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν (Lu. 8 : 40). Blass calls this an Aramaism.[5] But it is not a peculiarity of the discourses of Jesus, as it is found there only in ἐν τῷ σπείρειν (common to all the Synoptics, Mk. 4:4; Mt. 13:4; Lu. 8:5), and in Lu. 10:35; 19:15. Hence the idiom is common[6] in Luke from some other cause. The construction occurs in "classical historians, in Polybius and in papyri,"[7] but is most common in the LXX, and the parallel is wanting in the spoken Aramaic. Luke also freely uses καὶ ἐγένετο (almost peculiar to him in the N. T.), which at once suggests וַיְהִי. He doubtless got this from the LXX.[8] He has three constructions, viz. καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε, καὶ ἐγένετο ἦλθε and καὶ ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν. The first two[9] are common in the LXX, while ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν is due to the Greek vernacular[10] as the papyri testify. The superfluous ἀφείς, ἤρξατο, etc., are Aramaisms, while εἰμί and the participle is Aramaic, like the Hebrew, and also in harmony with the analytic vernacular κοινή. Nestle[11]

[1] Biesenthal (Das Trostschreiben des Ap. Paulus an d. Heb., 1878) even thinks that the Ep. was written in Aram. or Heb.

[2] Philol. of the Gosp., p. 205.

[3] Wds. of Jes., p. 38 f. Cf. also Blass, Philol. of the Gosp., pp. 113 f., 118; Vogel, Zur Charac. des Lukas, p. 27. [4] Dalman, Wds. of Jes., p. 33.

[5] Evang. sec. Lucam, p. xxii. But ἐν τῷ with the inf. occurs with great frequency in the LXX, 555 times in the 0. T., Apoc. and N. T. (Votaw, Inf. in Bib. Gk., p. 20), chiefly in the LXX (455 times, only 55 in the N. T.). It occurs nearly as often in the LXX as all other prepositions with the infinitive together. [6] Dalman, Wds. of Jes., p. 34.

[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 14 (1st ed.). [8] W.-M., p. 760 note.

[9] Cf. Thackeray, ya Gr., pp. 50 ff. We have the type ἐγένετο ἦλθε 145 and ἐγένετο καὶ ἦλθε 269 times in the LXX, but ἐγένετο ἐλθεῖν only once (1 Kgs 11:43 B). [10] Moulton, Prol., p. 17.

[11] Zeitschr. fur neutest. Wiss., 1906, p. 279 f.

agrees with Blass (p. 131) in taking ὁμολογεῖν ἐν in Mt. 10:32-Lu. 12:8 as a Syrism. בְּ with הוֹדָה is not in the Hebrew, nor ὁμολ. ἐν in the LXX, but אוֹדִי is used with בְּ in the Jewish-Aramaic and Christian-Syriac. Nestle refers to ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι (Heb. 13:15) as a Hebraism, for in such a case the Hebrew used לְ. The LXX and the Aramaic explain all the Semitisms in Luke. Dalman[1] ventures to call the LXX Hebraisms in Luke "Septuagint-Graecisms" and thinks that the same thing is true of the other Synoptists. Certainly it is proper to investigate[2] the words of Jesus from the point of view of the peculiarities of style in each reporter of them. But, after all is said, the Semitisms in the N. T. Greek, while real and fairly numerous in bulk, cut a very small figure in comparison with the entire text. One can read whole pages in places with little suggestion of Semitic influence beyond the general impress of the Jewish genius and point of view.

IV. Latinisms and Other Foreign Words. Moulton[3] considers it "hardly worth while" to discuss Latin influence on the κοινή of the N. T. Blass[4] describes the Latin element as "clearly traceable." Swete[5] indeed alleges that the vulgar Greek of the Empire "freely adopted Latin words and some Latin phraseology." Thumb[6] thinks that they are "not noteworthy." In spite of the conservative character of the Greek language, it yet incorporated Latin civil and military terms with freedom. Inasmuch as Judea was a Roman province, some allusion to Roman customs and some use of Latin military and official terms was to be expected,[7] though certainly not to the extent of Romanizing or Latinizing the language. Cicero[8] himself described Latin as provincial in comparison with the Greek. Latin words are fairly common in the Mishna.[9] Latin names were early naturalized into the Greek vernacular and in the N. T. we find such Roman names as Aquila, Cornelius, Claudia, Clemens, Crescens, Crispus, Fortunatus, Julia, Junia, Justus, Linus, Lucius, Luke, Mark,

[1] Wds. of Jes., p. 41.
[2] Ib., p. 72.
[3] Prol., p. 20.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 4.
[5] Comm. on Mk., 1898, p. xliv.
[6] Griech. Spr. etc., p. 152.
[7] Hoole, Class. Element in the N. T., p. 4.
[8] Pro Archia 10. Cato lamented: ἀπολοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ πράγματα γραμμάτων Ἑλληνικῶν ἀναπλησθέντες (Plut., Cato Maj. 23. 3). Cf. Colin, Rome et la Grêce de 200 a 146 avant Jesus-Christ (1905).
[9] Schurer, Jew. Peo. in Time of Ch., div. II, vol. I, pp. 43 ff. Krauss (Griech. und Lehnw. im Tal., TI. I, p. xxi) says: "One speaks of the Language of the Romans with the greatest respect as the speech of the soldiers."

Niger, Paul, Priscilla, Publius, Pudens, Rufus, Sergius, Silvanus (Silas), Tertius, Titus among the Christians themselves (Jewish and gentile), while Agrippa, Augustus (translated Σεβαστός), Caesar, Claudius, Gallio, Felix, Festus, Julius, Nero (Text. Rec.), Pilate, Tertullus are typical Roman names. Note the Roman cities mentioned in Ac. 28, Caesarea and Tiberias in Palestine. More than forty Latin names of persons and places occur in the N. T. The other Latin words, thirty (or thirty-one), are military, judicial, monetary or domestic terms. They come into the N. T. through the vernacular κοινή, none of them appearing in the LXX and but two in Polybius. "Plutarch uses Latin words more frequently than Polybius, but for the most part not those employed in the N. T."[1] Jannaris[2] observes that "the Roman administration, notwithstanding its surrendering to Greek culture and education, did not fail to influence the Greek language." But in the N. T. only these Latin words are found: ἀσσάριον (as), δηνάριον (denarius), ἔχω= aestimo (ἔχε με παρῃτημένον, Lu. 14:18), εὐρακύλων, θριαμβεύειν, κεντυρίων (centurio), κῆνσος (census), κοδράντης (quadrans), κολωνία (colonia), κουστωδία (custodia), λεγιών (legio), λέντιον, (linteum), λιβερτῖνος (libertinus), λίτρα (libra), μάκελλον (macellum), μεμβράνα (membrana), μίλιον (mille), μόδιος (modius), ξέστης (sextarius), πραιτώριον (praetorium), σικάριος (sicaries), σιμικίνθιον (semicinctium), σουδάριον (sudarium), σπεκουλάτωρ (speculator), αἱ ταβέρναι (taberna), τίτλος (titlus), φελόνης (paenula), φόρον (forum), φραγέλλιον (flagellum), φραγελλόω (flagello), χάρτης (? charta), χῶρος (corus). This is at most (31) not a formidable list. A few Latin phrases occur like ἐργασίαν δοῦναι (operam dare), τὸ ἱκανὸν λαμβάνειν (satis accipere), τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν (satis facere), συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν (consilium capere). But Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 117 f.) notes the use of ἐργάσίαν δίδωμι, in an Oxyrhynchus papyrus letter of the vulgar type in 2d cent. B.C. and also in an inscription in Caria with a decree of the Senate. A lead tablet at Amorgus shows κρίνω τὸ δίκαιον (cf. Lu. 12:57). So συναίρω λόγον (Mt. 18:23 f.) occurs in two papyri letters of 2d cent. A.D. (Moulton, *The Expositor*, April, 1901, p. 274 f.). Thayer[3] calls attention also to σὺ ὄψῃ (Mt. 27:4) as

[1] Burton, Notes on N. T. Gr., 1904, p. 15.

[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 7.

[3] Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B. Cf. also C. Wessely, Die lat. Elem. in der Grac. der agyp. Papyrusurk., Wien. Stud., 24 (1902). On the whole subject see L. Lafoscade, Infl. du Lat. sur le Grec, pp. 83-158. **Τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν** is as old as Polybius (Moulton, Exp., Feb., 1903, p. 115).

being like *videris*. So also ὄψεσθε αὐτοί (Ac. 18:15). Grimm[1] considers λαμβάνειν in Jo. 5:34, 41 equal to *capto* ('to catch at'). The majority of these instances occur in Mark and Matthew, Mark using more Latinisms than any other N. T. writer. Too much, however, cannot be argued from this point.[2] There are besides such adjectives as **Ἡρῳδιανοί, Χριστιανοί, Φιλιππήσιοι**, which are made after the Latin model.

Blass[3] thinks that the syntax shows a greater Latin influence, but admits that it is difficult to tell the difference between native development in the Greek and a possible Latin bent. It is indeed difficult to speak with decision on this point. Ultimately Greek and Latin had great influence on each other, but at this stage the matter is at least too doubtful to appeal to with confidence.[4] Paul indeed may have spoken in Latin at Lystra, according to Prof. Ramsay.[5] Thayer[6] indeed gives a longer list of Latin syntactical influences on N. T. Greek, but not all of them are certain. The anticipatory position of ἀπό and πρό in expressions of time and place, as πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν (Jo. 12:1), is a possible Latinism, though only of the secondary sort, since the Doric and the Ionic use this construction occasionally and the κοινή frequently (cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 101). Cf. also μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας (Ac. 1:5).[7] The increased use of the subjunctive rather than the optative after a past tense of the indicative is a necessary result of the disappearance of the optative rather than a Latinism. The alleged blending of present perfect and aorist might

[1] Gk.-Eng. Lex. of the N. T.

[2] Swete, Comm. on Mk., p. xliii. Cf. Blass, Philol. of the Gosp., p. 211 f.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 4.

[4] Viereck, Sermo Graecus, 1888, pp. 60, 66. Thumb (Griech. Spr., p. 152) considers the matter inconclusive, as does Moulton (Prol., p. 21). For the later Latinisms see Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 13 f. See also W. Schulze, Graeca Lat., 1891; Schwyzer, Weltspr. des Altert., p. 20. Cf. Sophocles, Lex., pp. 25-30 for Latinisms in Gk.

[5] Exp., Sept., 1905, and March, 1906. "As his father, and possibly also his grandfather, had possessed the Roman citizenship, the use of Latin speech and names was an inheritance in the family" (Ramsay, Exp., Aug., 1906, p. 160). Cf. also Ramsay, Pauline and Othet Studies (1906, p. 65), where he says it is "certain" that he spoke the Latin language. So holds Alex. "Souter (Did Paul Speak Latin?, Exp., April, 1911). At Iconium "a certain affectation of speaking Latin was fashionable." Moulton also thinks that Paul preached in Lat. at Lystra, since the earliest inscriptions there are Lat. (Prol., p. 233).

[6] Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B.

[7] On this matter of time see Schulze, Graeca Lat., pp. 13 ff.

be a Latinism, but it is at least doubtful if that is found in the N. T. The use of ὅτι and ἵνα rather than the infinitive follows naturally as the infinitive vanishes, but it is parallel to the growing use of *ut* with *rogo*, etc. Ἀπό and the ablative after φυλάσσειν may be due to *cavere ab* or to the general analytic tendency to express the preposition with the case (cf. the Hebrew also). Other smaller details are the absence of ὦ with the vocative, σύν as equal to καί, ὅς=καὶ οὗτος (*qui = et hic*), γαμέω with dative = *nubere alicui*, infinitive alone with κελεύω. There is no evidence that the absence of the article in Latin had any influence on the vernacular κοινή, though Schmid[1] thinks he sees it in the irregular use of the article in AElian. It is interesting in this connection to note the development in the vernacular Latin as represented in the Old Latin and the Vulgate versions. Unusual cases are used with many verbs; prepositions are much more frequent; the indicative with final *ut* and in indirect questions; common use of *quia* and *quoniam* like *quod* with verb rather than the accusative and infinitive; *ille, ipse, hic*, is, more like the article, as the later Italian *il*, Spanish *el*, French *le*.[2]

Other foreign words had, of course, entered the κοινή or the earlier Greek, like βουνός (Cyrenaic and Sicilian); ῥέδη (Gallic or Celtic); ἐγγαρεύω (even AEschylus), γάζα, παράδεισος, σανδάλιον (Persian); χιτών (Oriental); κράβαττος (cf. Latin *grabatus*), παρεμβολή, ῥύμη (Macedonian); ἀρραβών, κιννάμωμον, κύμινον, μνᾶ (Phoenician); βαΐον, βίβλος, βύσσος, σίναπι, σινδών (Egyptian or Semitic?); ζιζάνιον (Arabic?). On the Egyptian words in the Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser, *Grammatik*, pp. 35-40; on the Persian words, *ib*., p. 42 f., including γάζα and παράδεισος. Σίναπι is of uncertain origin. But Greek was known in all parts of the Roman Empire except parts of North Africa and the extreme west of Europe. There were great libraries in Alexandria, Pergamum and elsewhere. Schools were numerous and excellent. But none the less the mass of the people were βάρβαροι to the real Greeks and inevitably brought laxities into the vernacular. Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., pp. 9 ff., who gives a good discussion of the Latinisms in κοινή writers.

[1] Atticismus etc., p. 64. Cf. Georgi, De Latinismis N. T., iii, Vita, 1733.

[2] On this whole subject see Ronsch, Itala und Vulgata. Das Sprachid. der urchristl. Itala und der Lath. Vulg. unter Berucks. der ram. Volksspr., 1875, p. 480 f. Cf. also The Holy Lat. Tongue, W. Barry, in Dublin Rev., April, 1906, and Our Lat. Bible, ib., July, 1906. "The common dialect, spoken with local differences in every part of Italy, in Gaul, Spain and Africa, saw its happy moment arrive when Christianity spread over those shores" (Dublin Rev., April, 1906, p. 293).

V. The Christian Addition. But was there a Christian addition if there was no separate biblical Greek, not to say a special Christian Greek? Winer[1] admitted "religious technical terms" in the Christian sense, but thought that "the subject scarcely lies within the limits of philological inquiry." Blass has nothing to say on the subject. But even Deissmann[2] insisted that "the language of the early Christians contained a series of religious terms peculiar to itself, some of which it formed for the first time," but he added that this enrichment did not extend to the "syntax." Once more hear Deissmann[3]: "Christianity, like any other new movement affecting civilization, must have produced an effect upon language by the formation of new ideas and the modification of old ones." Moulton[4] sounds a note of warning when he says that "it does not follow that we must promptly obliterate every grammatical distinction that proves to have been unfamiliar to the daily conversation of the first century Egyptian farmer . . . The N. T. must still be studied largely by light drawn from itself." Westcott[5] indeed thinks the subject calls for "the most careful handling" in order to avoid Jewish usage on the one hand and the later ecclesiastical ideas on the other. This is obviously true. Connect the discussion of the Semitic influence on the N. T. with this point and recall the revolutionary effect that Christianity had upon the Greek language in the ecclesiastical Greek of the Byzantine period, and the difficulty will be appreciated. Mahaffy[6] does not hesitate to say that the main cause of the persistence of Greek studies to-day is due to the fact that the Gospels are written in Greek. "Greek conquered Jew and Jew conquered Greek and the world inherited the legacy of their struggle through Roman hands." Under the influence of Christianity some of the old heathen vocabulary vanished and the remaining stock "was now considerably reduced and modified in a Christian and modern spirit."[7] The

[1] W.-M., p. 36.

[2] B. S., p. 65 (note).

[3] Encyc. Bib., art. Papyri, p. 3562.

[4] Prol., p. 20. Cf. Thumb, Griech. Spr., p. 182 f.

[5] Smith's D. B., art. N. T.

[6] The Gk. World under Rom. Sway, 1890, p. 389 f. Butcher, Harv. Lect. on Gk. Subj., 1894, p. 2 f., calls the power of Jew and Gk. on modern life one of "the mysterious forces of the spirit." "Each entered on a career of world-wide empire, till at length the principles of Hellenism became those of civilization itself, and the religion of Judea that of civilized humanity."

[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 10 f.

N. T. Greek became the standard for ecclesiastical Greek as the Attic had been for the ancient world.

Winer[1] indeed curtly says: "To attempt to explain such expressions of the apostolical terminology by quotations from Greek authors is highly absurd." Rutherford[2] almost despairs of understanding N. T. Greek as well as "classical Greek," since it contains so many alien elements, "but it has at least begun to be studied from the proper point of view," though he overestimates the difficulty and the difference when he speaks of "the singular speech in which the oracles of God are enshrined." On the other hand[3] we must not let the papyri make us swing so far away from the old "biblical" Greek idea as to imagine that we can find in the vernacular κοινή all that Christianity has to offer. The Christian spirit put a new flavour into this vernacular κοινή and lifted it to a new elevation of thought and dignity of style that unify and glorify the language. This new and victorious spirit, which seized the best in Jew and Greek, knew how to use the Greek language with freedom and power.[4] If the beauty of the N. T. writings is different from the ancient standard, there is none the less undoubted charm. Matthew Arnold put the Gospels at the acme of simplicity and winsomeness, and Renan spoke of Luke's Gospel as the most beautiful book in the world. Norden[5] admits that the N. T. style is less exclusive and more universal. There was indeed a compromise between the old and the new. The victory of the new brought rhythm (not the technical sort) and unity as the chief characteristics.[6] In Christianity Hellenism becomes really cosmopolitan.[7] If Christianity had merely used the Greek language and had been entirely alien to Hellenism, the

[1] W.-M., p. 36, n. 3. [2] Epis. to the Rom., p. x f.

[3] Cf. Zerschwitz, Profangriic. and bibl. Sprachg., 1859, p. 4, where he speaks of "dieses neue geistige Princip an der Sprache." Deissmann (Die sprachl. Erforsch. der griech. Bibel, p. 8) accents the difference between the Christian ideas and the Gneco-Rom. heathen words that express them.

[4] Ib., p. 12. Norden (Die griech. Kunstpr., Bd. II, pp. 453 ff.) indeed thinks that the N. T. wants the "freedom" (*Freiheit*) and "serenity" (*Heiterkeit*) of the ancient literature. This is true in part of Paul's writing, where passion rages fiercely, and in Rev. and other apocalyptic passages. But what can excel Lu. and Jo. in lucidity and beauty? " *Heiterkeit* — blitheness or repose, and *Allgemeinheit* — generality or breadth, are the supreme characteristics of the Hellenic ideal." Walter Pater, The Renaissance, 1904, p. 225.

[5] Die griech. Kunstpr., Bd. II, p. 456.

[6] Ib., Bd. I, p. 290. [7] Ib., Bd. II, p. 463.

N. T. would not have belonged to Greek literature, but this sympathy with the best in the world must not be overworked.[1] The N. T. language is real Greek, though with the Christian spirit supreme in it because Christianity seized the Hellenic spirit and transformed it. W. Christ[2] rightly calls attention to the fact that Christianity brought "a renewal of the human race," "the moral worth of man and a purer view of God." So "this ethical new birth of mankind" found expression in the N. T. The touch of life is what distinguishes the N. T. writings from the philosophical, historical, religious and ethical writings of the time.[3] In the Synoptic Gospels this quality reaches its height. "Far above these details is the spirit, the literary conception of a life to be written without ornament, without reflection, without the writer's personality."[4] This fact constitutes a literary phenomenon amounting almost to a miracle. This vital spirit discloses itself on every page and baffles analysis. It is the essence of the N. T. language, but "is as pervasive as the atmosphere," "as intangible as a perfume."[5] If some concentration and strength are lost, there is great adaptability.[6] Thayer[7] does not hesitate to speak of the fitness of N. T. Greek for its providential office. It is the language of men's business and bosoms. It is the language of life, not of the study nor the cloister. It is not the language of a bygone age, but the speech of the men of the time. "The Book of the people has become, in the course of centuries, the Book of all mankind" (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 142). Christianity "began without any written book at all" except the Old Testament." There was only the living word — the gospel, but no Gospels. Instead of the letter was the spirit. The beginning, in fact, was Jesus Himself" (*ib*., p. 245). The N. T. is in close sympathy with both Jew and Greek, in a sense has both languages to draw on, can reach both the Semitic and the gentile mind, becomes a bond of union, in a word (as Broadus used to say) it is better suited to be the vehicle of truth conveyed by Jewish minds than classical Greek would have been. And a grammarian must admit that, however necessary and fundamental grammat-

[1] Cf. Hatch, Infl. of Hellen. on Christ.
[2] Gesch. der griech. Lit., 1905, p. 912.
[3] Hicks, Gk. Phil. and Rom. Law in the N. T., 1896, p. 12.
[4] Mahaffy, Surv. of Gk. Civiliz., 1897, p. 309.
[5] Thayer, Hast. D. B., art. Lang. of the N. T., p. 40b.
[6] Rodwell, N. T. Gk., 1899, p. 2.
[7] Hast. D. B., ib. Cf. Schaff, Comp. to the Gk. N. T., p. 26.

ical exegesis is, it forms only the basis for the spiritual exposition which should follow.

When one comes to details, he notes that the influence of Christianity is chiefly lexical, not grammatical.[1] But a few points in syntax are to be observed, as in expressions like **ἐν Χριστῷ**[2]; **ἐν Κυρίῳ; πιστεύω**[3] **ἐν** with locative, **εἰς** with accusative, **ἐπί** with the locative or the accusative, **πιστεύω** with the dative, with the accusative or absolutely. As to the lexical element the lists of **ἅπαξ εἰρημένα** require severe sifting.[4] It is too soon to pass a final verdict, but in the nature of the case the number would be small. Such words as **ἀντίχριστος, ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω, εὐαγγελιστής, συνσταυρόω, ψευδάδελφος, ψευδαπόστολος**, etc., naturally spring out of the Christian enterprise. The vocabulary of the N. T. Greek is not very extensive, somewhere near 5600 words, including proper names.[5] But the main point to note is the distinctive ideas given to words already in use, like **ἀγάπη, ἁγιάζω, ἅγιος, ἀδελφός, ἀντίτυπος, ἀντιμισθία, ἀπολύτρωσις, ἀπωλεια, ἀπόστολος, ἀποστολή, ἄρτος, βασιλεία, βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα (-μός), γλῶσσα, διάκονος, δικαιόω, εἰρήνη, ἐκκλησία, ἐκλεκτός, ἐλπίζω, ἐλπίς, ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπιστρέφομαι, ἔργα, εὐαγγελίον, εὐαγγελίζω, ἐξουσία, ζωή, θάνατος, ἱερεύς, καλέω, καταλλαγή, καταλλάσσω, κηρύσσω, κλητός, κόσμος, κοινωνία, λύτρον, λυτρόω, μετάνοια, ὁδός, παράκλητος, πίστις, πιστός, πιστεύω, πνεῦμα, πνευματικός, πρεσβύτερος, πρόσκομμα, σάρξ, σταυρός, συνείδησις, σώζω, σωτήρ, σωτηρία, ταπεινός, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, υἱοθεσία, χάρις, Χριστός, ψυχή, ψυχικός**. When one considers the new connotations that these words bear in the N. T., it is not too much "to say that in the history of these and such like words lies the history of Christianity."[6] The fact that these and other terms were used

[1] Cf. Thumb, griech. Spr., pp. 162-201.

[2] Cf. Deiss., Die neutest. Formel "in Christo Jesu" untersucht, 1892.

[3] Cf. Abb., Joh. Vocab., 1905, pp. 19-80. On the whole question see Buttmann, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 173 ff.; Moulton, Prol., p. 67 f.

[4] Cf. Deiss., Hell.-Griech., Hauck's Realencyc., p. 636. Not 550 (as Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 93) bibl. words, but only 50 N. T. formations (Deissmann, Exp., Jan., 1908; Light, p. 73).

[5] Kennedy, Sour. of N. T. Gk., p. 88. The Eng. of the King James Vers. (0. T. and N. T.) contains only about 6000 words (Adey, The Eng. of the King James Vers.). Max Muller (Sci. of Lang., p. 16) says that we use only about 4000 words in ordinary Eng.

[6] Westcott, Smith's B. D., N. T. Cf. also Hatch, Ess. in Bibl. Gk., p. 11. "Though Greek words were used they were the symbols of quite other than Greek ideas." That is, when the distinctively Christian ideas are given. On the influence of Gk. on other languages see Wack., Die Kult. der Gegenw., Tl. I, Abt. 8, pp. 311 ff.

in the popular language of the day gives a sharper point to the new turn in the gospel message. The deification of the emperor made Christians sensitive about the words **θεός, υἱὸς θεοῦ, θεῖος, κύριος, κυριακός, σωτήρ, χάραγμα, βασιλεύς, βασιλεία.** See the luminous discussion of Deissmann (*Light*, pp. 343-384). The papyri and the inscriptions throw almost a lurid light on these words. Cf. **Κύριος Καῖσαρ** and **Κύριος Ἰησοῦς** (*Martyrium Polycarpi*, viii, 2) with 1 Cor. 12:1-3. The Christians did not shrink from using these words in spite of the debased ideas due to the emperor-cult, Mithraism, or other popular superstitions. Indeed, Paul (cf. Col. 2:1 f.) often took the very words of Gnostic or Mithra cult and filled them with the riches of Christ. Cf. *The Expositor* for April, 1912, "Paul and the Mystery Religions," by H. A. A. Kennedy. For the stimuli that Christianity derived from popular notions of law, religion and morality see Deissmann, *Light*, pp. 283-290. The mass of the N. T. vocabulary has been transfigured. The worshippers of a Caesar would indeed call him **σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου** or **υἱὸς θεοῦ**, but the words were empty flattery. Deissmann[1] well shows that a LXX word, for instance, in the mouth of a citizen of Ephesus, did not mean what it did in the LXX, as **ἀρχιερεύς, διαθήκη, θεός, προφήτης, σωτηρία**. Much more is this true of the N. T. The new message glorified the current **κοινή**, took the words from the street and made them bear a new content, linked heaven with earth in a new sense. In particular the N. T. writers took and greatly enriched the religious vocabulary of the LXX.

VI. Individual Peculiarities. The language of Christianity was not stereotyped at first and there was more play for individualism. If the style is not all of the man, certainly each writer has his own style. But style varies with the same man also at different stages of his own development, with varying moods and when discussing different themes. Style is thus a function of the subject. All these points of view must be kept in mind with several of the N. T. writers, as Paul, Luke, Peter and John, whose writings show marked variations. Simcox[2] notes that in the Thessalonian and Corinthian letters Paul uses **ἐν παντί** twelve

[1] B. S., p. 83. Cf. Schleierm., Hermen., pp. 66 ff., 138 ff., who early called attention to the Christian element in the N. T. Cf. also Viteau, Le Verbe; Synt. des Prop., p. xl f.

[2] Writers of the N. T., p. 37. A. Souter (The Exp., 1904, Some Thoughts on the Study of the Gk. N. T., p. 145) says: "We must take each writer's grammar by itself."

times, in the Pastoral Epistles ἐν πᾶσι five (or six) times, while in Ph. 4:12 he has both. In thus accenting the individuality of the N. T. writers one must not forget that each writer had access to the common religious terminology of early Christianity. There was a common substratum of ideas and expressions that reappear in them all, though in certain cases there may have been actual use of documents. But one can never be sure whether Peter had James, or the author of Hebrews Luke's writings. Peter probably had some of Paul's letters when he wrote 1 Peter, and 2 Peter 3:15f. expressly refers to them. The grammarian cannot be expected to settle questions of authorship and genuineness, but he has a right to call attention to the common facts of linguistic usage. Immer[1] indeed complains that the linguistic peculiarities of the N. T. writers have been worked more in the interest of criticism than of exegesis. The modern method of biblical theology is designed to correct this fault, but there is a work here for the grammarian also. Winer[2] declines to discuss this question and is horrified at the idea of grammars of each writer of the N. T.[3] Language is rightly viewed from the point of view of the speaker or writer. The rapid and continued changes in the individual mind during the mental process of expressing thought find a parallel in the syntactical relations in the sentence.[4] One cannot protest too strongly against the levelling process of an unsympathetic and unimaginative linguistic method that puts all the books of the N. T. through the same syntactical mill and tags this tense as "regular" and that one as "irregular." It is not too much to say that the characteristic of the Greek literature of this time was precisely that of individuality (cf. Plutarch's Lives).[5] Viteau[6] has a brief discussion of "The Psychological Character of the Syntax of the N. T.," for, added to all other things, there is "the influence of the moment." Differences in

[1] Hermen. of the N. T., 1877, p. 132. Thayer (Lex. of N. T. Gk., p. 689) speaks of "the monumental misjudgments committed by some who have made questions of authorship turn on vocabulary alone."

[2] W.-M., p. 1 f., remands this whole matter to the realm of N. T. rhetoric (cf. Wilke, 1843, N. T. Rhet.; Schleierm., Hermen.; Gersdorf, Beitr. zur Sprachchar. d. N. T.), but some discussion is demanded here. Schmiedel abbreviates Winer's comments.

[3] W.-M., p. 4. He did not live to see Dr. Abbott's two stout volumes, Joh. Vocab. (1905) and Joh. Gr. (1906).

[4] Cf. Steinthal, Intr. to the Psych. and Sci. of Lang.

[5] Cf. Norden, Die griech. Kunstpr., Bd. I, p. 243. Cf. also Blass, Hermen. and Krit., p. 206.

[6] Le Verbe; Synt. des Prop., pp. xli ff.

culture, in environment, in gifts, in temperament inevitably affect style, but this fact is not to be stressed so as to make a new dialect for each writer.[1] In the following discussions some lexical comments are given besides the grammatical to give a better idea of the writer's style as a whole.

(a) MARK. Certainly Blass' theory[2] of an original Aramaic Mark is not proven, but Peter often spoke in Aramaic, and Mark was bilingual like Peter. For the Aramaisms and Hebraisms of Mark see previous discussion (Semitic Influence). The idea that Mark first wrote in Latin need not be seriously discussed. Matthew and Luke have also nearly as many Latinisms as Mark. It is not in his vocabulary that Mark is most distinctive, for of the 1270 words in Mark (besides 60 proper names) only 80 are peculiar to him among the N. T. writers.[3] He has 150 in common with Matthew and Luke alone, while only 15 belong to Mark and John and nowhere else in the N. T.[4] About 40 words belong only to Mark and the LXX in the Greek Bible, while Mark has 38 (besides proper names) occurring nowhere else in the N. T. or the LXX; but these are not all real ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, for there are the papyri! Mark seems fond of diminutives like the vernacular κοινή in general (θυγάτριον, κοράσιον, κυνάριον, etc.); εἰμί and ἔρχομαι with the participle are common, as in Luke (cf. 1:6, ἦν . . . ἐκδεδυμένος 1:39, ἦλθεν κηρύσσων); in fact he multiplies pictorial participles (cf. 14:67, ἰδοῦσα . . . ἐμβλέψασα λέγει); ἄν occurs with past tenses of the indicative (3:11, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν); he loves the double negative (1:44, μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς); the article is common (as in N. T. generally) with the infinitive and sentences (9:23, τὸ εἰ δύνῃ); broken and parenthetic clauses are frequent (cf. 7:19, καθαρίζων); at times he is pleonastic (2:20, τότε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ); he uses εὐθύς (W. H. text) 41 times; he is emotional and vivid, as shown by descriptive adjectives, questions and exclamations (cf. 1:24; 2:7); the intermingling of tenses (9:33 ff., ἐπηρώτα . . . λέγει. . . εἶπεν) is not due to ignorance of Greek or to artificiality, as Swete well says, but to "a keen sense

[1] As Simcox does in Writers of the N. T., p. 1.

[2] Philol. of the Gosp., pp. 196 ff. Cf. Marshall, Exp., ser. 4, vi, pp. 81 ff.; Allen, ib., ser. 6, vi, pp..436-443.

[3] Swete, Comm. on Mk., 1898, p. xl. Thayer (Lex. of N. T. Gk., App., p. 699) gives 102, but the text of some 32 is in dispute. Hawkins, Hor. Syn.', p. 200, gives 71. Swete gives interesting lists of Mark's vocabulary from various points of view. Cf. also Salmond, Mark (Gosp. of), in Hast. D. B.

[4] Swete, Comm. on Mk., p. xliii. Thieme (Die Inschr. von Magn. am Maander and das N. T., 1906, p. 4) says: "Die Gruppe der sogenannten Ha-

of the reality and living interest of the facts; there are 151 historic presents in the W. H. text against 78 in Matthew and 4 in Luke; there is frequent and discriminating use of prepositions (2:1, 2, 10, 13); the connective is usually καί rather than δέ, seldom οὖν; there is little artistic effect, but much simplicity and great vividness of detail; the vernacular κοινή is dominant with little literary influence, though εἶτεν, παιδιόθεν and ὀψία are held so by Norden.[1] Πεπλήρωται (Mk. 1:15) is paralleled by ἐπληρώθη in a Fayum papyrus and[2] συμπόσια συμπόσια, πρασιαὶ πρασιαί by τάγματα τάγματα in the "Shepherd of Hermas" (Goodspeed, Bibl. World, 1906, p. 311 f.). In general Mark is not to be considered illiterate, though more Semitic in his culture than Greek. Wellhausen has noted that D has more Aramaisms in Mark's text than B. But Mark's Semitisms are not really barbarous Greek, "though Mark's extremely vernacular language often makes us think so, until we read the less educated papyri" (Moulton, *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, p. 492). Even his fondness for compound (even double compound) verbs is like the vernacular κοινή. If the influence of Peter is seen in the Gospel of Mark, it was thoroughly congenial as to language and temperament.[3] He gives an objective picture of Jesus and a realistic one.

(b) MATTHEW. The writer quotes both the Hebrew and the LXX and represents Jesus as doing the same. He has 65 allusions to the 0. T., 43 of them being verbal quotations. And yet the book is not intensely Hebraistic. He has the instinct for Hebrew parallelism and the Hebrew elaboration, and his thought and general outlook are Hebraistic, though his language is "colourless Hellenistic of the average type" (Moulton, *Camb. Bibl. Essays,* p. 484). We need not enter into the linguistic peculiarities of Q as distinct from our Greek Matthew if that hypothesis be correct. In Mt. 9:6 we see κλίνη rather than the vulgar κράβαττος of Mark. In 12:14 Matthew has συμβούλιον ἔλαβον for σ. ἐδίδουν of Mark (Moulton, *op. cit*., p. 485). He can use paronomasia as in κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς (21:41). He uses τότε 91 times against 6 in Mark and 14 in Luke; he has ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν 32 times, while he

paxlegomena ist bedenklich zusammengeschrumpft; es handelt sich im Neuen Testament meistens um ἅπαξ εὑρημένα, nicht ἅπαξ εἰρημένα."

[1] Die Ant. Kunstpr., Bd. II, p. 488. [2] Mk. 6:39 f.

[3] Schaff, Comp. to Gk. N. T., p. 51. Cf. on Mark, Schulze, Der schriftsteller. Charakter and Wert des Marcus (Keil and Tzschirner's Analecta, II, 2, 3). See Hawkins, Hor. Syn.[2], pp. 114-153. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 203, 261, 276, 278, 302) has comments on the narrative style of Mark.

has ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ 4 times (Mk. 14; Lu. 32); he uses ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος 7 times and ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς 13 times; he 12 times quotes the 0. T. with the formula ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν or τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθέν, whereas Luke does not have it at all, Mark only once and John 7 times; κατ᾽ ὄναρ occurs 6 times and nowhere else in N. T.; like Luke he uses καὶ ἰδού often (27 times) and ἰδού after the genitive absolute 11 times; he alone speaks of ἡ ἁγία πόλις and πόλις τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως; like Mark he uses Ἱεροσόλυμα always save once (23:37), whereas Luke usually has Ἱερουσαλήμ; ὀμνύω ἐν or εἰς, common in Matthew, does not occur in the other Gospels; τάφος, not in the other Gospels, is found 6 times; συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος occurs 5 times, and only once more in the N. T. (Heb.); note the pleonastic use of ἄνθρωπος as ἄνθρωπος βασιλεύς; he twice uses εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, but the other Gospels ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι or ἐπί; the oriental particularity is seen in using προσέρχομαι 51 times while Mark has it only 5 and Luke 10 times; συνάγειν is used by Matthew 24 times; the vernacular κοινή is manifest in many ways as in the use of μονόφθαλμος (like Mark), κολλυβισταί. Thayer in his list (*Lexicon*, p. 698 f.) gives 137 words occurring in Matthew alone in the N. T., but 21 are doubtful readings. Matthew has fewer compound verbs than Mark. Matthew does not use adverbial πολλά, while Mark has it 9 times. He has δέ where Mark has καί about 60 times. Matthew has ὅτι after verbs of saying 38 times, while Mark has it 50 times. Of the 151 historic presents in Mark only 21 appear in Matthew, though Matthew has 93 historic presents in all. See Hawkins, *Horae Synopt.*, p. 144 f. Matthew frequently has aorist when Mark has imperfect (see Allen, *Matthew*, p. xx f.). The periphrastic tenses are less common in Matthew than in Mark and Luke (*op. cit*., p. xxii). Matthew is less fond than Mark of redundant phrases (*op. cit*., p. xxvi). The Gospel is largely in the form of discourses with less narrative element than Mark. The style is more uniform and less graphic than either Mark or Luke and so less individual.[1]

(c) LUKE. Whether Luke knew Hebrew or Aramaic or both, cannot be stated with certainty. He did make use of Aramaic documents or sayings in Lu. 1 and 2, and in the early part of the Acts. He was also quite familiar with the LXX, as his quo-

[1] Cf. Dalman, Wds. of Jes., 1902; Gift, Die Originalspr. des Mt., 1887; See Hawkins, Hor. Syn.[2], pp. 154-173; Allen, Mt., pp. xix–xxxi; Plummer, Mt., p. xiii f.; Zahn, Einl. in d. N. T., Bd. II, 1898. On Matthew's style see Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 203, 276, 278, 300, 302, 305.

tations from it show. The Semitic influence in his writings has already been discussed. "He consciously imitates the Greek Bible, and in the parts of his narrative which have their scene in Palestine he feels it congruous to retain the rough diction of his sources" (Moulton, *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, p. 479). One thing is certain about him. He had a good command of the vernacular κοινή and even attains the literary κοινή in Lu. 1:1-4 and Ac. 1:1-5; 17:16-34. The preface to his Gospel has often been compared to those of Thucydides and Herodotus, and it does not suffer by the comparison, for his modesty is an offset to their vain-glory.[1] Selwyn[2] thinks that Luke was a Roman citizen, and he was a fit companion for Paul. He exhibits the spirit of Paul in his comprehensive sympathy and in his general doctrinal position.[3] Renan[4] calls Luke's Gospel the most literary of the Gospels. He writes more like an historian and makes skilful use of his materials[5] and with minute accuracy.[6] His pictures in the Gospel have given him the title of "the painter." Norden indeed thinks that Luke alone among the N. T. writers received Atticistic influence (*Kunstprosa*, II, pp. 485 ff. Cf. Blass, *Die Rhythmen der asianischen und romischen Kunstprosa*, p. 42). But we need not go so far. His versatility is apparent in many ways, but withal he makes a faithful use of his materials.[7] His vocabulary illustrates his breadth of culture, for he uses 750 (851 counting doubtful readings) words not occurring elsewhere in the N. T.[8] Some of them are still ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. One special item in his vocabulary is the large number of medical terms in his writings, as is natural, since he was a physician.[9] His command of nautical phraseology is abun-

[1] Schaff, Comp. to Gk. N. T., p. 55. He calls attention to the fact that the intrs. of Herodotus and Luke are about equal in length. Cf. Blass, Philol. of the Gosp., pp. 7 ff.

[2] St. Luke the Prophet, 1901, p. 81.

[3] Davidson, Intr. to N. T., ii, p. 17.

[4] Les Evang., pp. 232, 283.

[5] Plummer, Comm. on Luke, 1896, p. xlvii.

[6] Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 1895; Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?; Chase, Credibility of Acts, 1902.

[7] Vogel (Zur Charak. des Lukas, 1899, p. 19) calls attention Ito differences in the speeches of Stephen, Peter and Paul in the Acts.

[8] See the lists of Thayer (Lex., pp. 699 ff.), Plummer (Comm., pp. lii Hawkins (Hon Syn.[2], pp. 201-207). Of the 851 some 312 occur in the Gospel and 478 in the Acts.

[9] Hobart, Medical Lang. of St. Luke, 1882. Many of these occur in the LXX also, but plenty remain to show his knowledge of the medical phraseology of the time.

dantly shown in Ac. 27 and 28.[1] The question of a double edition of the Gospel and Acts does not belong here.[2] His language is that of a man of culture with a cosmopolite tone, who yet knows how to be popular also (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 241 f.). He not only has a rich vocabulary, but also fine command of the κοινή diction. In particular his style is more like that of Paul and the writer to the Hebrews. Among matters of detail in Luke one will note his use of the infinitives with ἐν τῷ (34 times) and of τοῦ with the infinitive (24 instances); σύν (23 times) is frequent, though seldom in the other Gospels; καὶ αὐτός (αὐτή) he has 28 times, and often constructions like αὐτὸς ὁ χρόνος; καὶ ἐγένετο or ἐγένετο δέ he uses 43 times; he has δὲ καὶ 29 times; he loves πορεύομαι (88 examples); he uses εἰ like an interrogative 19 times; τό occurs often before a clause, especially an indirect question; he makes frequent use of καὶ ἰδού; ἱκανός is common with him; ἦν with present participle occurs 55 times; the descriptive genitive is common; πρός with the accusative occurs 296 times with him and very often in the rest of the N.T.; he is fond of ἐνώπιον; τε (and τε καί) is almost confined to him in the N.T.; the optative is alone used by Luke in indirect questions and more often otherwise than by any other N. T. writer save Paul. This is a literary touch but not Atticistic. He alone makes any special use of the future participle; he is fond πᾶς and ἅπας; ὡς in temporal sense is common in Luke, once in Mark, not in Matthew; a good many anacolutha occur in Acts, and the change from direct to indirect discourse is frequent; the relative is often attracted to the case of the antecedent and often begins a sentence (Ac. 2:24); ἐπιστάτα is used 7 times (peculiar to Luke) rather than κύριε or ῥαββεί; the syntax is throughout in general that of the κοινή of the time.[3]

[1] Smith, Voy. and Shipw. of St. Paul, 1882.

[2] Blass, Philol. of the Gosp., and Acta, Apostol. Bacon (Story of St. Paul, 1905, p. 156, note) actually urges καὶ ἐγένετο in the "we" sections of Acts as a "pronounced Septuagintism improbable for a Greek"! Cf. Moulton, Prof, p. 16 f. On Luke's style see Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 1, 3, 5, 203, 250 f., 261, 276, 278, 280, 300, 305.

[3] Cf. Vogel, Zur Charak. des Lukas, pp. 21-37, for criticism of the Syntax of Luke; Plummer, Comm. on Luke, has many sensible remarks; Wright, Gosp. ace. to Luke, 1900, p. xi, on Luke's literary habits, and see also Hawkins, Hor. Syn.[2], pp. 174-193. On relation of Luke to Josephus, cf. Bebb, Luke's Gosp. in Hast. D. B. On Luke's Hebraisms cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 13 f. Cf. Norden, Ant. Kunstpr., II, pp. 486 ff., for differences between Luke and Mark and Matthew. See also Harnack, Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evang. and der Apostelgesch. (1906). On p. 15 he gives a list of 84 words

Luke is also fond of ὁ μὲν οὖν (Acts). The historic present is rare in Luke (4 or 6 times). Luke uses the conjunctions and subordinate clauses with more literary skill than the other N. T. writers. He makes choice use of words and idioms. Cf. his report of Paul's speech on Mars Hill. He accumulates participles, especially in the Acts, but not without stylistic refinement. In the Acts he is fond of εἰς when ἐν, would ordinarily be used.

(d) JAMES. It is at first surprising that one recognized as such a thorough Jew as James, the brother of our Lord, and who used Aramaic, should have written in such idiomatic Greek. "In the skilful use of the Greek language its [Epistle of James] author is inferior to no N. T. writer."[1] There are very few Hebraisms in the Epistle, though the tone is distinctly Jewish, perhaps the earliest Christian document in the N. T. But one cannot think that James wrote the book in Aramaic, for the indications of translation are not present, as Bishop John Wordsworth once argued.[2] There is not, however, in James studied rhetoric or keen dialectics. The author of Hebrews, Luke and Paul far surpass him in formal rhetoric. "The Epistle of James is from the beginning a little work of literature," "a product of popular literature" (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 235). The writer uses asyndeton very often and many crisp aphorisms. Just as the Synoptic Gospels preserve the local colour of the countryside, so the Epistle of James is best understood in the open air of the harvest-field (*ib*., p. 241). The incongruity of such a smooth piece of Greek as this Epistle being written by a Palestinian Jew like James vanishes when we consider the bilingual character of the people of Palestine (cf. Moulton, *Camb. Biblical Essays*, p. 487). Nevertheless, the author has a Hebrew mould of thought reminiscent of 0. T. phrases. The atmosphere is Jewish and "international vulgarisms" do not explain it all. The pleonasms are just those seen in the LXX, and the book has the fondness for assonance so common in the 0. T. Cf. Oesterley, *Exp. Gk. Test*., p. 394. He uses many examples that re-

peculiar in the N. T. to Luke and Paul. On p. 15 of Luke the Physician (trans., 1907) Harnack considers the Gk. of Luke's Gospel "excellent." "It occupies a middle position between the κοινή and Attic Gk. (the language of literature)." This is not a very exact description, for Harnack here uses κοινή for vernac. κοινή and Attic was not the language of literature in Luke's time (save the Atticists), but the literary κοινή).

[1] Thayer, Lang. of N. T., Hast. D. B.

[2] First series of Stud. Bibl., pp. 144 ff. Cf. Mayor, Comm. on James, pp. ccv ff.

mind one vividly of the parables of Jesus and many of the ideas and phrases of the Sermon on the Mount are here. There is also a marked similarity between this Epistle and the speech of James in Ac. 15 and the letter there given, which was probably written by him.[1] He is fond of repeating the same word or root, as θρησκός, θρησκεία (1:26 f.)[2]; his sentences, though short, are rhythmical[3]; he is crisp, vivid, energetic; there is little in the forms or the syntax to mark it off from the current κοινή or the N. T. representatives of it, though his idiomatic use of the pronouns is worth mentioning, as is also that of ἄγε as an interjection, the gnomic aorist, the possible nominative μεστή in apposition with γλῶσσαν (3:8). But it is in the vocabulary that James shows his individuality, for in this short epistle there are 73 (9 doubtful) words not appearing elsewhere in the N. T., some of which are found in the LXX,[4] like παραλλαγή. The use of συναγωγή (2:2) of a Christian assembly is noteworthy (cf. ἐκκλησία in 5:14 and ἐπισυναγωγή in Heb. 10:25). He has many compound words like ἀδιάκριτος, bookish words like ἔμφυτος, philosophical terms like ὕλη, picturesque words like ὀλολύζω, some of a technical nature like πηδάλιον, some strictly classical like ἔοικε, χρή.

(e) JUDE. It is here assumed against Spitta[5] and Biggs[6] that Jude is prior to 2 Peter, the second chapter of which is so much like Jude. There is not in Jude the epigram of James, but he has a rugged rotundity of style that is impressive and vigorous, if a bit harsh. His style is marked by metaphor and the use of triplets. He cannot be said to be "steeped in the language of the LXX" with Chase,[7] but there is a more Hebraistic flavour than is observed in James, his brother. He has literary affinities with some of the apocryphal books and with some of Paul's writings. If he shows a better command of Greek than 2 Peter, yet his

[1] See this point well worked out by Mayor, James (Epis. of), Hast. D. B. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 279.

[2] Cf. Mayor, Comm., pp. cxcv ff., for exx.

[3] Ib., p. cci f. Mayor, ch. viii, has also a luminous discussion of the "Grammar of St. James," which shows conclusively that he has little that is distinctive in his grammar. Cf. Thayer (Lex., p. 708) for list of words peculiar to James.

[4] Cf. Mayor, Comm., p. cxci f. On συναγωγή cf. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 150.

[5] Der Zweite Brief des Petrus and der Brief des Judas, 1885.

[6] Comm. on St. Peter and St. Jude, 1901.

[7] Jude (Epis. of), Hast. D. B.

"Greek is a strong and weighty weapon over which, however, he has not a ready command."[1] *Per contra*, there is little that is peculiar in his grammar, for he shows a normal use of the Greek idiom. The optative occurs twice (πληθυνθείη, verse 2, and ἐπιτιμήσαι, in 9) and the article is used skilfully with the participle. Cases, pronouns, tenses, free use of participles, indicate a real mastery of current Greek. The true superlative occurs in τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ πίστει. The idiomatic use of ἕβδομος without article is seen in Jude 14. The adverbial accusative is seen in τὸ δεύτερον 5 and τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον 7. For further details see Mayor on "Grammar of Jude and of Peter" (*Comm*., pp. xxvi–lv). He has 20 words (one doubtful) not found elsewhere in the N. T.[2] A few of them like πλανήτης occur in the LXX. Some of them have a stately ring like κύματα ἄγρια, and a number occur which are found in writers of the literary κοινή. He uses ἡ κοιινή σωτηρία ("the safety of the state") in a Christian sense, and so οἱ προγεγραμμένοι ("the proscribed"). But he has also command of technical Christian terms like ἅγιοι, κλητοί, πίστις, πνεῦμα, ψυχικός as Paul used them. The vividness of his style hardly justifies the term "poetic."[3] Deissmann (*Light*, p. 235) considers Jude a literary epistle in popular style and "cosmopolite" in tone (p. 242), with a certain degree of artistic expression. The correctness of the Greek is quite consonant with the authorship of the brother of Jesus, since Palestine was a bilingual country (Moulton, *Camb. Bibl. Essays*, p. 488). Besides, the Epistle has only 25 verses.

(f) PETER. As Peter was full of impulses and emotions and apparent inconsistencies, the same heritage falls to his Epistles. The most outstanding difference between 1 Peter and 2 Peter is in the vocabulary. 1 Peter has 361 words not found in 2 Peter, while 2 Peter has 231 not in 1 Peter.[4] Many in each case are common words like ἁγιάζω, ἐλπίζω, εὐαγγελίζω, etc., in 1 Peter, and βασιλεία, ἐπαγγελία, ἐπιγινώσκω, etc., in 2 Peter. 1 Peter has 63 words not in the rest of the N. T., while 2 Peter has 57 (5 doubtful); but of these 120 words only one (ἀπόθεσις) occurs in both.[5] This is surely a remarkable situation. But both of them have a

[1] Chase, Jude (Epis. of), Hast. D. B.

[2] See Thayer's list (Lex., p. 709). For fresh discussion of the gram. aspects of Jude and 2 Pet. see Mayor's Comm. (1908). He accepts the genuineness of Jude, but rejects 2 Peter.

[3] Maier, Der Judasbrief, 1906, p. 169.

[4] Bigg, Comm. on St. Peter and St. Jude, p. 225.

[5] Thayer, Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B., p. 42[a].

number of words in common that occur elsewhere also in the N. T., like ἀναστροφή, ψυχή, etc.[1] Both use the plural of abstract nouns; both have the habit, like James, of repeating words,[2] while Jude avoids repetitions; both make idiomatic use of the article; both make scant use of particles, and there are very few Hebraisms; both use words only known from the vernacular κοινή; both use a number of classical words like ἀναγκαστῶς (1 Peter, Plato), πλαστός (Her., Eur., Xen., 2 Peter)[3]; both use picture-words[4]; both seem to know the Apocrypha; both refer to events in the life of Christ; both show acquaintance with Paul's Epistles, and use many technical Christian terms. But, on the other hand, 1 Peter is deeply influenced by the LXX, while 2 Peter shows little use of it; 1 Peter is more stately and elevated without affectation, while 2 Peter has grandeur, though it is, perhaps, somewhat "grandiose" (Bigg) and uses a number of rare words like ταρταρόω; 1 Peter makes clear distinctions between the tenses, prepositions, and uses smooth Greek generally, while 2 Peter has a certain roughness of style and even apparent solecisms like βλέμμα (2:8), though it is not "baboo Greek" (Abbott)[5] nor like modern "pigeon English"; 1 Peter shows little originality and rhetorical power, while 2 Peter, though not so original as Jude, yet has more individuality than 1 Peter. Deissmann (*Light*, p. 235) says: "The Epistles of Peter and Jude have also quite unreal addresses; the letter-like touches are purely decorative. Here we have the beginnings of a Christian literature; the Epistles of Jude and Peter, though still possessing as a whole many popular features, already endeavour here and there after a certain degree of artistic expression." It is not for a grammarian to settle, if anybody can, the controversy about those two Epistles, but Simcox[6] is not far wrong when he says of 2 Peter that "a superficial student is likelier than a thorough student to be certain that it is spurious." Spitta,[7] Bigg[8] and

[1] Cf. Zahn, Einl. in d. N. T:, Bd. II, p. 108; B. Weiss, Einl. in d. N. T., p. 445.

[2] Bigg, Comm., p. 225 f. Cf. also Schulze, Der schriftsteller. Charakter und Wert des Petrus, Judas und Jacobus, 1802.

[3] Cf. excellent lists by Chase, Hast. D. B., 1 Peter and 2 Peter. Many of these words are cleared up by the pap., like δοκίμιον and ἀρετή.

[4] Vincent, Word-Studies, vol. I, p. 621.

[5] Exp., ser. 2, v. III. Chase, Hast. D. B., p. 808[a], finds needless difficulty with παρεισφέρειν (2 Pet. 1:5), for παρά is 'alongside,' 'in addition.'

[6] Writers of the N. T., p. 64.

[7] Der Zweite Brief des Petrus.

[8] Comm. on St. Peter and Jude.

Zahn[1] among recent writers suggest that in 2 Peter we have Peter's own composition, while in 1 Peter we have the Greek of an amanuensis who either wrote out Peter's ideas, revised them or translated Peter's Aramaic into Greek. We know that Peter had interpreters (Mark, for instance), and Josephus used such literary help and Paul had amanuenses. On the other hand Chase (Hastings' *D. B.*) and others reject 2 Peter entirely. It is worth mentioning that 2 Peter and the Apocalypse, which are the two books that furnish most of the linguistic anomalies in the N. T., both have abundant parallels among the less well-educated papyri writers, and it is of Peter and John that the terms ἀγράμματοι and ἰδιῶται are used (Ac. 4:13). As we have a problem concerning 1 Peter and 2 Peter on the linguistic side, so we have one concerning John's Gospel and Epistles on the one hand and Revelation on the other. The use of the article in 1 Peter is quite Thucydidean in 3:3 (Bigg), and eight times he uses the idiom like τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον (1:17) and once that seen in τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν (4:3), the rule in the N. T. The article is generally absent with the attributive genitive and with prepositions as εἰς ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος (1:2). There is a refined accuracy in 1 Peter's use of ὡς (Bigg), cf. 1:19; 2:16, etc. A distinction is drawn between μή and οὐ with the participle in 1:8. Once ἵνα occurs with the future indicative (3:1). The absence of ἄν and the particles ἄρα, γε, ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, τε, δή, που, πως is noticeable. 1 Peter makes idiomatic use of μέν, while 2 Peter does not have it. 2 Peter uses the "compact" structure of article, attributive and noun, like 1 Peter (cf. 2 Pet. 2:1, 10, 16, 21), but the "uncompact" occurs also (cf. 2 Pet. 1:3, 9, 11, 14). In Jude and 2 Peter the commonest order is the uncompact (Mayor, *Jude and Second Peter*, p. xxii). The single article in 2 Pet. 1:1, 11 is used of two names for the same object. Cf. also Jude 4. The article with the infinitive does not occur in 2 Peter (nor Jude). 2 Peter has some unusual uses of the infinitive after ἔχω (2 Pet. 1:15) and as result (2 Pet. 3:1 f.). 1 Peter has the article and future participle once (3:13) ὁ κακώσων. Both 1 Pet. (1 : 2) and 2 Pet. (1:2) have the optative πληθυνθείη (like Jude). 1 Peter twice (3:14, 17) has εἰ and the optative. See further Mayor on "Grammar of Jude and 2 Peter" (Comm., pp. xxvi–lv).

(g) PAUL. There was a Christian terminology apart from Paul, but many of the terms most familiar to us received their

[1] Einl. in d. N. T. Mayor in his Comm. on Jude and 2 Peter (1907) rejects 2 Peter partly on linguistic grounds.

interpretation from him. He was a pathfinder, but had inexhaustible resources for such a task. Resech[1] has done good service in putting together the words of Paul and the words of Jesus. Paul's rabbinical training and Jewish cast of mind led Farrar[2] to call him a Haggadist. Simcox[3] says that "there is hardly a line in his writings that a non-Jewish author of his day would have written." Harnack[4] points out that Paul was wholly unintelligible to such a Hellenist as Porphyry, but Ramsay[5] replies that Porphyry resented Paul's use of Hellenism in favour of Christianity. But Hicks[6] is certainly right in seeing a Hellenistic side to Paul, though Pfleiderer[7] goes too far in finding in Paul merely "a Christianized Pharisaism" and a "Christianized Hellenism." Paul and Seneca have often been compared as to style and ideas, but a more pertinent linguistic parallel is Arrian's report of the lectures of Epictetus. Here we have the vernacular **κοινή** of an educated man in the second century A.D. The style of Paul, like his theology, has challenged the attention of the greatest minds.[8] Farrar[9] calls his language "the style of genius, if not the genius of style." There is no doubt about its individuality. While in the four groups of his letters each group has a style and to some extent a vocabulary of its own, yet, as in Shakespeare's plays, there is the stamp of the same tremendous mind. These differences of language lead some to doubt the genuineness of certain of the Pauline Epistles, especially the Pastoral Group, but criticism is coming more to the acceptance of all of them as genuine. Longinus ranks Paul as master of the dogmatic style (**Παῦλος ὁ Ταρσεὺς ὅντινα καὶ πρῶτόν φημι προιστάμενον**

[1] Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu, 1904.

[2] Life and Work of St. Paul, vol. I, p. 638.

[3] Writers of the N. T., p. 27.

[4] Miss. und Ausbr. des Christent., p. 354. Cf. Moffatt's transl., vol. II, p. 137.

[5] Exp., 1906, p. 263.

[6] St. Paul and Hellen., Stud. Bib., IV, i.

[7] Urchristentum, pp. 174-478.

[8] See Excursus I to vol. I of Farrar's Life of Paul.

[9] Ib., p. 623. On Paul's style cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 1, 5, 251, 276, 279, 281 f., 284 f., 289, 300-305. As to the Pastoral Epistles it has been pointed out that there is nothing in Paul's vocabulary inconsistent with the time (James, Genuin. and Author. of the Past. Epis., 1906). It is natural for one's style to be enriched with age. The Church Quart. Rev. (Jan., 1907) shows that all the new words in the Past. Epis. come from the LXX, Aristotle, **κοινή** writers before or during Paul's time. Cf. Exp. Times, 1907, p. 245 f.

δόγματος ἀνυποδείκτου). Baur[1] says that he has "the true ring of Thucydides." Erasmus (*ad* Col. 4:16) says: " Tonat, fulgurat, meras flammas loquitur Paulus." Hausrath[2] correctly says that "it is hard to characterize this individuality in whom Christian fulness of love, rabbinic keenness of perception and ancient will-power so wonderfully mingle." It is indeed the most personal[3] and the most powerful writing of antiquity. He disclaims classic elegance and calls himself ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ (2 Cor. 11:6), yet this was in contrast with the false taste of the Corinthians. But Deissmann (*St. Paul*, p. 6) goes too far in making Paul a mere tentmaker, devoid of culture. He is abrupt, paradoxical, bold, antithetical, now like a torrent, now like a summer brook. But it is passion, not ignorance nor carelessness. He was indeed no Atticist. He used the vernacular κοινή of the time with some touch of the literary flavour, though his quotation of three heathen poets does not show an extended acquaintance with Greek literature.[4] The difference between the vernacular and the literary κοινή is often a vanishing point. Paul's style is unhellenic in arrangement, but in Ro. 8 and 1 Cor. 13 he reaches the elevation and dignity of Plato.[5] Certainly his ethical teaching has quite a Hellenic ring, being both philosophical and logical.[6] Hatch[7] considers Paul to be the foremost representative of the Hellenic influence on early Christianity. He shows some knowledge of Roman legal terms[8] and uses arguments calling for educated minds of a high order.[9] The grammar shows little Semitic influence. He uses many rhetorical figures such as paronomasia, paradox, etc., which will be discussed in the chapter on that sub-

[1] Paul, vol. II, p. 281. Cf. K. L. Bauer, Philol. Thucyd.-Paul., 1773; also his Rhet. Paul., 1782. Cf. Tzschirner, Observ. Pauli ap. epist., 1800; Lasonder, De ling. paul. idiom., 1866.

[2] Der Apost. Paulus, p. 502.

[3] Renan, St. Paul, p. 232. Cf. also Jacquier, Hist. des Livres du N. T., tome 1er, 1906, p. 37: "Son grec, nous le verrons, n'est pas le grec litteraire, mais celui de la conversation." Cf. also pp. 61-70 for discussion of "Langue de Saint Paul." Cf. also Adams, St. Paul's Vocab. St. Paul as a Former of Words, 1895.

[4] Cf. Farrar, Exc. III, vol. I of Life of St. Paul.

[5] orden, Die Ant. Kunstpr., Bd. II, 1898, pp. 499, 509.

[6] Hicks, St. Paul and Hellen., 1896, p. 9.

[7] Hibbert Lect. (Infl. of Hellen. on Chris., p. 12).

[8] Ball, St. Paul and the Rom. Law (1901). Cf. Thack., Rela. of St. Paul to Contemp. Thought (1900). Paul's use of νόμος shows knowledge of the Roman *lex* as well the Jewish Torah.

[9] Mahaffy, Surv. of Gk. Civiliz., p. 310.

ject, some thirty kinds occurring in his writings. Farrar[1] suggests that Paul had a teacher of rhetoric in Tarsus. He is noted for his varied use of the particles and writes with freedom and accuracy, though his anacolutha are numerous, as in Gal. 2:6-9. He uses prepositions with great frequency and discrimination. The genitive is employed by Paul with every variety of application. The participle appears with great luxuriance and in all sorts of ways, as imperative or indicative or genitive absolute, articular, anarthrous, etc. He is Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραιων, but he handles his Greek with all the freedom of a Hellenist. He thinks in Greek and it is the vernacular κοινή of a brilliant and well-educated man in touch with the Greek culture of his time, though remaining thoroughly Jewish in his mental fibre. The peculiar turns in Paul's language are not due to Hebraisms, but to the passion of his nature which occasionally (cf. 2 Cor.) bursts all bounds and piles parenthesis and anacoluthon on each other in a heap. But even in a riot of language his thought is clear, and Paul often draws a fine point on the turn of a word or a tense or a case. To go into detail with Paul's writings would be largely to give the grammar of the N. T. In Phil. 2:1 we have a solecism in εἴ τις σπλάγχνα. His vocabulary is very rich and expressive. Thayer (*Lexicon*, pp. 704 ff.) gives 895 (44 doubtful) words that are found nowhere else in the N. T., 168 of them being in the Pastoral Epistles. Nageli[2] has published the first part of a Pauline lexicon (from α to ε) which is very helpful and makes use of the papyri and inscriptions. The most striking thing in this study is the cosmopolitan character of Paul's vocabulary. There are very few words which are found only in the Attic writers, like αἰσχρότης, and no cases of Atticism, though even in the letters α to ε he finds some 85 that belong to the literary κοινή as shown by books, papyri and inscriptions, words like ἀθανασία, ἀθετέω, etc. In some 50 more the meaning corresponds to that of the literary κοινή, as in ἀναλύω (Ph. 1:23). To these he adds words which appear in the literary κοινή, papyri and inscriptions after Paul's time, words like ἁρπαγμός, ἀναζῆν, etc. Then there are words that, so far as known, occur first in the N. T. in the Christian sense, like ἐκκλησία. But the vernacular κοινή as set

[1] Life of St. Paul, vol. I, p. 630.

[2] Der Wortsch. des Apost. Paulus, 1905. He says (p. 86): "Es uberrascht uns nicht mehr, dass jeder paulinische Brief eine Reihe von Wortern enthalt, die den ubrigen unbekannt sind." This is well said. Each letter ought to have words not in the others.

forth in the papyri and inscriptions furnishes the ground-work of his vocabulary, when to this is added the use of the LXX (including the Apocrypha) as in ἀντιλαμβάνομαι, ἁγιάζω. Especially noteworthy are some nice Greek points that are wanting in Paul (as well as in the rest of the N. T.) and in the papyri and inscriptions, as οἷός τέ εἰμι, αἰσθάνομαι, πάνυ, μάλα, ἔπομαι (seldom in the inscriptions), etc. Nageli sums up by saying that no one would think that Paul made direct use of Plato or Demosthenes and that his diligent use of the LXX explains all his Hebraisms besides a few Hebrew words like ἀμήν or when he translated Hebrew. His Aramaisms (like ἀββά) are few, as are his Latinisms (like πραιτώριον). "The Apostle writes in the style natural to a Greek of Asia Minor adopting the current Greek of the time, borrowing more or less consciously from the ethical writers of the time, framing new words or giving a new meaning to old words . . . His choice of vocabulary is therefore much like that of Epictetus save that his intimate knowledge of the LXX has modified it."[1] Paul's Greek, in a word, "has to do with no school, with no model, but streams unhindered with overflowing bubbling right out of the heart, but it is real Greek" (Wilamowitz-Mollendorff, *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums*, 2. Aufl., p. 159. Cf. *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Tl. I, Abt. 8, 1905). Deissmann (*Light*, p. 234) sees Paul wholly as "a non-literary man of the non-literary class in the Imperial Age, but prophet-like rising above his class and surveying the contemporary educated world with the con- of superior strength."

[1] Walter Lock, Jour. of Theol. Stud., 1906, p. 298. Athletic figures are almost confined to Paul (and Heb.), and Ramsay (Exp., 1906, pp. 283ff.) thinks Tarsus left this impress on him. A further discussion of Paul's rhetoric will be found in the chapter on Figures of Speech. Cf. J. Weiss, Beitr. zur paulin. Rhetorik, 1897; Blass, Die Rhyth. der asian. and rain. Kunstpr., 1905. Deiss. (Theol. Literaturzeit., 1906, pp. 231 ff.) strongly controverts Blass' idea that Paul used conscious rhythm. Cf. Howson, Metaph. of St. Paul. On Paul's Hellen. see Hicks, St. Paul and Hellen. (Stud. Bibl. et Feel., 1896); Curtius, Paulus in Athens (Gesarnm. Abhandl., 1894, pp. 527 ff.); Ramsay, Cities of St. Paul (pp. 9, 30-41); Heinrici, Zum Hellen. des Paulus (2 Cor. in Meyer); Wilamowitz-Moll., Die griech. Lit. des Altert. (p. 157); G. Milligan, Epis. to the Th. (1908, p. 1v). Paul had a full and free Gk. vocab., thought in Gk., wrote in Gk. as easily as in Aramaic. But his chief indebtedness seems to be to the LXX, the vernac. κοινή and the ethical Stoical writers. Milligan (see above, pp. lii–lv) has a very discriminating discussion of Paul's vocab. and style. Garvie (Stud. of Paul and His Gospel, p. 6 f.) opposes the notion that Paul had a decided Gk. influence.

(h) WRITER OF HEBREWS. Bruce[1] is certain that the author was not a disciple of Paul, while Simcox[2] is willing to admit that he may have belonged once to the school of Philo, as Paul did to that of Gamaliel. Harnack suggests Priscilla as the author. If Paul had "imperial disregard for niceties of construction," Hebrews shows "a studied rhetorical periodicity."[3] Von Soden[4] considers that in the N. T. Hebrews is "the best Greek, scarcely different in any point from that of contemporary writers." This is the more surprising when one observes the constant quotation of the LXX. The grammatical peculiarities are few, like the frequent use of παρά in comparison, ἐπεί with apodosis (protasis suppressed), the perfect tense to emphasize the permanence of the Scripture record which sometimes verges close to the aorist (4:3), the frequent participles, the varied use of particles, periphrases, the absence of the harsher kinds of hiatus, the presence of rhythm more than in any of the N. T. books, and in general the quality of literary style more than in any other N. T. writing. Westcott notes "the parenthetical involutions." "The calculated force of the periods is sharply distinguished from the impetuous eloquence of St. Paul." The writer does not use Paul's rhetorical expressions τί οὖν; τί γάρ; Moulton (*Camb. Bibl. Essays,* p. 483) notes the paradox that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by one who apparently knew no Hebrew and read only the LXX. The use of subordinate sentences is common and the position of words is carefully chosen. There is frequent use of μέν, and τε as well as ὅθεν and διό. The optative occurs only once and illustrates the true κοινή. The studied style appears particularly in ch. 11 in the use of πίστει. The style is hortatory, noble and eloquent, and has points of contact with Paul, Luke and Peter. The vocabulary, like the style, is less like the vernacular than any book in the N. T. Of 87 words which are found in the LXX and in this book alone in the N. T., 74 belong to the ancient literary works and only 13 to the vernacular. 18 other words peculiar to this Epistle are found in the literary κοινή. There are 168 (10 doubtful) words in Hebrews that appear nowhere else in the N. T. (cf. Thayer, *Lexicon*, p. 708). These 168 words are quite characteristic also, like ἀφορᾶν, αἰσθητήριον, πανήγυρις, πρωτοτόκια. West-

[1] D. B., Hebrews. [2] Writers of the N. T., p. 42.

[3] Thayer, Lang. of the N. T., Hast. D. B.

[4] Early Chris. Lit., 1906, p. 12. On the lang. of Heb. see the careful remarks of Jacquier (Hist. des Livres du N. T., tome l^{er}, 1906, pp. 457 ff.). Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 1, 5, 279, 280 f., 288 f., 296 ff., 303 f.

cott[1] considers the absence of words like **εὐαγγέλιον, μυστήριον, πληρόω** remarkable. The chief bond of contact in the vocabulary of Hebrews with the **κοινή** is in the use of "sonorous" words like **ἀντικαθίστημι, εὐπερίστατος**, but the author is by no means an Atticist, though he does approach the literary **κοινή**. Deissmann[2] indeed considers Hebrews as alone belonging "to another sphere: as in subject-matter it is more of a learned theological work, so in form it is more artistic than the other books of the N. T." He even feels that it "seems to hang in the background like an intruder among the N. T. company of popular books" (*Light*, p. 243).

(i) JOHN. The Johannine question at once confronts the modern grammarian who approaches the books in the N. T. that are accredited to John. It is indeed a difficult problem.[3] There is a triple difficulty: the Gospel presents a problem of its own (with the Epistles), the Apocalypse also has its burden, and there is the serious matter of the relation of the Gospel and Apocalypse on the linguistic side. Assuming that John the Apostle wrote the Gospel, Epistles and Apocalypse, we have the following situation. The Gospel of John has a well-defined character. There are few Hebraisms in detail beyond the use of **υἱοὶ φωτός** (12:36), **καί** in the sense of "and yet" or "but" (cf. Hebrew וְ and **καί** in LXX) as in 20:14, the absence of the particles save **οὖν**, and the constant co-ordination of the sentences with rhythmical parallelism. In the formal grammar the Greek is much like the vernacular (and literary) **κοινή** but the cast of thought is wholly Hebrew. Ewald[4] rightly calls its spirit "genuinely Hebrew," while Renan[5] even says that the Gospel "has nothing Hebrew" in its style. Godet[6] calls the Gospel a Hebrew body with a Greek dress and quotes Luthardt as saying that it "has a Hebrew soul in the Greek language." Schaff[7] compares Paul to an Alpine torrent and John to an Alpine lake. There is indeed in this Gospel great simplicity and profundity. John's vocabulary is somewhat limited, some 114 words (12 doubtful, Thayer, *Lexicon*, p. 704) be-

[1] Comm. on Heb., p. xlvi. [2] Exp. Times, Nov., 1906, p. 59.

[3] Cf. Drummond, Charac. and Author. of the Fourth Gosp., 1904; Sanday, Crit. of the Fourth Gosp., 1905; Bacon, The Fourth Gosp: in Res. and Debate, 1910.

[4] Quoted in Schaff, Comp. to Gk. N. T., p. 67.

[5] Ib. On p. 73 Schaff puts Jo. 1:18 side by side in Gk. and Heb The Heb. tone of the Gk. is clear.

[6] Comm. sur l'Evang. de S. Jean, vol. I, pp. 226, 232.

[7] Comp. to Gk. N. T., p. 66.

longing to the Gospel alone in the N. T. But the characteristic words are repeated many times, such as ἀλήθεια, ἁμαρτία, γινώσκω, δόξα, ζωή, κόσμος, κρίσις, λόγος, μαρτυρέω, πιστεύω, σκότος, φῶς, etc. "He rings the changes on a small number of elementary words and their synonyms."[1] But words like ἐκκλησία, εὐαγγέλιον, μετάνοια, παραβολή, πίστις, σοφία do not occur at all. However, too much must not be inferred from this fact, for πιστεύω and εὐαγγελίζω do appear very often.[2] Other characteristics of the Gospel are the common use of ἵνα in the non-final sense, the distinctive force of the pronouns (especially ἐκεῖνος, ἐμός, ἴδιος), the vivid use of the tenses (like Mark), the unusual use of οὖν,[3] ζωὴ αἰώνιος is frequent (21 times, and more than all the rest of the N. T.), frequent repetition, favourite synonyms.[4] The Johannine use of καί, δέ, ἀλλά, γάρ, εἰ, ὅτι, μή, οὐ, etc., is all interesting (see Abbott). The prepositions, the cases, the voices, the modes all yield good results in Abbott's hands. The Epistles of John possess the same general traits as the Gospel save that οὖν does not occur at all save in 3 Jo. 8 while ὅτι is very common. Καί is the usual connective. Only eight words are common alone to the Gospel and the Epistles in the N. T., while eleven are found in the Epistles and not in the Gospel. Westcott,[5] however, gives parallel sentences which show how common phrases and idioms recur in the Gospel and the First Epistle. The Apocalypse has much in common with the Gospel, as, for instance, no optative is found in either; ὅπως is not in either save in Jo. 11:57; ἵνα is very common in Gospel, 1 John and Apocalypse, more so than in any other book of the N. T. save Mark, and ἵνα μή is very common in Gospel and Apocalypse; οὖν is almost absent from the Apocalypse

[1] Abb., Joh. Vocab., p. 348.

[2] Ib., p. 158. Abbott has luminous remarks on such words as πιστεύω, ἐξουσία, and all phases of John's vocabulary.

[3] Occurs 195 times in the Gospel and only 8 of the instances in the discourses of Jesus. Nearly all of these are in the transitional sense. Cf. Abb., Joh. Gr., 1906, p. 165.

[4] On Joh. Synon. (like θεωρέω, ὁράω) see ch. III of Abbott's Joh. Vocab., 1905. In John ὁράω is not used in present (though often ἑώρακα), but βλέπω, and θεωρέω. Luke uses it also in present only 3 times, Heb. 2, Jas. 2, Ac. 8, Apoc. 18. On the whole subject of Joh. gr. see the same author's able work on Joh. Gr. (1906), which has a careful and exhaustive discussion of the most interesting points in the Gospel.

[5] Comm. on Epis. of Jo., pp. xli The absence of οὖν, when so characteristic of the Gospel, shows how precarious mere verbal argument is. Baur, Die Evang., p. 380, calls the Gospel the Apocalypse "transfigured." Cf. Blass on John's style, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 261, 276, 278 f., 291, 302.

as in Epistles and the discourses of Jesus, being common as transitional particle in narrative portion of Gospel[1]; ἄρα, common in other Evangelists and Paul, is not found in Gospel, Epistles or Apocalypse; μέν, so common in Matthew, Luke (Gospel and Acts), Paul and Hebrews, is not found at all in Apocalypse and John's Epistles and only eight times in his Gospel; ὥστε, which appears 95 times elsewhere in the N. T., is not found in Gospel, Epistles or Apocalypse save once in Jo. 3:16; μή ποτε, fairly common in Matthew, Luke and Hebrews, does not occur in John's writings save in Jo. 7:26 (Paul uses it also once only, 2 Tim. 2:25, preferring μή πως, which he alone uses, 13 exx.); μαρτυρέω is more frequent in Gospel than in 1 John and Apocalypse, but μαρτυρία is as common in Apocalypse as Gospel; ὄνομα is frequent in Gospel and Apocalypse as applied to God; οἶδα is found less often in Apocalypse than in Gospel; ἀληθινός is common in Gospel, Epistle and Apocalypse, though ἀληθής and ἀλήθεια do not appear in the Apocalypse; νικάω occurs only once in Gospel (16:33), but is common in 1 John and Apocalypse; δίδωμι is more frequent in Gospel and Apocalypse than in any other N. T. book (even Matt.); δείκνυμι appears about the same number of times in Gospel and Apocalypse; λόγος is applied to Christ in Jo. 1:1 and Rev. 19:13; the peculiar expression καὶ νῦν ἐστίν which occurs in John 5:25 is similar to the καί ἐσμεν of 1 Jo. 3:1, and the καὶ οὐκ εἰσί of Rev. 2:2, 3:9; all are fond of antithesis and parenthesis and repeat the article often. Over against these is to be placed the fact that the Apocalypse has 156 (33 doubtful) words not in the Gospel or Epistles, and only nine common alone to them. Certainly the subject-matter and spirit are different, for the Son of Thunder speaks in the Apocalypse. Dionysius[2] of Alexandria called the language Of the Apocalypse barbaric and ungrammatical because of the numerous departures from usual Greek assonance. The solecisms in the Apocalypse are not in the realm of accidence, for forms like ἀφῆκες, πέπτωκαν, διδῶ, etc., are common in the vernacular κοινή. The syntactical peculiarities are due partly to *constructio ad sensum* and *variatio structurae*. Some ("idiotisms" according to Dionysius) are designed, as the expression of the unchangeableness of God by ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν (1:4). As to ὁ ἦν the relative use of ὁ in Homer may be recalled. See also ἡ οὐαί in 11:14, ὅμοιον υἱόν in 14:14, οὐαὶ τοὺς κ. in 8:13. Benson

[1] Similarly τε, which occurs 160 times in the Acts, is found only 8 times in Luke's Gospel. Cf. Lee, Speaker's Comm., p. 457.

[2] Apud Eus. H. E., VII, xxv.

(*Apocalypse*) speaks of "a grammar of Ungrammar," which is a bold way of putting it. But the "solecisms" in the Apocalypse are chiefly cases of anacolutha. Concord is treated lightly in the free use of the nominative (1:5; 2:20; 3:12), in particular the participles λέγων, and ἔχων (4:1; 14:14); in the addition of a pronoun as in 3:8; in gender and number as in 7:9; in the use of parenthesis as in 1:5 f. Cf. Swete, *Apocalypse*, p. cxviii

The accusative, as in the vernacular κοινή (cf. modern Greek) has encroached upon other cases as with κατηγορεῖν (12:10). The participle is used freely and often absolutely in the nominative as ὁ νικῶν (2:26). Most of the variations in case are with the participle or in apposition, as ὁ μάρτυς after **Χριστοῦ** (1:5). Moulton[1] has called attention to the numerous examples of nominative apposition in the papyri, especially of the less educated kind. The old explanation of these grammatical variations was that they were Hebraisms, but Winer[2] long ago showed the absurdity of that idea. It is the frequency of these phenomena that calls for remark, not any isolated solecism in the Apocalypse. Moulton[3] denies that the Apocalypse has any Hebraisms. That is possibly going too far the other way, for the book is saturated with the apocalyptic images and phrases of Ezekiel and Daniel and is very much like the other Jewish apocalypses. It is not so much particular Hebraisms that meet us in the Apocalypse as the flavour of the LXX whose words are interwoven in the text at every turn. It is possible that in the Apocalypse we have the early style of John before he had lived in Ephesus, if the Apocalypse was written early. On the other hand the Apocalypse, as Bigg holds true

[1] Exp., 1904, p. 71. Cf. also Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 151; Reinhold, Graec. Patr. etc., p. 57 f.; Schlatter, Die Spr. and Heimat des vierten Evang. Schl. overemphasizes the Aramaic colour of the Gospel.

[2] W.-M., p. 671.

[3] Prol., p. 9. Cf. also Julicher, Intr. to N. T.; Bousset, Die Offenb. Joh., 1896; Lee, Speaker's Comm. on Rev. Swete (Apoc. of St. John, 1906, p. cxx) thinks that John's "eccentricities of syntax belong to more than one cause: some to the habit which he may have retained from early years of thinking in a Semitic language; some to the desire of giving movement and vivid reality to his visions, which leads him to report them after the manner of shorthand notes, jotted down at the time; some to the circumstances in which the book was written." The Apoc. "stands alone among Gk. literary writings in its disregard of the ordinary rules of syntax, and the success with which syntax is set aside without loss of perspicuity or even of literary power." Swete welcomes gladly the researches of Deissmann, Thumb and Moulton, but considers it precarious to compare a literary document like the Apoc. with slips in business letters, etc.

of 2 Peter, may represent John's real style, while the Gospel and Epistles may have been revised as to Greek idioms by a friend or friends of John in Ephesus (cf. Jo. 21:24). With this theory compare Josephus' *War* and *Antiquities*. One is slow (despite Moffatt's positiveness in the *Exp. Gk. Test*.), in the light of Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, to say that John could not have written the Apocalypse, though it be the last of his books. Besides what has been said one must recall that the Apocalypse was composed on the Isle of Patmos, in some excitement, and possibly without careful revision, while the Gospel and First Epistle probably had care and the assistance of cultured friends. At any rate the vernacular κοινή is far more in evidence in the Apocalypse than in the Gospel and Epistles. "As Dante had the choice between the accepted language of education, Latin, and the vulgar tongue, so St. John had to choose between a more artificial kind of Greek, as perpetuated from past teaching, and the common vulgar speech, often emancipated from strict grammatical rules, but nervous and vigorous, a true living speech.'"

VII. N. T. Greek Illustrated by the Modern Greek Vernacular. Constant use will be made of the modern Greek in the course of the Grammar. Here a brief survey is given merely to show how the colloquial κοινή survives in present-day Greek vernacular. Caution is necessary in such a comparison. The literary modern Greek has its affinities with the literary κοινή or even with the Atticists, while the vernacular of to-day often shows affinities with the less educated writers of papyri of the N. T. time. The N. T. did indeed have a great effect upon the later κοινή when theological questions were uppermost at Alexandria and Constantinople.[2] The cleavage between the literary and the vernacular became wider also. But apart from ecclesiastical terms there is a striking likeness at many points between the Vernacular κοινή and modern Greek vernacular, though modern Greek has, of course, Germanic and other elements[3] not in the κοινή. The diminutive[4] is more common in the modern Greek than in

[1] Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches, 1905, p. 209. In general isee Seeberg, Zur Charak. des Apost. Joh., Neue Kirch. Zeitschr., 1905, pp. 51-64.

[2] Cf. Gregory Naz., II, 13, A; Gregory Nyssa, III, 557 B; Reinhold, De Graec. Patr. etc., 1898.

[3] Thumb, Indoger. Forsch., 1903, p. 359 f. Boltz (Die hell. Spr., 1881, p. 10) quotes Rangabe as saying that the mod. Gk. is as far removed from that of the LXX as from that of Xenophon.

[4] Cf. Hatz., Einl. in d. neugr. Gr., p. 37 f., for list.

the κοινή and usually in ι, as τὸ ἀρνί. The optative is rare in the N. T.; in the modern Greek it has disappeared. The infinitive is vanishing before ἵνα in the N. T.; in the modern Greek νά has displaced it completely save with auxiliary verbs.[1] The accusative[2] in modern Greek has made still further headway and is used even with ἀπό and all prepositions. The μι verb has entirely vanished in modern Greek vernacular except εἶναι. The forms in —οσαν, —ουσαν are very common, as are the α forms in aorist and imperfect. The forms in –ες (–ας) for perfect and first aorist are also frequent. The middle voice has almost vanished as a separate voice (cf. Latin). Prepositions in the vernacular (chiefly εἰς) have displaced the dative. The superlative is usually expressed by the article and the comparative. Kennedy[3] gives an interesting list of words that appear either for the first time or with a new sense in the LXX or the N. T. (or the papyri) that preserve that meaning in the modern Greek, as δῶμα ('roof'), θυσιαστήριν ('altar'), καθηγητής ('professor,' in N. T. 'master'), ξενοδοχεῖον ('hotel,' in N. T. ξενοδοχέω = 'entertain strangers'), παιδεύω ('chastise,' from παῖς), φθάνω ('arrive'), χορτάζω ('feed'), etc. The list could be greatly extended, but let these suffice.[4] A specimen of modern Greek vernacular is given from Pallis' translation of Jo. 1:6-8: **Βγῆκε ἕνας ἄνθρωπος σταλμένος ἀπὸ τὸ θεό· τ᾽ ὄνομά του ᾽Ιωάνης. Αυτὸς ἦρθε γιὰ κήρυγμά γιὰ νὰ κηρύξει τὸ φῶς, ποὺ νὰ κάνει κι᾽ ὅλοι νὰ πιστέψουν. Δὲν εἶταν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς παρὰ γιὰ νὰ κηρύξει τὸ φῶς.** The literary modern Greek in these verses differs very little from the original N. T. text, only in the use of **ὑπῆρξεν, ὀνομαζόμενος, διὰ νά, δέν, ἦτο.** Moulton[5] in an interesting note gives some early illustrations of modern Greek vernacular. In the second century A.D. ἐσοῦ; is

[1] It still persists in Pontic-Cappadocian Gk. according to Thumb, Theol. Literaturzeit., 1903, p. 421.

[2] There is a riot of indifference as to case in the vernacular Byz. Gk., as σύν τῆς γυναικός. Cf. Mullach, Gr. der griech. Vulgarspr., p. 27. Jean Psichari, **Ῥόδα καὶ Μῆλα** (1906), has written a defence of the mod. Gk. vernac. and has shown its connection with the ancient vernac. The mod. Gk. has like freedom in the use of the genitive case (cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 32 ff.). Prepositions have displaced the partitive gen., the genitive of material and of comparison (abl.), in mod. Gk. The mod. Gk. shows the acc. displacing the gen. and dat. of the older Gk. (*op. cit*., p. 35 f.) after ἀκολουθῶ, ἀκούω, ἀπαντῶ, etc. The double acc. goes beyond anc. Gk. usages (*op. cit*., p. 36) as ὅλα ρόδινα τὰ βλέπω, 'I see everything rosy.'

[3] Sour. of N. T. Gk., pp. 153 ff.

[4] Cf. Thumb's Handb. der neugr. Volksspr. (1895); V. and D., Handb. to Mod. Gk. (1887); Thumb-Angus, Handb. of Mod. Gk. Vernac. (1912).

[5] Prol., p. 234.

found in OP 528. He quotes Thumb (BZ ix, 234) who cites from an inscription of the first century A.D. ἔχουσες as nominative and accusative plural. And Ramsay (*Cities and Bish.*, II, p. 537) gives ἐπιτηδεύσουν as third plural form on a Phrygian inscription of the third century A.D. As one illustration note Paul's use of κατέχω (Ro. 1:18). In modern Greek dialects κατέχω=ἠξεύρω, 'I know.'

PART II

ACCIDENCE

CHAPTER V

WORD–FORMATION

I. Etymology. Grammar was at first a branch of philosophy among the Greeks, and with the foundation of the Alexandrian library a new era began with the study of the text of Homer.[1] After Photius etymology "rules the whole later grammatical literature."[2] The Stoic grammarians were far better in etymology than in anything else and we owe them a real debt in this respect, though their extended struggle as to whether analogy or anomaly ruled in language has left its legacy in the long lists of "exceptions" in the grammars.[3] In some grammars the term etymology is still applied to the whole discussion of Forms or Accidence, *Formenlehre*. But to-day it is generally applied to the study of the original form and meaning of words.[4] The word ἐτυμολογία is, of course, from ἔτυμος and λόγος, and ἔτ-υμος, meaning 'real' or 'true,' is itself from the same root ετ— from which ἐτ-εός, 'true,' comes. So also ἐτ-άζω, 'to test.' Compare also Sanskrit *sat-yas*, 'true,' and *sat-yam*, 'truth,' as well as the Anglo-Saxon *soth*, 'sooth.' **Τὸ ἔτυμον** is the true literal sense of a word, the root. No more helpful remark can be made at this point than to insist on the importance of the student's seeing the original form and import of each word and suffix or prefix. This is not all that is needed by any means, but it is a beginning, and the right beginning.[5] "It was the comparative study of languages that first

[1] Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet. et Et. des Formes Grq. et Lat., 1901, p. 245.

[2] Reitzenstein, Gesch. der griech. Etym., 1897, p. vi.

[3] Steinthal, Gesch. der Sprachw. etc., 2. pp. 347 ff.

[4] "ὁ ἔτυμος λόγος heissit ja auch 'die wahre Bedeutung '; dass man hier ἔτυμος sagte und nicht ἀληθής, liegt daran, dass ionische Sophisten, namentlich Prodikos, die Etymologie und Synonymik aufbrachten." F. Blass, Hermen. und Krit., Bd. I, Muller's Handb. d. klass. Alt., 1892, p. 183.

[5] See Pott, Etym. Forsch., 1861; Curtius, Gk. Etym., vols. I, II, 1886; Prellwitz, Etym. Worterb. der griech. Spr., 1893; Brug. und Delb., Grundr. der vergl. Gr., 1897-1901; Skeat, Etym. Dict. of the Eng. Lang., etc.

gave etymology a surer hold."[1] Curtius means etymology in the modern sense, to be sure.

II. Roots.[2] It is not to be supposed that what are called roots necessarily existed in this form. They represent the original stock from which other words as a rule come. What the original words actually were we have no means of telling. They were not necessarily interjections, as some have supposed. Mere articulate sounds, unintelligible roots, did not constitute speech. Some interjections are not roots, but express ideas and can often be analyzed, as "jemine"=*Jesu Domine*.[3] Others, like most nursery words, are onomatopoetic. There is, besides, no evidence that primitive man could produce speech at will.[4] But a few root-words appear like the Latin *i* ('go') and probably the Greek ἴ (though ἠέ is found in Epic Greek). The number of Greek roots is comparatively few, not more than 400, probably less. Harris[5] observes that of the 90,000 words in a Greek lexicon only 40,000 are what are termed classic words. The new words, which are constantly made from slang or necessity, are usually made from one of the old roots by various combinations, or at any rate after the analogy of the old words.[6] Words are "the small coin of language,"[7] though some of them are sesquipedalian enough. There seem to be two ultimate kinds of words or roots, verbs and pronouns, and they were at last united into a single word as **φη-μί**, 'say I.'

[1] Curtius, Gk. Etym., vol. I, p. 16.

[2] The whole subject of N. T. lexicography calls for reworking. Deissmann is known to be at work on a N. T. Lex. in the light of the pap. and the inscr. Meanwhile reference can be made to his Bible Studies, Light, and his New Light on the N. T.; to J. H. Moulton's articles in the Exp. (1901, 1903, 1904, 1908); to Kennedy's Sour. of N. T. Gk. (for LXX and N. T.); to Thayer's N. T. Gk. Lex. and his art. on Lang., of N. T. in Hast. D. B.; to Cremer's Theol. Lex. of N. T.; to Mayser's Gr. d. griech. Pap. For the LXX phenomena see careful discussion of Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 112-136. Nothing like an exhaustive discussion of N. T. word-formation can yet be attempted. But what is here given aims to follow the lines of historical and comparative grammar. We must wait in patience for Deissmann's Lex. George Milligan is at work with Moulton on his Vocabulary of the New Testament. Cf. also Nageli, Der Wortsch. des Apost. Paulus, a portion of which has appeared. Especially valuable is Abb. Joh. Vocab. (1905). For the LXX cf. also Swete, Intr. to 0. T. in Gk., pp. 302-304. The indices to the lists of inscr. and pap. can also be consulted with profit.

[3] Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 181.

[4] Ib., p. 187.

[5] MS. notes on Gk. Gr.

[6] Cf. on slang, Wedgwood, Intr. to the Dict. of the Eng. Lang.; Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 175.

[7] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 235.

It does not seem possible to distinguish between verbal and nominal roots, as in English to-day the same word is indifferently verb or noun, "walk," for instance. The modern view is that verbs are nominal in origin (Hirt, *Handb*., p. 201). The pronominal roots may furnish most of the suffixes for both verbs (ῥήματα) and nouns (ὀνόματα). Verbs, substantives and pronouns (ἀντωνομίαι), therefore, constitute the earliest parts of speech, and all the others are developed from these three.[1] Adjectives (ὀνόματα ἐπίθετα) are merely variations from substantives or pronouns. Adverbs (ἐπιρρήματα) are fixed case-forms of substantives or adjectives or pronouns. Prepositions (προθέσεις) are adverbs used with nouns or with verbs (in composition). Conjunctions (σύνδεσμοι) are adverbs used to connect words and sentences in various ways. Intensive (ἐπιτάσεως) particles are adverbs from nominal or pronominal stems of a special kind. Speech has made a very small beginning with isolated words; in fact the sentence is probably as old as human speech, though we first discuss words.[2] The number of root-words with the mere ending is not very great, but some few survive even in the N. T., where the case-ending is added directly to the root, as ἅλ-ς (ἅλα, Mk. 9:50), with which compare Latin *sal*, English *sal-t*. So ναῦς (Ac. 27:41), Latin *nau-is*. Instead of ἅλς the N. T. elsewhere follows the κοινή in using τὸ ἅλας, and τὸ πλοῖον instead of ναῦς. In πούς (πόδ-ς) the root is only slightly changed after the loss of δ (analogy of οὖς or ὀδούς). The pronoun εἷς (ἕν-ς) is similarly explained. Pronouns and numerals use the root directly. In verbs we have many more such roots used directly with the personal endings without the thematic vowel ο/ε and sometimes without any tense-suffix for the present, like φη-μί (φα-μί). The whole subject of verbs is much more complicated, but in general the non-thematic forms are rapidly disappearing in the N. T., while in the vernacular modern Greek the non-thematic or μι verbs are no longer used (save in the case of εἶμαι), as δίδω for δίδω-μι, for instance. A number of these roots go back to the common Indo-Germanic stock. Take δικ, the root of δείκνυ-μι. The Sanskrit has *dic-a-mi*; the Latin *dic-o*, *in-dic-o*, *ju-dex*; the Gothic *teiho*; the German *zeigen*. Take the thematic verb σκέπ-το-μαι. The Sanskrit root is *spac* (‘look’), *spac*= spy. The Zend has *cpac*, the Latin *spec-io, spec-alum, spec-to*, etc. In the Greek root metathesis has taken place and σπεκ has become

[1] Uber das relative Alter der einen oder der anderen Wortklasse sich nichts Sicheres ausmachen" (Vogrinz, Gr. des horn. Dial., 1889, p. 164).

[2] Brug., Furze vergl. Gr., p. 281.

σκεπ in σκέπ-το-μαι ('to spy out'), σκοπ-ή ('a watching'), σκοπ-ιά ('a watch-tower'), σκοπ-ός ('a spy,' 'a goal'), σκώψ ('owl').[1] Cf. Ph. 3:14 κατὰ σκοπόν. The old Greek writers[2] made μυστήριον= μῦς τηρεῖν!

III. Words with Formative Suffixes. The Indo-Germanic languages have a highly developed system of affixes,[3] prefixes, infixes, suffixes. The suffixes are used for various purposes, as case-endings of nouns, as personal endings of verbs, as aids in the creation of words (formative suffixes). The Greek is rich in these formative suffixes, which are more or less popular at various periods of the language. The suffixes in the Greek are quite similar to those in the older Sanskrit. When the formative suffixes are used directly with the root, the words are called primitives; when the stem of the word is not a root, it is called a derivative. Hence there are primitive and derivative verbs, primitive and derivative substantives, primitive and derivative adjectives. There are, of course, in the N. T. Greek no "special" formative suffixes, though the κοινή does vary naturally in the relative use of these terminations from the earlier language. In the modern Greek a number of new suffixes appear like the diminutives –πουλος (πῶλος, 'foal'), κτλ. "In all essentials the old patterns are adhered to" in the N. T. word-formation.[4] See also Hadley-Allen (pp. 188 ff.) for the meaning of the Greek formative suffixes.

(a) VERBS. On the stem-building of the verb one can consult Hirt or Brugmann for the new point of view.[5] Without attempting a complete list of the new words in the κοινή, I give what is, I trust, a just interpretation of the facts concerning the new words appearing from the time of Aristotle on that we find in the N. T. Hence some classes of words are not treated.

1. *Primary or Primitive Verbs.* No new roots are used to make verbs with old or new terminations[6] in the κοινή. The ten-

[1] Cf. Rachel White, Cl. Rev., 1906, pp. 203 ff., for interesting study of ἐπισκήπτω.

[2] Blass, Hermen. und Krit, Bd. I, p. 191. Heine, Synon. des neutest. Griech., 1898, has a very helpful discussion of N. T. word-building (pp. 28-65), but does not distinguish the κοινή words.

[3] Next to Sans. Gk. uses more inflections and so more affixes. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 45.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 61. On the whole subject of word-building see Brug., Griech. Gr., 1900, pp. 160-362; K.-B1., Bd. II, Ausf. Gr., pp. 254-340.

[5] Brug. *op. cit.* Hirt, Handb. der griech. Laut- und Formenl., 1902, pp. 360-391.

[6] Schmid, Der Atticis. etc., 4. Bd., p. 702.

dency is all towards the dropping of the non-thematic or **μι**. forms both with the simple root and with the suffix. The remnants of the **μι** forms, which are not quite obsolete in the N. T., will be given in the chapter on the Conjugation of the Verb. Here may be mentioned **ἀπόλλυμι**, which uses the suffix **–νυ**.[1] Thematic verbs made from the root by the addition of **ο/ε** are very common, like **λέγ-ω, λείπ-ω (λιπ)**. The N. T., as the **κοινή**, has new presents like **κρύβω, νίπτω, χύννω**, etc. These kept increasing and are vouched for by modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, *Handbook*, pp. 129 ff.

2. *Secondary or Derivative Verbs*. Not all of these verbs are formed from nouns; many come also from verbs. Denominatives are made from nouns, like **τιμά-ω** from **τιμή**, while verbals (post-verbals, Jannaris[2]) are made from verbs. The simple denominatives,[3] ending in **–ὰω, –έω, --εύω, --άζω, --ίζω** are not always distinguished from the intensive verbals or the causative denominatives, though **–άω, –αίνω, --ύνω** more commonly represent the latter. **᾽Οπτάνω** (from **ὄπτω**) besides Ac. 1:3 appears in the LXX, Hermes, Tebt. Papyri. Cf. also the rare **λιμπάνω**. The **κοινή** is rich in new verbs in **--νω.** Verbs in **–άω** are common in the N. T., as in the **κοινή**, like **τιμάω, διψάω, ζάω**, etc. **᾽Ανα-ζάω** occurs in Artem., Photius, inscriptions, etc. In the modern Greek verbs in **–άω** have gained at the expense of verbs in **–εω**.[4] They belong to the oldest Greek speech and come from feminine stems in **–α**.[5] Verbs in **–άζω** show great increase in the N. T. as in the **κοινή** and modern Greek,[6] like **ἁγιάζω (ἅγιος, ἁγίζω**, LXX), **ἐνταφιάζω (ἐντάφια**, Anthol., Plut.), **νηπιάζω (νήπιος)** in Hippocrates, **στυγνάζω** (from **στυγνός**) in Schol. on AEsch. and in LXX **σινιάζω** (**σινίον**, eccl., Byz.). **Πυρράζω** (Mt. 16:2 f.) occurs in LXX and Philo, but W. H. reject this passage.

The majority of the new verbs in **–έω** are compound, as **ἀσχημονέω, πληροφορέω** (**πληρο-φόρος**, LXX, pap.), but **δυνατέω** (only in N. T.) is to be noticed on the other side.[7] **᾽Ακαιρέω** (from **ἄκαιρος**) is found

[1] On history of the **μι** verbs see Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 234. In the pap. verbs in **-υμι** keep the non-thematic form in the middle, while in the active both appear. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 3S.

[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 300.

[3] Harris, MS. Notes on Gk. Gr.

[4] Thumb, Handb., p. 175; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 218, 300.

[5] Sutterlin, Gesch. der Verba Denom. in Altgriech., 1891, p. 7. Cf. also Pfordten, Zur Gesch. der griech. Denom., 1886. Mayser (Gr., pp. 459-466) has an interesting list of derivative verbs in the Ptol. pap. Cf. Frankel, Gr. Den.

[6] Thumb, Handb. of Mod. Gk., V., p. 135 f. There is frequent interchange between forms in **–άζω, --ίζω** and **–ῶ**.

[7] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 61.

in Diodorus; εὐπροσωπέω (εὐπρόσωπος) is found in Gal. 6:12 (in papyri, 114 B.c.; ὅπως εὐπροσωπῶμεν, Tebt. P. No. 1912 f.). Cf. Moulton, *Expositor*, 1903, p. 114. These verbs have always been very numerous, though –εω gradually retreats before –αω. **Γρηγορέω** (Arist., LXX, Jos.) is formed from the perfect ἐγρήγορα, which is not in the N. T., but Winer long ago found a similar form in ἐπικεχειρέω (Papyri Taurin. 7).[1] **Ἐλαττονέω** (Arist., LXX, pap.) is from ἔλλατον. **Ἐλλογέω** (and –άω) is in inscriptions and papyri. **Ἐξακολουθέω** (Polyb., Plut., inscriptions) is not "biblical" as Thayer called it. **Αὐθεντέω** (αὐθέντης, αὐτός and ἔντεα) is in the κοινή, according to Moeris, for the Attic αὐτοδικέω. (In the late papyri see Deissmann, *Light*, p. 85.) No great distinction in sense exists between –άω and —έω.

Verbs in –εύω are also very common and are formed from a great variety of stems. **Αἰχμαλωτεύω** (from αἰχμάλωτος) is read in 2 Tim. 3:6 only by D^c EKL al. p1. Or., the form in –ίζω being genuine. It is, however, common in the LXX, as is ἐγκρατεύομαι (1 Cor. 9:25), from ἐγκρατής (in Aristotle). **Γυμνιτεύω** (not γυμνητεύω, Dio Chrys., Plut., Dio Cass., etc.) is found in 1 Cor. 4:11 and is from γυμνήτης. **Ζήλευε** (Simplic., Democr.), not ζήλωσον, is the correct text in Rev. 3:19 (so W. H. with ABC against ℵP). Both are from ζῆλος. **θριαμβεύω** (from θρίαμβος) is in the literary κοινή.[2] **Ἱερατεύω** (Lu. 1:8) is from ἱερεύς and is found in the LXX, the κοινή writers and the inscriptions. **Μεσιτεύω** (Heb. 6:17) is from μεσίτης and is found in Arist., Polyb. and papyri. **Μαθητεύω** is from μαθητής (Plut., Jambl.); **ὀλοθρεύω** (Heb. 11:28, LXX) is from ὄλεθρος (ADE read ὀλεθρεύων in Heb. 11:28). In Ac. 3:23 ἐξολεθρεύω) is the form accepted by W. H. after the best MSS. of the LXX.[3] **Παγιδεύω** (Mt. 22 : 15) is from παγίς and occurs in the LXX. **Παρα-βολεύομαι** is the correct word in Ph. 2:30 against CKLP which read παρα-βουλεύομαι. The word is from παρά-βολος, which has not been found in other writers, but an inscription (ii/A.D.) at Olbia on the Black Sea has the very form παραβολευσάμενος used by Paul (cf. Deissmann, *Light*, p. 84). **Περπερεύομαι** (1 Cor. 13:4) is made from πέρπερος and is found in

[1] W.-M., p. 115.

[2] Cf. θρίαμβον εἰσάγιν, *triumphum agere*. Goetzeler, Einfl. d. Dion. von Ital. auf d. Sprachgeb. d. Plut., 1891, p. 203. Deiss. (Light, p. 368) gives this word (with ἀρετή, ἐξουσία, δόξα, ἰσχύς, κράτος, μεγαλειότης) as proof of a parallel between the language of the imperial cult and of Christianity.

[3] Cf. W.-M., note, p. 114. Mayser (Gr., pp. 415-509) gives a very complete discussion of "Stammbildung" in the Ptol. pap.

Antoninus. **Χρηστεύομαι** is from χρηστός. Three verbs in –θω appear which are made from verbs in –άω and –εω, viz. ἀλήθω (ἀλέω), κνήθω (κνάω) νήθω (νέω), one (νήθω) being found also in Plato Polit. (p. 289 c). Cf. modern Greek **θέτω (τίθημι)**.

The causative ending –**όω** is usually formed on noun-stems and is very common, sometimes supplanting verbs in –**εύω** or –**ίζω,** as ἀνα-**καινόω** (Isocrates, ἀνακαινίζω),[1] **ἀναστατόω** (from ἀνάστατος, LXX, papyri. Cf. **ἀναστατοῖ με**, 'he upsets me,' Deissmann, *Light*, p. 81); **ἀφ-υπνόω** (*Anthol*., classical **ἀφυπνίζω**); **δεκατόω** (classical **δεκατεύω**); **δολιόω** (LXX, from **δόλιος**); **δυναμόω** (LXX, eccl. and Byz., from **δύναμις**); **ἐξουδενόω** (often in LXX, but W. H. read **ἐξουδενέω** in Mk. 9:12, Plutarch even **ἐξουδενίζω**); **θεμελιόω** (LXX) is from **θεμέλιον**; **καυσόω** (from **καῦσος**, Disc., Galen); **κεφαλιόω** (Lob., *ad Phryn*., p. 95, **κεφαλίζω**, though not in any known Greek author) W. H. read in Mk. 12:4 with **ℵ**BL as against **κεφαλαιόω** and it means 'beat on the head' (cf. **κολαφίζω**). So **κολοβόω** (from **κόλοβος,** Arist., Polyb., Diod.); **νεκρόω** (from **νεκρός**, Plut., Epict., M. Aur., inscriptions); **κραταιόω** (LXX, eccl.), from **κρατύνω**; **σαρόω** (Artem., Apoll., Dysc.), from **σαίρω** (**σάρος**); **σημειόω** (from **σημεῖον**, Theoph., Polyb., LXX, Philo, Dion. Hal., etc.); **σθενόω** (Rhet. Gr.), from **σθενέω** (**σθένος**); **χαριτόω** (LXX, Jos., eccl.), from **χάρις**. Verbs in –**όω** do not always have the full causative idea,[2] **ἀξιόω**='deem worthy' and **δικαιόω**='deem righteous.'

Verbs in –**ίζω** do not necessarily represent repetition or intensity. They sometimes have a causative idea and then again lose even that distinctive note and supplant the older form of the word. Forms in –**ίζω** are very common in modern Greek. **῾Ραντίζω** (LXX, Athen.), for instance, in the N. T. has displaced **ῥαίνω**, and **βαπτίζω** (since Plato) has nearly supplanted **βάπτω**. These verbs come from many sorts of roots and are very frequent in the N. T., as the **κοινή** is lavish with them. The new formations in the **κοινή** appearing in the N. T. are as follows: **αἱρετίζω** (from **αἱρετός**, LXX, inscriptions); **αἰχμαλωτίζω** (literary **κοινή** and LXX), from **αἰχμάλωτος**; **ἀναθεματίζω** (LXX and inscriptions), from **ἀνάθεμα**; **ἀνεμίζω** (Jas. 1:6) is found in schol. on Hom. Od. 12, 336, the old form being **ἀνεμόω**; **ἀτενίζω** (from **ἀτενής,** Arist., Polyb., Jos.); **δειγματίζω** (from **δεῖγμα**) appears in apocryphal Acts of Peter and Paul; **δογματίζω** (from **δόγμα**) is in Diodorus and the LXX; **ἐγγίζω** (from **ἐγγύς**, from Polyb. and Diod. on); **ἐξ-υπνίζω** (from **ὕπνος** LXX, Plut.); **θεατρίζω** (from **θέατρον**) in ecclesiastical and Byzantine writers, **ἐκθεατρίζω** being in Polybius; **ἱματίζω** (from **ἱμάτιον**) is

[1] Cf. Zur Gesch. der Verba Denom., p. 95. [2] Ib.

found in Serapeum papyrus 163 B.C.; ἰουδαΐζω (from Ἰουδαῖος) is found in the LXX and Josephus and is formed like ἑλληνίζω and, similar ethnic terms; καθαρίζω (classic καθαίρω, from καθαρός, LXX, Jos., inscriptions); κρυσταλλίζω (from κρύσταλλος, Rev. 21:11) is still "not found elsewhere" (Thayer); μυκτηρίζω (from μυκτήρ, the nose') is in the LXX; ὀρθρίζω (from ὄρθρος) is in the LXX; πελεκίζω (from πέλεκυς) is common in literary κοινή; σκορπίζω (akin to σκορπίος, root *skerp*) is in LXX and in literary κοινή, Attic form being σκεδάννυμι, old Ionic according to Phrynichus; σπλαγχνίζομαι (from σπλάγχνα, Heb. וַחֲמִים) occurs in LXX, Attic had an active σπλαγχνεύω; συμμορφίζω (from σύμμορφος) is the correct text in Ph. 3:10 against συμμορφόω (EKL), though neither word is known elsewhere, perhaps coined by Paul; φυλακίζω (from rom φυλακή) is in LXX and Byzantine writers. Of verbs in –ύζω, γογγύζω (onomatopoetic, like τονθρύζω of the cooing of doves) is in the LXX and the papyri.

Verbs in –ύνω are fairly common, like παροξύνω. Only one word calls for mention, σκληρύνω (from σκληρός), which takes the place of the rare σκληρόω and is found in LXX and Hippocrates. No new verbs in –αίνω (like εὐφραινω) appear in the N. T. Verbs in –σκω are, like the Latin verbs in –*sco*, generally either inchoative or causative. It is not a very common termination in the N. T., though εὑρίσκω, γινώσκω and διδάσκω occur very often, but these are not derivative verbs. In the N. T. the inchoative sense is greatly weakened. The suffix belongs to the present and the imperfect only. In modern Greek it has nearly disappeared save in the dialects.[1] Γαμίσκω (accepted by W. H. in Lu. 20:34) rather than γαμίζω is causative (Arist. pol.); γηράσκω and μεθύσκω both come from the earlier Greek.[2] Ἐν-διδύ-σκω occurs in the LXX, Jos., inscriptions. The new present στήκω (Mk. 11:25) is made from the perfect stem ἕστηκα (στέκω in modern Greek). As in N. T., so in modern Greek desideratives in –σείω, –σιάω drop out. The verbs in –ιάω still retained (ἀγαλλιάω, ἀροτρ-ιάω, θυμ-ιάω, κοπ-ιάω) have no desiderative meaning. Of these ἀγαλλιάω, for the old ἀγάλλομαι, is late κοινή; ἀροτριάω is from Theophr. on, κοπιάω is late in the sense of 'toil.' No new reduplicated verbs appear in the N. T.

(b) SUBSTANTIVES.

1. *Primary or Primitive Substantives*. Here the formative (stem-suffix) suffix is added to the root. It is important to seek the

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 302; Thumb, Handb., p. 133.

[2] Cf. Donaldson, New Crat., p. 615, for discussion of –σκω verbs.

meaning not only of the root, but of this formative suffix also when possible. The root has in most cases the strong form, as in λόγ(λεγ)-ο-ς. These substantives are thus from the same root as the verb. With —μό-ς, --μή, expressing action, are formed in the old Greek words like θύ-μός, -τι-μή. With —μα, denoting result, we find ἀντ-απόδο-μα (LXX, old Greek ἀντ-από-δο-σις, from ἀντ-απο-δίδωμι); διά-στη-μα (from δι-ίστημι Arist., Polyb., Philo); ἔν-δυ-μα (from ἐν-δύω, LXX, Strabo, Jos., Plut.); θέλη-μα (from θέλω, Arist. and LXX); κατά-κρι-μα (from κατα-κρίνω, Dion. Hal., pap.); κατά-λυ-μα (from κατα-λύ-ω, literary κοινή for old κατ-αγωγεῖον, and with idea of place); κατά-στη-μα (καθ-ίστη-μι, Plut. and the LXX); κτίσ-μα (from κτίζω Strabo, Dion. Hal.); πρόσ-κομ-μα (from προσ-κόπ-τω, in LXX and Plut.). The suffix —σι-ς, meaning action (abstract), appears in ἀνά-βλεψ-ις (Arist., LXX); ἀνά-δειξ-ις (from ἀνα-δείκ-νυ-μι-- Plut., Diod., Strabo, Sirach); θέλη-σις in Heb. 2:4 (from θέλω), a "vulgarism," according to Pollux); κατά-νυξ-ις (from κατα-νύσσ-ω, LXX); κατά-κρισις (from κατα-κρίνω, Vettius Valens, eccl.); πε-ποίθ-η-σις (from πέ-ποιθ-α, πείθω, Josephus and Philo, condemned by the Atticists); πρόσ-κλι-σις (from προσ-κλίν-ω, Polyb. and Diod.); πρόσ-χυ-σις (from προσ-χέ-ω, Justin Martyr and later). The suffix —μονή is used with πεισ-μονή (from πείθω, Ignatius and later) and επι-λησ-μονή (ἐπι-λανθ-άνω, ἐπι-λήσ-μων, Sirach). Σαγ-ήνη (LXX, Plut., Lucian) has suffix —ήνη (cf. —ονο, --ονη, etc.). Δια-σπορ-ά (δια-σπείρω, LXX, Plut.) and προσ-ευχ-ή (προσ-εύχ-ομαι, LXX, inscriptions) use the suffix —α (—η). Cf. ἀπο-γραφ-ή (N. T., papyri), ἀπο-δοχή (inscriptions), βροχή (papyri), ἐμπλοκή (ἐμπλέκω inscriptions), δια-ταγή (δια-τάσσω, papyri, inscriptions, later writings). The agent is usually —της (Blass, *Gr*., p. 62), not —τωρ or —τηρ as in διώκτης (from διώκω, earliest example) and δό-της (from δί-δω-μι, classic δοτήρ. But cf. σω-τήρ). See γνώστης (γι-νώσκω, LXX, Plut.), κτίσ-της (κτίζω, Arist., Plut., LXX), ἐπι-στάτης (only in Luke, ἐφίστημι). See further under compound words for more examples. In modern Greek —της is preserved, but —τωρ and τηρ become —τορης, —τηρας. Jannaris, *op. cit*., p. 288; Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 49. I pass by words in –ευς, —μην, --τρον, etc.

2. *Secondary or Derivative Substantives*. Only important words not in common use in the older Greek can be mentioned.

(a) *Those from verbs.* Words in —μός expressing action. From verbs in —άζω come ἁγιασ-μός (ancient Greek ἁγίζω, but later form common in LXX and N. T.); ἁγνισ-μός (from ἁγνίζω, Dion. Hal., LXX, Plut.); ἁπαρτισ-μός (Dion. Hal., Apoll. Dysc., papyri); ἁρπαγ-μός (ἁρπάζω is from root ἁρπ, like Latin *rapio*. Ἁρπαγ-μός once

in Plutarch, ἁρπαγή common from AEschylus)[1]; γογγυσ-μός (from γογγύζω, Antonin.); ἐνταφιασ-μός (Plutarch and scholia to Eur. and Arist., ἐνταφιάζω); ἱματισ-μός (from ἱματίζω, LXX, Theophr.,Polyb., Diod., Plut., Athen.); πειρασ-μός (from πειράζω and common in the LXX). From verbs in –ίζω have βαπτισ-μός (Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 62) used by Josephus of John's baptism,[2] but not in the N. T. of the ordinance of baptism, save in Col. 2:12, in א° BD*FG 47, 67**, 71, a Western reading rejected by W. H.; ὀνειδισ-μός (Plutarch and Dion. Hal.); παροργισ-μός (not found earlier than LXX nor in κοινή writers, Dion. uses παροργίζω); ποριστ-μός (Sap., Polyb., Jos., Plut., Test. XII Patr.); ῥαντισ-μός (LXX); σαββατισ-μός (Plut. and eccl. writers); σωφρονισ-μός (Jos., Plut., etc.); ψιθυρισ-μός (from ψιθυρίζω, LXX, Clem. Rom., Plut., onomatopoetic word for the hissing of the snake). The ending –μός survives in literary modern Greek. Cf. Jannaris, *op. cit.*, p. 288. The tendency to make new words in —μός decreased. The modern Greek vernacular dropped it (Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 62).

Abstract nouns in —σις are βίω-σις (in Sirach, from βιόω); ἀνα-καίνω-σις (ἀνα-καινό-ω, *Etym. M. Herm.*); ἀπάντη-σις (ἀπ-αντά-ω, LXX, Polyb., Diod., papyri); ἀπο-κάλυψις (LXX, Plut.); ἀπο-κατά-στα-σις (Poly ., Diod., papyri, etc.); ἀπο-στα-σία (LXX); ἐκζήτη-σις (ἐκ-ζητέω, true text in 1 Tim. 1:4, Basil Caes., Didym.); ἐν-δόμη-σις (from ἐνδομέω, Jos., also ἐνδώμησις) ἐπιπόθη-σις (LXX, from ἐπι-ποθέω); ὑπ-άντη-σις (LXX, Jos., App.). Words in –σις, common in Hebrews, make few new formations in the later Greek. Ἀγάπη begins to displace ἀγάπησις (LXX, inscription in Pisidia, and papyrus in Herculaneum). Abstract nouns in —εία (W. H. –ία) are chieiiy from verbs in –εύω as ἀρεσκεία (from ἀρεσκεύω, Polyb., Diod., papyri, and usually in bad sense); ἐπι-πόθεια (so W. H., not ἐπι-ποθία, in Ro. 15:23, from ἐπιποθέω probably by analogy like ἐπιθυμία. Not found elsewhere). Ἐριθεία (from ἐριθεύω, Arist pol. The verb from ἔριθος, 'working for hire'); ἱερατεία (from ἱερατεύω, Arist. pol., Dion. Hal., LXX, inscriptions); λογεία (—ία) is from λογεύω (‘collect’) and is found in inscriptions, ostraca, papyri (see Deissmann, *Light*, p. 105); μεθοδεία (from μεθοδεύω, which occurs in the κοινή, from μέθοδος, but not the abstract noun).

[1] Rutherford, New Phryn., p. 407; Donaldson, New Crat., p. 451; Lightfoot on Ph. 2:6.

[2] Ant. 18. 5, Cf. Sturtevant, Stud. in Gk. Noun-Formation (Cl. Philol., vii, 4, 1912). For long list of derivative substantives in the Ptol. pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 416-447.

From ὀφείλω we have ὀφειλή (common in the papyri), ὀφείλημα (Plato, Arist., LXX). Words in –μα (result) are more common in the later Greek and gradually take an abstract idea of –σις in modern Greek.[1] The new formations appearing in the N. T. are ἀ-γνόη-μα (0. T. Apoc., from ἀγνοέω); αἰτίω-μα (correct text in Ac. 25:7, and not αἰτίαμα, from αἰτιάομαι). Cf. αἰτίωσις in Eustathius, p. 1422, 21. This form as yet not found elsewhere); ἄντλημα (from ἀντλέω, Plut., what is drawn, and then strangely a thing to draw with, like ἀντλητήρ or ἀντλητήριον); ἀπ-αύγασ-μα (from ἀπαυγάζω, and this from ἀπό and αὐγή, in Wisdom and Philo); ἀπο-σκίασ-μα (from ἀποσκιάζω, and this from ἀπό and σκιά. Only in Jas. 1:17); ἀσθένη-μα (from ἀσθενέω, in physical sense in Arist. hist., papyri); βάπτισ-μα (from βαπτίζω), "peculiar to N. T. and ecclesiastical writers," Thayer). In βάπτισ-μα, as distinct from βαπτισ-μός, the result of the act is included (cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 62); ἐξέρα-μα (from ἐξεράω, in Dioscor., example of the verb, cf. Lob., *ad Phryn*., p. 64); ἧττη-μα (from ἡττάο-μαι, LXX, in ecclesiastical writers); ἱεράτευ-μα (from ἱερατεύω, LXX); κατ-όρθω-μα (from κατ-ορθόω, literary as Polyb., Diod., Strabo, Jos., Plut., Lucian and 3 Macc.); ῥάπισ-μα (from ῥαπίζω, Antiph., *Anthol*., Lucian); στερέω-μα (from στερεόω, Arist., LXX). Blass[2] calls attention to the fact that in the later Greek words in –μα, like those in –σις, –της, --τος often prefer stems with a short vowel, as δόμα (δόσις), θέμα (θέσις), though this form is already in the older Doric, κλί-μα, κρί-μα, πόμα (Attic πῶμα). Hence ἀνάθε-μα in N. T., though ἀνάθημα in Lu. 21:5 (W. H. acc. to BLQΓ, etc.), and in the papyri "nouns in –μα are constantly showing short penult."[3] But ἀνάθεμα, like θέμα and δόμα, belongs to the list of primary substantives.

Words in --της (agent) are fairly numerous, like βαπτισ-τής (from βαπτίζω, Jos.); βιασ-της (from βιάζω. Pind., Pyth. and others use βιατάς); γογγυσ-τής (from γογγύζω, Theodotion and Symm. translation of the LXX); ἑλληνισ-τής (from ἑλληνίζω, not in Greek authors, though ἑλληνίζω is, as in Xen., *Anab*., and Strabo, etc.); ἐξ-ορκισ-τής (from ἐξ-ορκίζω, Jos., Lucian, eccl. writers); εὐαγγελισ-τής

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 289. Thumb, Handb., p. 65. On frequency in LXX see C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 28. Cf. Frankel, Griech. Denom., 1906.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 62 f. For same thing in LXX (ἀνάθεμα, πρόσθεμα, δόμα, etc.) H C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 28.

[3] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 108. He instances besides ἀνάθεμα in the sense of 'curse,' θέμα, ἐπίθεμα, πρόσθεμα, πρόδομα. On ἀνάθεμα, for exx. in iii/B.C. inscr., see Glaser, De Rat., quae interc. inter Berm. Polyb. etc., 1894, p. 82.

(from εὐαγγελίζω, eccl. writers); κερματισ-τής (from κερματίζω, Nicet., Max. Tyr.); κολλυβις-της (found in Men. and Lys.) has no verb κολλυβίζω, but only κόλλυβος, a small coin; λυτρω-τής (from λυτρόω, LXX and Philo); μερισ-τής (from μερίζω, Pollux); προσ-κυνη-τής (from προσκυνέω, inscriptions, eccl. and Byz.); στασιασ-τής (from στασιάζω, Diod., Dion. Hal., Jos., Ptol.); τελειω-τής (from τελειόω, only in Heb. 12:2).

A few late words in –τήρ-ιον (from –τηρ and –ιον) occur as ἀκροα-τήριον (from ἀκροάομαι, Plut. and other κοινή writers) where --τήριον means 'place'; ἱλασ-τήριον (from ἱλάσκομαι, LXX, inscriptions, papyri, Dio Chrys.) is a substantive in the N. T., made probably from the adjective ἱλαστήριος (cf. σωτήριος) and means 'propitiatory gift' or 'means of propitiation' and does not allude to the mercy seat[1] or covering. However, in Heb. 9:5 ἱλαστήριον does have the meaning of 'place of propitiation' or 'mercy seat' (cf. θυμια-τήριον). Deissmann passed this passage by, though he is correct in Ro. 3:25. Cf. φυλακτήριον.

(β) *Those from substantives*. Several words expressing place are formed after the fashion of the older Greek as ἀφεδρών (probably from the Macedonian ἄφεδρος, and that from ἕδρα and ἀπό) which may be compared with κοπρών; βραβεῖον (from βραβεύς, Menand. Mon., Opp,, Lycoph., Clem. Rom.); ἐλαιών (from ἔλαιον, like ἀμπελ-ών from ἄμπελος, in the LXX, Jos., inscriptions and papyri),[2] with which compare μυλών (--ῶνος) in Mt. 24:41 according to DHM and most cursives instead of μύλος. Moulton (*The Expositor*, 1903, p. 111) has found φοικών (—ῶνος), 'palm-grove,' in A. P. 31 (112 B.C.). Εἰδωλεῖον (–ιον W. H.), found first in 1 Macc. and 1 Esd., is formed after the analogy of μουσε-ῖο-ν. Τελώνιον (from τελώνης) is found in Strabo. Τετράδιον (Philo) is from τετράς, the usual guard in the prisons. Several new words in —της (quality) appear, as ἀδελφότης (from ἀδελφός, 1 Macc., 4 Macc., Dio Chrys., eccl. writers); θεό-της (from θεός, Lucian, Plut.); κυριό-της

[1] See Deiss., B. S., p. 131 f., where a lucid and conclusive discussion of the controversy over this word is given. See also Zeitschr. fur neutest. Wiss., 4 (1903), p. 193.

[2] Blass is unduly sceptical (Gr., p. 64). Deiss. (B. S., p. 208 f.) finds nine examples of ἐλαιών= 'place of olives' or 'olive orchard' in vol. I of the Ber. Pap., and Moulton (Exp., 1903, p. 111; Prol., p. 49) has discovered over thirty in the first three centuries A.D. In Ac. 1:12 it is read by all MSS. and is correct in Lu. 19:29 (ag. W. H.) and 21:37 (ag. W. H.). Ἐλαιῶν is right in Lu. 19:37, etc. In Lu. 19:29; 21:37, question of accent. Cf. also ἀμπελών (from ἄμπελος, LXX, Diod., Plut.) which is now found in the pap.

(from **κύριος**, originally adj., eccl. and Byz. writers). **Συρο-φοινίκισσα** is the text of **א**AKL, etc., in Mk. 7:26 as against **Σύρα Φοινίκισσα** in BEFG, etc. In either case **φοινίκισσα,** not **φοίνισσα** (Text. Rec.) which is the usual feminine of **φοίνιξ**, as **Κίλισσα** is of **Κίλιξ.** Lucian has a masculine **Συροφοίνιξ** and Justin Martyr a feminine **Συροφοινίκη**. From this last **φοινίκισσα** probably comes. Cf. the use of βασίλισσα, the Atticists preferring βασιλίς or βασίλεια.

Ἡρῳδιανός (from **Ἡρῴδης**) and **Χριστ-ιανός** (from **Χριστός**) first appear in the N. T., and are modelled after Latin patronymics like *Caesarianus* (**Καισαρ-ιανός**, Arrian-Epictetus). Blass[1] goes unnecessarily far in saying that the N. T. form was **Χρηστ-ιανός** (from **Χηρστός**), though, of course, **ι** and **η** at this time had little, if any, distinction in pronunciation. **Μεγιστάν** is from **μέγιστος** (as **νεάν** from **νέος**). Cf. Latin *megistanes*. **Μεγιστάν** is found in LXX, Jos., Maneth. **Πλημμύρα** (LXX, Dion. Hal., Jos., Philo) is from **πλήμμη**. There was, of course, no "Christian" or "biblical" way of forming words.

Diminutives are not so common in the N. T. as in the Byzantine and modern Greek[2] where diminutives are very numerous, losing often their original force. **Βιβλαρίδιον** (a new form, but compare **λιθαρίδιον**) is read in Rev. 10:2 by **א**ACP against **βιβλιδάριον** (fragment of Aristoph.) according to C* and most of the cursives and **βιβλίον** (by B). Variations occur also in the text of verses 8, 9, 10. **Γυναικάριον** (from **γυνή**) is used contemptuously in 2 Tim. 3:6 (also in Antonin. and Epict.). **Ἰχθύδιον** (from **ἰχθύς**), **κλινίδιον** and **κλινάριον** (from **κλίνη**) occur from Aristoph. on. **Κοράσιον** (from **κόρη**, called Maced. by Blass) is used disparagingly in Diog. Laert. and Lucian, but in LXX and Epict. as in the N. T. that is not true, though it hardly has the endearing sense (sometimes found in the diminutive) in **κυνάριον** (**κύνες**='street-dogs'), but that sense appears often in **παιδίον** as in Jo. 21:5. **Ὀνάριον** (from **ὄνος**) is found in Machon and Epictetus. **Ὀψάριον** (from **ὄψον**) is found in Alexis and Lucian, and **οψώνιον** (likewise from **ὄψον**) is used by Dion., Polyb., Jos., Apocrypha and papyri. **Πτε-**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 63. Cf. Lipsius, Ursp. des Christennamens, 1873. W.-Sch. (p. 135) suggests that these two words are not after the Lat. model, but after the type of **Ἀσιανός**, which was foreign to the European Greeks. But **Ἀσιανός** (from **Ἀσία**) is in Thucyd. and besides is not parallel to **Χριστός**, **Χριστ-ιανός**. Cf. Eckinger, Die Orthog. lat. Worter in griech. Inschr., 1893, p. 27.

[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 292; Thumb, Handb., p. 62.

ρύγιον (from πτέρυξ) comes from Arist. down, but ψιχίον (from ψίξ) does not appear elsewhere. Both ὠτάριον (*Anthol*., Anax.) and ὠτίον (LXX) are from οὖς, but have lost the diminutive idea, just as μάτι in modern Greek means merely 'eye' (ὀμμάτιον). Blass[1] indeed accuses Luke of atticising when he uses οὖς in Lu. 22:50.

(γ) *Those from adjectives*. The new substantives derived from adjectives in the later Greek found in the N. T. all have suffixes expressing quality. With –ία we find ἀπο-τομ-ία (from ἀπό-τομος, Diod., Dion., pap.); ἐλαφρία (from ἐλαφρός., cf. Lob., *ad Phryn*., p. 343. Cf. αἰσχρ-ία from αἰσχρός, Eust.); παραφρον-ία (from παράφρων. Greek writers use παραφρο-σύνη, but cf. εὐδαιμον-ία from εὐδαίμων). So περισσεία (from περισσός, LXX, inscriptions, Byz.). W. H. use the ending –ία with κακοπάθε-ια (from κακοπαθής). With –σύνη several new words occur from adjectives in -ος, with the lengthening of the preceding vowel, as ἀγαθω-σύνη (from ἀγαθός, eccl.); ἁγιω-σύνη (from ἅγιος, not in earlier Greek writers); μεγαλω-σύνη (from stem μεγέλο of μέγας, LXX and eccl.). These forms are like ἱερω-σύνη from ἱερός (also in N. T.) which is as old as Herod. and Plato. Still μεγαλο-σύνη and ἱερο-σύνη are both found in inscriptions or in Glycas.[2] Most of the words in –σύνη belong to the later language.[3] **Ἐ**λεημο-σύνη (from ἐλεήμων**,** Callim. in Del., Diog. Laert., LXX), like other words in –σύνη, loses the ν. So ταπεινο-φρο-σύνη (Jos., Epict.).

Rather more numerous are the new words in -της,[4] as ἁγιό-της (from ἅγιος, 2 Macc.); ἁγνό-της (from ἁγνός, inscriptions); ἀδηλό-της (from ἄδηλος, Polyb., Dion. Hal., Philo); ἀφελότης (from ἀφελής, eccl. writers, ancient Greek ἀφέλεια); γυμνό-της (from γυμνός, Deut., Antonin.); ματαιό-της (from μάταιος, LXX and eccl. writers); μεγαλειό-της (from μεγαλεῖος, Athen., Jer.); πιό-της (from Arist., Theophr., LXX). **Ἀ**καθάρ-της (Rev. 17:4) is not supported by any Greek MSS.

The neuter (and often the masculine and feminine) of any adjective can be used as a substantive with or without the article, as τὸ δοκίμιον (from δοκίμιος, Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 259 f., Dion. Hal., Long., LXX, papyri). Like μεθόριον (the Syrian reading for ὅρια in Mk. 7:24) is προσφάγιον, (προσ-φάγιος, —ον from προσ-φα-

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 63.

[2] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 124, n. 14. On the termination —συνη see Aufrecht, Ber. Zeitschr. fur vergl. Sprachf., 6. Heft.

[3] W.-M., p. 118, n. 1.

[4] On words in --της see Lob. ad Pliryn., p. 350; Buhler, Das griech. Secundarsuffix της, 1858; Frankel, d. Gr. Nom. Ag. (1910).

γεῖν inscriptions), σφάγιον (σφάγιος, --ον, σφαγή, Am., Ezek.), ὑπο-λήνιον (ὑπολήνιος, -ον, from ὑπὸ ληνόν, Demiopr. in Poll., Geop., LXX. Cf. ὑπο-ζύγιον). As already seen, ἱλασ-τήριον is probably the neuter of the adjective ἱλασ-τήριος, —α, —ον (from ἱλάσκομαι). So φυλακ-τήριον is th neuter of the adjective (φυλακ-τήριος, —α, —ον (from φυλακτήρ, φυλάσσω), Dem., Diosc., Plut., LXX).[1] Σωτήριον and σωτηρία (from σωτήριος) are both common in the old Greek as is the case with ὑπερ-ῷον (from ὑπερῷος, -ωιος). Ζευκ-τηρία (from ζευκ-τήριος, only in Ac. 27:40) reverts to the abstract form in —ία.

(c) ADJECTIVES.

1. *Primary or Primitive Adjectives*. These, of course, come from verbal roots. Ἁμαρ-ωλός (from root ἁμαρτ-άνω, Arist., Plut., LX , inscriptions) is like φείδ-ωλος (4 Macc. 2:9), from φείδ-ομαι. Πειθ-ός (W. H. πιθ-ός from πείθω, as φειδ-ός from φείδομαι) is not yet found elsewhere than in 1 Cor. 2:4, but Blass[2] regards it as "a patent corruption," πειθοῖς for πειθοῖ. The evidence is in favour of πειθοῖς (all the uncials, most cursives and versions). Φάγος (from root φαγ--) is a substantive in the N. T. with paroxytone accent as in the grammarians, the adjective being φαγ-ός. The other new adjectives from roots in the N. T. are verbals in -τος. There is only one verbal (gerundive) in —τέος (Lu. 5:38, elsewhere only in Basil), and that is neuter (βλητέον), "a survival of the literary language in Luke."[3] The sense of capability or possibility is only presented by the verbal παθη-τός (from root παθ--, πάσχω, eccl. writers). But the weakened sense of the verbal in —τος, more like an ordinary adjective, is very common in the later Greek.[4] But they are rare in the modern Greek (Thumb, Handb., p. 151). These verbals correspond to the Latin participle in —*tus*,[5] like γνωστός, or to adjectives in —*bilis*, like ὁρατός. They are common in the N. T., though not many new formations appear. They are usually passive like γραπ-τός (from γράφω, Georg. apd., LXX), though προσ-ήλυ-τος (προσ-έρχ-ομαι, root -ηλυθ-, LXX, Philo) is active in sense. The ancient form was

[1] This termination became rather common in the later Gk., as, for instance, in ἀνακαλυπήριον, δεητήριον, θανατήριον, ἰαματήριον. See also Stratton, hapters in the Hist. of Gk. Noun-Formation, 1889.

[2] Gr. of N T. Ok., p. 64. So W.-Sch., p. 135.

[3] Viteau, ss. sur la Synt. des Voix, Rev. de Philol., p. 38.

[4] Jann., H st. Gk. Or., p. 297. Ἑκών also is wholly adjective and μέλλων, sometimes so Cf. Brugmann, Grundr. d. vergl. Gr., p. 429.

[5] W.-M., . 120. Cf. Viteau, Ess. sur le Synt. de Voix, Rev. de Philol., p. 41. For deriv. adj. in the Ptol. pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 447-455.

ἔπηλυς. A number of new verbals were formed on compound words which will be discussed later. For the syntactical aspects of the verbal adjectives see discussion of the participle (cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 221).

2. *Secondary or Derivative Adjectives*.

(a) *Those from verbs*. **Σιτισ-τός** (from σιτίζω, Jos., Athen.) is to be mentioned. It is equivalent to the Latin *saginatus* and is passive in meaning.

(β) *Those from substantives*. Some new words in **--ινος** occur as ἀμαράντινος (from ἀμάραντος, Philost., inscriptions); **καθημερ-ινός** (from **καθ' ἡμέραν,** Athen., Plut., Jos.) is for ancient **καθημέριος**; **κόκκ-ινος** is from **κόκκος** (LXX, Plut., Epict., papyri); **ὀρθρ-ινός** (from **ὄρθρος**, LXX, older form **ὄρθριος**), with which compare **ἑσπερ-ινός** (from **ἑσπέρα**, from Xen. on) in the minusc. 1, 118, 209 (Lu. 12:38); **πρωινός** (so W. H., from **πρωί**, for the older **πρώιος**, LXX, Plut., Athen., etc.); **πύρ-ινος** (from **πῦρ**, Arist., LXX, Polyb., Plut.); **ταχινός** (from **τάχα**) from Theocritus on (LXX also).

There are several words in **–ικός**, like **ἐθνικός** (from **ἔθνος**, Polyb., Diod.); **κεραμ-ικός** (from **κέραμος**, Hipp., Plat. pol., LXX) which supplanted the earlier **κεράμιος, κεραμεοῦς; κυρι-ακός** (from **κύριος**, **-ακός** instead of **—ικός** after **ι**, eccl. writers) is found in papyri of Faytim and in inscriptions of Phrygia and Lydia.[1] So **λειτουργι-κός** (from λειτουργία, LXX, papyri) and **ὀνικός** (from **ὄνος**, in a contract in the Fayum Papyri dated Feb. 8, A.D. 33).

Of special interest are several words in **-ινος** and **–ικός**. **Ὀστράλ-ινος** (from **ὄστρακον**, Hipp., *Anthol*., LXX), 'made of clay,' 'earthen'; **σάρκ-ινος** (from σάρξ, Aristoph., Plato, Arist.) is thus not a new word, but is used in Heb. 7:16 and by Paul in 1 Cor. 3:1; Ro. 7:14 (correct text in each instance), where many MSS. have **σαρκ-ικός**. Indeed **σάρκινος** in these two passages must mean more than made of flesh or consisting in flesh, perhaps "rooted in the flesh" (Thayer).[2] Cf. relation of **ἀληθ-ινός** to **ἀληθές**. Still a real distinction seems to be observed between **σάρκ-ινος** and **σαρκ-ικός** in 1 Cor. 3:1 and 3:3. **Σαρκ-ικός** (from σάρξ, Arist., Plut., LXX) is a man who lives according to the flesh and is here opposed to those who are **πνευματ-ικοί**. (from **πνεῦμα**, from Arist. down, but not in LXX, pertaining to the wind). But **ὁ ψυχ-ικός** (from **ψυχή**, Arist., Polyb., down) is the man pos-

[1] Deiss., B. S., p. 217 f.; Liget, p. 361; Thieme, Die Inschr. v. M., p. 15.

[2] See comm. *in loco*. W.-M. (p. 123) held that **σάρκινος** was "hardly to be tolerated" in Heb. 7:16, but Schmiedel (p. 139) has modified that statement. Cf. on **--ινος**, Donaldson, New Crat., p. 45S.

sessed of mere natural life (1 Cor. 2:14) as opposed to regenerate (πνευματ-ικός) life (1 Cor. 2:15). Σαρκ-ικός can be applied to either of these two distinct classes.[1] But in 1 Cor. 3:3 ἔτι γὰρ σαρκικοί ἐστε Paul reproaches the Corinthians. Proper names also have -ικός, as Ἑβρα-ϊκός. Note accent in Τυχ-ικός. Ῥωμα-ϊκός (from Ῥώμη) is read in Lu. 23:38 by the Western and Syrian MSS., common in the literary κοινή (Polyb., Diod., etc.).

Αἰώνιος, though found in Plato and Diod., is not a common adjective. But cf. LXX, 0. T. Apoc., Philo, inscriptions, papyri. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, 1908, p. 174. Δοκίμιος is from δοκιμή (Dion. Hal., Long., LXX, papyri). Μίσθιος is from μισθός (LXX, Plut.), while Ῥωμαῖος is common in the literary κοινή. Μελίσσιος (from μέλισσα, like θαλάσσιος from θάλασσα) is read by the Syrian class of documents in Lu. 24:42. The word occurs nowhere else, though Nic. has μελισσαῖος and Eustath. μελίσσειος.

(γ) *Those from adjectives*. There are only a few new adjectives of this character, but they present special difficulties. About ἐπιούσιος (found only in Mt. 6:11 and Lu. 11:3 and used with ἄρτος) there has raged a long controversy. It has been derived successively from ἐπί and οὐσία, 'bread for sustenance,' though οὐσία only has the sense of ὕπαρξις in philosophical language (another theory, 'bread of substance' in the spiritual sense); from ἐπί and ὤν (ἐπόντιος, ἐπούσιος, like ἑκών, ἑκούσιος, etc.), 'bread for the present,' though the ι in ἐπί is not allowed to remain with a vowel save when a digamma existed as in ἐπιεικής; from ἐπ-ιών (ἔπ-ειμι, 'approach'), like ἡ ἐπιοῦσα (ἡμέρα), 'the next day' (Ac. 16:11), this last a common idiom. Lightfoot[2] has settled the matter in favour of the last position. See also ἤρεμος (from ἠρεμής, adv. ἠρέμα, Lucian, Eustath., Hesych); νεωτερικός (from νεώτερος, 3 Macc., Polyb., Jos.). In περιούσιος (from περι-ών, περίειμι, LXX) no serious problem in etymology arises, for περί retains the ι in composition with vowels. It is used with λαός, to express the idea that Israel belongs to God as his very own.[3] Πιστ-ικός (from πιστός,

[1] See Trench, N. T. Synon., 1S90, pp. 268 ff.

[2] See Rev. of the N. T., pp. 194-234. Deiss., B. S., p. 214, calls attention to Grimm's comment on 2 Macc. 1:8 about τοὺς ἐπιουσίους being added to τοῦς ἄρτους by "three codices Sergii." Cf. W.-Sch., p. 136 f., n. 23, for full details. Cf. Bischoff, Ἐπιούσιος, p. 266, Neutest. Wiss., 1906. Debrunner (Glotta, IV. Bd., 3. Heft, 1912) argues for ἐπὶ τὴν οὖσαν ηπμέραν, 'for the day in question.'

[3] Cf. Lightfoot, Rev. of the N. T., pp. 234-242, for full discussion of περιούσιος.

Plato, Diog., Dion. Hal., in sense of persuading, but Artem., Cedrenus and other late writers in sense of 'genuine') is hardly to be derived from πιπίσκω or πίω and hence= drinkable.' 'Genuine nard' is a much more probable meaning. For curious details see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 138, n. 24. **Ποταπός** is from the older ποδαπός and occurs in Dion. Hal., Philo, Jos., papyri.

(δ) Those from adverbs. From ἄνω come ἀνώτερος (Polyb., LXX, Arist.) and ἀνω-τερικός (Hippoc., Galen); ἐξώ-τερος (LXX, Strabo, etc.). See also ἐσώ-τερος (only N. T.); κατώ-τερος (Theoc., Hippoc., Athen.). Cf. Hagen, *Bildung d. griech. Adverbien.*

(d) THE ADVERB. The adverb **φειδομενως** (from the participle **φειδόμενος**, Plut., Mosch., Alex.) is a new word of this nature. Cf. **ὁμολογουμένως** in the older Greek. So **τυχόν, ὄντως** and **ὑπερβαλλόντως**. The neuter accusative singular and plural of adjectives continue to be used adverbially. **Βαθέως** occurs also in Theoc. and AElian. **Ἀκμήν** (Theoc., Polyb., Strabo) is in the inscriptions also as well as **ἐν ἀκμᾶι** (cf. Ditt., Syll. 326, 12). **Ἑβραϊστί** (Sirach) is properly formed (cf. **Ἑλληνιστί**) from **Ἑβραΐς. Ἰουδαϊκῶς** is in Jos. See also **ἐθνικῶς** (Apoll. Dysc., Diog. Laert.). **Εἶτεν** (correct text Mk. 4:28) is a rare Ionic form for **εἶτα** (papyri also). **Κενῶς** is used from Arist. on. **Ὀλίγως** occurs out of the N. T. only in *Anthol.* and Aquila. **Πρώτως** (correct text Ac. 11:26) occurs here for the first time. **Ῥητῶς** is found in Polyb., Strabo, Plut. **Ῥωμαϊστί** is common in the literary **κοινή** (Plut., App., etc.) and in Epictetus. **Σωματικῶς** comes from Aristotle and Plutarch. **Τυπικῶς** is in the ecclesiastical writers. **Φυσικῶς** is in Aristotle, Philo, etc. Mayser (*Gr.*, pp. 455-459) has a good list of derivative adverbs. See ch. VII for full discussion of the formation of the adverb.

IV. Words Formed by Composition (*Composita*). The Greek in the Ptolemaic papyri is not equal to modern German in the facility with which agglutinative compound words (διπλᾶ Aristotle termed them) are formed, but it is a good second. The N. T. writers make use of many of the new compounds (some new kinds also), but not more than the literary **κοινή**, though more than the Atticists or Purists.[1] The following lists will show how fond the N. T. is of double prepositional compounds like **ἀντ-ανα-πληρόω, ἀπο-κατ-αλλάσσω, ἐπι-συν-άγω, συν-αντι-λαμβάνομαι**, etc. So also compound prepositional adverbs like **ἐνώπιον, κατενώπιον, κατέναντι,** etc. On the whole subject of compound words in the Ptolemaic papyri see Mayser, *Gr.*, pp. 466-506. Compound words played an in-

[1] Schmid, Der Atticismus, Bd. IV, p. 730.

creasing role in the κοινή. Cf. Jannaris, *op. cit*., p. 310. See in particular F. Schubert, *Zur mchrfachen preifixalen Zusammensetzung im Griechischen, Xenia Austriaca*, 1893, pp. 191 ff.

(a) KINDS OF COMPOUND WORDS IN GREEK: proper composition (σύνθεσις), copulative composition (παράθεσις), derivative composition (παρασύνθεσις). In the first class the principal idea is expressed by the second part of the word, while the first and qualifying part is not inflected, but coalesces with the second, using merely the stem with connective vowel. As an example take οἰκο-νόμος, 'manager of the house.' The second kind of composition, paratactic or copulative, is the mere union of two independent words like παρά-κλητος. It is not common in the old Greek save in the case of prepositions with verbs, and even this usage is far more frequent in the later Greek. It is seen in many late compound adverbs as in ὑπερ-άνω. The third or derivative composition is a new word made on a compound, whether proper or copulative, as εἰδωλο-λατρία (or –εία) from εἰδωλο-λατρεύω. The above classification is a true grammatical distinction, but it will be more serviceable to follow a more practical division of the compound words into two classes. Modern linguists do not like the term "proper composition." In principle it is the same as copulative.

(b) INSEPARABLE PREFIXES. These make a cross-line in the study of compound words. They enter into the formation of verbs, substantives, adjectives and adverbs. By prefixes here is not meant the adverbs and prepositions so commonly used in composition, but the inseparable particles ἀ- (ἀν–) privative, ἀ-- collective or intensive, ἀρχι--, δυσ--, ἡμι--, νη--. As examples of such new formations in the N. T. may be taken the following substantives and adjectives (chiefly verbals) with ἀ– privative: ἀ-βαρής (from Arist. down, papyri, in metaphysical sense); ἀ-γενεα-λόγητος (LXX); ἄ-γναφος (Thom. Mag.); ἀ-γνόημα (0. T. Apoc., papyri); ἀγρι-έλαιος (Arist., papyri); ἀ-γνοέω (Apoc., papyri); ἀ-δηλότης (Polyb., Dion. Hal., Philo); ἀ-διά-κριτος (from Hippocrates down); ἀ-διά-λειπτος (Tim. Loer., Attic inscriptions, i/B.C.); ἀ-δια-=φθροία (not in ancient Greek); ἀ-δυνατέω (LXX, ancient Greek means 'to be weak'); ἀ-θέμιτος (for earlier ἀ-θέμιστος); ἄ-θεσμος (LXX, Diod., Philo, Jos., Plut.); ἀ-θετέω (LXX, Polyb.); ἀ-καιρέω (Diod.); ἀ-θέτησις (Diog. Laert., eccl. writers, papyri); ἀ-κατά-γνωστος (2 Macc., eccl. writers, inscriptions, papyri); ἀ-κατα-κάλυπτος (Polyb., LXX, Philo); ἀ-κατά-κριτος (earliest example); ἀ-κατά-λυτος (4 Macc., Dion. Hal.); ἀ-κατά-παστος (found only here.

This is the reading of AB in 2 Pet. 2:14 rather than ἀ-κατά-παυστος, verbal of καταπαύω, found in Polyb., Diod., Jos., Plut., cf. W. H., App., p. 170; Moulton, *Prol*., p. 47); ἀ-κατα-στασία (Polyb., Dion. Hal., papyri); ἀ-κατά-στατος (Hippoc., Polyb., LXX); ἀ-κατά-σχετος (LXX, Diod.); ἀ-κυρόω (Diod., Dion. Hal., Plut., 1 Esdr.); ἀ-λάλητος (Anth. Pal.); ἀ-μέθυστος (LXX, Dion. Hal., Plut.); ἀ-μετά-θετος (Polyb., LXX, Diod., Plut., inscriptions); ἀ-μετα-νόητος (Lucian, Philo, papyri); ἀν-ἀντί-ρητος (from Polyb. down, inscriptions); ἀν-απο-λόγητος (Polyb., Dion. Hal., Plut.); ἀν-εκ-δι-ήγητος (Clem. Horn., Athen.); ἀν-έκ-λειπτος (Diod., Plut., papyri); ἀν-έν-δεκτος (Artem., Diog. Laert., eccl., Byz.); ἀν-εξ-ερεύνητος (LXX, Symm., Dio Cass.); ἀν-εξ-ιχνίαστος (LXX, eccl. writers); ἀν-επ-αίσχυντος (Jos.); ἀν-εύ-θετος (Moschion); ἀν-ίλεως (reading in Jas. 2:13 of L, other MSS. have ἀν-έλεος, old Greek ἀν-ηλεής); ἄ-νομος (LXX, ἀ-νομία from Thuc.); ἀν-υπό-τακτος (Artem., Philb); ἀ-παρά-βατος (Jos., Plut., papyri, etc.); ἀ-πειραστος (Jos., eccl., old Greek ἀ-πείρατος); ἀ-περί-τμητος (LXX, Philo, Plut.); ἀ-πρόσ-ιτος (lit. κοινή); ἀ-πρόσ-κοπος (Sir., Sext., inscriptions); ἄ-ραφος (LXX, Jos.); ἄ-σπιλος (*Anthol*., eccl.); ἀ-στατέω (*Anthol*.); ἀ-στοχέω (Polyb., Plut., Lucian, papyri); ἀ-στήρικτος (*Anthol*.); ἀ-φελότης (eccl. writers); ἄ-φθαρτος (Arist., Wisd., Plut., inscriptions); ἀ-φιλ-άγαθος (papyri and 2 Tim. 3:3); ἀ-φιλ-άργυρος (Diod., Hippoc., inscriptions, papyri).[1]

With ἀρχι-- (from ἄρχω) we have ἀρχ-άγγελος (eccl.); ἀρχ-ιερατικός (inscr., Jos.); ἀρχ-ιερεύς (LXX, inscr.); ἀρχι-ποιμήν (Test. of 12 Patr., wooden tablet from Egypt, Deissmann, *Exp. Times*, 1906, p. 61); ἀρχι-συν-άγωγος (inscr., eccl.); ἀρχι-τελώνης (only in Lu. 19:2); ἀρχι-τρί-κλινος (Heliod., cf. συμποσι-άρχης in Sirach). Cf. ἀρχι-φυλακίτης, P.Tb. 40 (B.C. 117), ἀρχι-δεσμο-φύλαξ (LXX).

With ἀ— connective or intensive are formed ἀ-νεψιός (for ἀ-νεπτιός, LXX, cf. Lat. *con-nepot-ius*), ἀ-τενίζω (Polyb., Diod., Jos., Lucian).[2]

With δυσ-- we have δυσ-βάστακτος (LXX, Philo, Plut.); δυσ-εντέριον (late form, correct text in Ac. 28:8, older form δυσ-εντερία);

[1] Cf. Hamilton, The Neg. Comp. in Gk., 1899. "The true sphere of the negative prefix is its combination with nouns, adjectives and verbal stems to form adjective compounds" (p. 17). Cf. also Margarete Heine, Subst. mit α privativum. Wack. (Verm. Beitr. zur griech. Sprachk., 1897, p. 4) suggests that ἄδης is from ἀεί and --δε, not from α-- and ἰδεῖν. Ingenious! Cf. Wack. again, Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Composita, 1889.

[2] Cf. on ἀ- connective or intensive, Don., New Crat., p. 397. Also Doderlein, De ἄλφα intenso, 1830.

δυσ-ερμήνευτος (Diod., Philo, Artem.); δυσ-νόητος (Arist. Diog. Laert.); δυσ-φημία (LXX, Dion. Hal., Plut.).

With ἡμι-- (cf. Lat. *semi*) are found only ἡμι-θανής (Dion. Hal., Diod., LXX, Strabo), ἡμί-ωρον, (so W. H., Strabo, Geop., ℵP have --ώριον). Cf. ἥμισυς.

For νη— note νηπιάζω (Hippoc., eccl.).

(c) AGGLUTINATIVE COMPOUNDS (*Juxtaposition or Parathesis*). This sort of composition includes the prepositions and the copulative composition (*dvandva*). This last is much more common in the κοινή than in the older Greek. Cf. Jannaris, *op. cit*., p. 310, and Mayser, *Gr*., p. 469.

1. Verbs. The new compound verbs are made either from compound substantives or adjectives or by combining adverbs with a verb-stem or noun-stem or by adding a preposition to the older verb. This last method is very frequent in the later Greek due to "a love for what is vivid and expressive."[1] This embellishment of the speech by compounds is not absent from the simplest speech, as Blass[2] shows in the case of Titus, where over thirty striking compound words are found, omitting verbals and other common ones. Moulton (*Cl. Quarterly*, April, 1908, p. 140) shows from the papyri that the compound verb is no mark of the literary style, but is common in the vernacular also. The preposition fills out the picture as in ἀντι-μετρέω (Lucian), and so ἀντι-λαμβάνω (Diod., Dio Cass., LXX). So also observe the realistic form of the preposition in ἐξ-αστράπτω (LXX, Tryphiod.) in Lu. 9:29; κατα-λιθάζω (eccl. writings) in Lu. 20:6. The modern Greek even combines two verbs to make a compound, as παιζω-γελῶ. As examples of new compound verbs may be given ἀγαθουγέω, ἀγαθοεργέω, in 1 Tim. 6:18 (eccl.); ἀγαθο-ποιέω (LXX, later writers); ἀλλ-γορέω (Philo, Jos., Plut., grammatical writers); ἀνα-ζάω (inscriptions, later writers); ἀνα-θεωρ-έω (Diod., Plut., Lucian); ἀνα-στατό-ω (LXX, papyri); ἀν-ετάζω (LXX, papyri); ἀντι-δια-τίθημι

[1] W.-M., p. 127. Cf. Winer, De Verb. cum Praep. compos. in N. T. usu, 1834-43.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 70. Mostly adj., but πειθ-αρχεῖν occurs in the list. Blass, ib., p. 65, even thinks that it is not the province of grammar to discuss the numerous compounds with prepositions. It belongs to the lexicon. The lists that I give are not complete for prepositional compounds because of lack of space. See Helbing (Gr. d. Sept., pp. 128-136) for good list of compound verbs in the LXX. Mayser (Gr., pp. 486-506) gives list of compound verbs in the Ptol. pap. The κοινή is fond of compound verbs made of noun and verb. Cf. εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν, εἰ ἐξενοδόχησεν (1 Tim. 5:10). So ὑψηλοφρονεῖν (text of W. H. in 6:17).

(Philo, eccl. writers); ἀντι-παρ-έχρο-μαι (*Anthol*., Sap., eccl. writers, Byz.); ἀντ-οφθαλμέω (Sap., Polyb., eccl. writers); ἀπ-ελπίζω (LXX, Polyb., Diod., inscriptions); ἀπο-γράφομαι (papyri); ἀπο-θησαυρίζω (Sir., Diod., Jos., Epict.); ἀπο-κεφαλίζω (LXX, Epict., etc.); αὐθ-εντέω (Polyb., papyri); γονυ-πετέω (Polyb., Heliod., eccl. writers); δια-γνωρίζω (Philo, schol. in Bekk.); δια-γογγύζω (LXX, Heliod., Byz.); δια-γρηγορέω (Herod., Niceph.); δι-αυγάζω (Polyb., Plut.); δια-φημίζω (Aratus, Dion. Hal.); δι-ερμηνεύω (2 Macc. Pilyb., Philo); δι-οδεύω (LXX, Polyb., Plut.); δουλ-αγωγέω (Diod. Sic. and on); εἰρηνο-ποιέω (LXX, Hermes); ἐκ-δαπανάω (Polyb.); ἐκ-δικέω (LXX, Apo11., Diod.); ἐμ-βατεύω (inscr.); ἐν-κανίζω (LXX); ἐν-κακέω (Polyb., Symm. translation of LXX, Philo, Clem. Rom.); ἐν-χρίω (Tob., Strabo, *Anthol*., Epict.); ἐξ-αρτίζω (Jos., Hipp.); ἐξ-ισχύω (Sir., Strabo, Plut.); ἐπι-σκηνόω (Polyb.); ἐπι-φαύσκω (LXX, Acta Thom.); ἐπι-χορηγέω (Dion. Hal., Phal., Diog. Laert., Alex. Aphr.); ἑτερο-διδασκαλέω (eccl. writers); ἑτερο-ζυγέω (LXX); εὐ-αρεστέω (LXX, Philo, Diod.); εὐδοκέω (probably simply from εὖ and δοκέω, as there is no such form as δόκος or εὔδοκος and cf. καρα-δοκέω in Polyb., Diod., Dion. Hal.); εὐθυ-δρομέω (Philo); εὐ-καιρέω (from Polybius on, papyri); εὐ-προσ-ωπέω (P. Tb., Chrys.); θηριο-μαχέω (Diod., Artem., Ign.); ζωο-γονέω (Theophr., Diod., Lucian, Plut.); ζωο-ποιέω (Arist., Theophr., LXX); κακ-ουχέω (from obsolete κακ-οῦχος, i.e. κακόν, ἔχω, LXX, Diod., Dio Cass., Plut.); καλο-ποιέω (Etym. Magn., LXX, Philo); κατα-βαρέω (Polyb., Diod., App., Lucian papyri); κατ-αγωνίζωομαι (Polyb., Jos., Lucian, Plut., AElian); κατ-αντάω (Polyb., Diod., eccl. writers, papyri); κατα-κληρο-δοτέω (LXX); κατα-πονέω (2 and 3 Macc., Hipp., Polyb., Diod., Jos., AEl., etc.); κατ-εξ-ουσιάζω (only N. T.); κατ-οπτρίζω (Athen., Diog. Laert., Philo); if the conjectural κεν-εμ-βατεύω in Col. 2:18 be correct (as is now no longer probable), κεν-εμ-βάτης has to be presupposed; λα-τομέω (LXX, Diod., Dion. Hal., Strabo); λιθο-βολέω (LXX, Diod., Plut.); λογο-μαχέω (only instance in 2 Tim. 2:14); μακρο-θυμέω (LXX, Plut.); μεθ-ερμηνεύω (Polyb., Diod., Sir., Plut.); μετα-μορφόω (Diod., Philo); μετριο-παθέω (Philo, Jos.); μοσχο-ποιέω (LXX and eccl. writers); μυ-ωπάζω (Arist.); οἰκο-δεσποτέω (Lucian, Plut.); ὁμείρομαι is a puzzle (Fritzsche derives it from ὁμοῦ and εἴρω, but other compounds with ὁμοῦ have instrumental-associative, not genitive case, as ὁμι-λέω, from ὅμιλος (ὁμοῦ, ἴλη) Photius and Theophr. get it from ὁμοῦ ἡρμόσθαι; but, as Nicander uses μείρομαι ἱμείρομαι, modern editors print ὁμειρόμενοι in 1 Th. 2:8 (ὀ-- W. H., elsewhere only in Job and Symm., Ps. 62); ὀρθο-ποδέω (only instance); ὀρθο-τομέω (LXX, eccl.

writers); ὀχλο-ποιέω (only in Ac. 17:5); παρα-βολεύομαι (inscr. ii,/A.D.); παρ-εισ-έρχομαι (Polyb., Philo, Plut.); περι-λάπω (Diod., Jos., Plut.); πληρο-φορέω (LXX, eccl. writers); προ-ελπίζω (Posid., Dexipp., Greg. N.); προσ-εγγίζω (LXX, Polyb., Diod., Lucian); προσ-κληρόω (Philo, Plut., Lucian); προσωπο-λημπτέω (N. T. word); συν-αυξάνω (LXX, inscriptions); συν-αποστέλλω (LXX, papyri, inscriptions); στρατο-λογέω (Diod., Dion. Hal., Jos., Plut., etc.); συν-υπο-κρίνομαι (Polyb., Plut.) and many other verbs with συν; τεκτο-γονέω (*Anthol*.); τεκνο-τροφέω (Arist.); τετρα-αρχέω (Jos.); τροπο-φορέω (LXX and eccl. writers, so W. H. with ℵBDHLP, etc., in Ac. 13:18); τροφο-φορέω (LXX and eccl. writers, so ACE and some cursives in Ac. 13:18); ὑπερ-πλεονάζω (Ps. Sal, Herond., Herm.); ὑπο-λιμπάνω (Themist., Dion. Hal., eccl. and Byz.); φιλο-πρωτεύω (Artem., Plut.); φρεν-απατάω (eccl. and Byz. writers); χρονο-τριβέω (Arist., Plut., Heliod., Byz. writers). Thus, it will be noticed, verbs compounded with nouns are very common in the κοινή.

Often two prepositions are used in composition with the same verb, where the proper meaning must be given to each. The use of double prepositional compounds grew rapidly in the κοινή; cf. Schmid, *Att*. IV, pp. 708 ff. Mayser gives a long list in the Ptol. papyri (*Gr*., pp. 497-504), some of which are old and some new. Of 162 examples 96 are new. The N. T. is in perfect accord with the κοινή here. So it is with ἀντι-παρ-έρχομαι (*Anthol*., Wisdom, eccl. and Byz. writers) in Lu. 10:31; ἀντ-ανα-πληρόω Col. 1:24 (Dem., Dio Cass., Apoll. Dysc.); ἀντι-δια-τίθημι (Philo, Diod.); ἀπο-κατ-αλλάσσω (not in old Greek), ἐπι-δια-τάσσομαι (only in N. T.); ἐπι-συν-άγω (LXX, AEsop, Polyb.); κατ-εξ-ουσιάζω (only in N. T.); παρ-εισ-έρχομαι (Polyb., Philo, Plut.); προ-εν-άρχομαι (only in N. T.); συν-ανα-μίγνυμι (LXX, Plut.); συν-ανα-παύομαι (LXX, Dion. Hal., Plut.); συν-αντι-λαμβάνομαι (LXX, Diod., Jos., inscriptions, papyri); ὑπερ-εκ-χύνω (LXX) ὑπερ-εν-τυγχάνω (eccl.). There is in the papyri (P. Th. I, 66) a triple prepositional compound, προ-αντ-αν-αιρέω.

2. *Substantives*. Here again the new compound substantive draws on verbs, substantives, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions for part or all of the word. There are also double compound substantives from compound substantives, adjectives, adverbs and prepositions like προσωπολημψία, ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, διαπαρατριβή. The great majority have substantive or adjective for the second half of the word. These nouns are more often abstract than concrete. Ἀγαθο-ποιία (from adjective and verb-stem, eccl. writers); ἀγαθο-

ποιός (adjective and verb-stem, Sirach, Plut. and later papyri); ἀργι-ἐλαιος (from ἄγριος and ἔλαιος, Arist.); αἱματ-εκ-χυσία (from substantive, preposition and verb χύνω, eccl. writers); ἀκρο-βυστία (LXX); ἀλεκτορο-φωνία (AEsop, Strabo, eccl. writers); ἀλλοτρι-επί-σκοπος (from ἀλλότριος and ἐπί-σκοπος, Dion. Areop., eccl. writers. Deissmann finds a synonym for the word in ἀλλοτρίων ἐπιθυμητὴς, Fayum Papyri. See *Bible Studies*, p. 224); ἄμφ-οδον (LXX, Aristoph., Hyper., papyri); ἀνά-χυσις (Sir., Polyb., Plut.); ἀνα-ύπατος in the ethical sense (LXX, Polybius on, inscriptions in Pergamum and Magnesia); ἀνά-δειξις (Strabo, Philo, Plut.); ἀνα-στροφή (Polyb., Dion. Hal., Lucian, Plut., inscriptions); ἀντί-λυτρον (one translation of Ps. 48:9, Orph.); ἀντί-χριστος (probably formed by John, eccl.); ἀργυρο-κόπος (Plut., LXX, papyri); ἀρσενο-κοίτης (*Anthol*., eccl.); ἀπο-καρα-δοκία (verb –έω in LXX, Jos., Plut.); ἀσι-άρχης (inscriptions, Polyc.); γαζο-φυλάκιον (LXX, Jos., Strabo); γλωσσό-κομον (earlier γλωσσοκουμεῖον, LXX, Jos., Plut., Longin., inscriptions, papyri); δεισι-δαιμονία (Polyb., Diod., Jos., Plut.); δεσμο-φύλαξ (Jos., Lucian, Artem., ἀρχι-δεσμο-φύλαξ, LXX); δι-ερμη-νία (only in AD 1 Cor. 12:10; δι-ερμηνευτής probably correct 1 Cor. 14:28, ℵAKL against ἑρμηνευτής by BDFG); δια-παρα-τριβή (not found elsewhere) is the correct text for 1 Tim. 6:5, not παρα-δια-τριβή, which may be compared with παρα-κατα-θή-κη in 2 Tim. 1:12, but παρα-θή-κη (Herod., LXX, inscriptions, papyri) is the true reading; δωδεκά-φυλον (Clem. of Rome, N. T. Apoc.); δικαιο-κρισία (Test. xii Pat., eccl., papyri); δωρο-φορία is read by MSS. BDFG against διακονία in Ro. 15:31; ἐθελο-θρησκία (from verb ἐθέλω and θρησκία, eccl., cf. ἐθελο-δουλεία); εἰδωλο-λατρεία (W. H. –ία, two substantives, eccl.) and εἰδωλο-λάτρης (eccl.); εἰλι-κρίνεια (LXX, Theophr. Sext., Stob.); ἐκ-πλήρωσις (2 Macc., Dion. Hal., Philo, Strabo); ἐκ-τένεια (2 Macc., Judith, inscriptions); ἔν-εδρον (late form of ἐνέδρα, LXX); ἐξ-ανά-στα-σις (double compound, Polyb.); ἐπι-συν-αγωγή (double compound, 2 Macc., inscriptions, Artem., Ptol.); ἐπι-σύ-στασις (double compound, LXX, Philo, Sext.); ἐπι-χορηγία (eccl.); εὐ-δοκία (LXX, inscriptions); εὐρ-ακύλων (a hybrid from εὖρος and Lat. *aquilo*, like *auto-mobile*; so W. H. for Text. Rec. εὐρο-κλύδων in Ac. 27:14, which is Etym. Magn. alone); ἡδύ-οσμος (Strabo, Theophr.); Ἱερο-σολυμείτης (Jos.); καλλι-έλαιος (Arist.); καλο-διδάσκαλος (only in Tit. 2:3); καρδιο-γνώστης (eccl. writers); κατ-αγγελεύς (inscriptions); κατά-θεμα (only in Rev. 22:3); κατά-κριμα (Sir., Dion. Hal., papyri); κατά-λειμα (ℵ^{a}DEFGKLP in no. 9:27 for ὑπό-λ, LXX, Gal.); κατ-ήγωρ (papyri; cf. Deissmann, *Light*, p. 90; Radermacher, *Gr*., p. 15); κατά-λυμα (LXX,

Polyb, Diod.); **κατα-πέτασμα** (LXX, Jos., Aristeas, Philo, inscriptions); **κενο-δοξία** (4 Macc., Polyb., Philo, Plut., Lucian); **κοσμο-κράτωρ** (Orph., eccl. writers, inscriptions); **κωμό-πολις** (Strabo, Ag. and Theod., eccl.); **λογο-μαχία** (only in 1 Tim. 6:4); **ματαιο-λογία** (Plut., Porph.); **μεσο-νύκ-τιον** (Arist., LXX, **κοινή** writers); **μεσό-τοιχον** (Erat.); **μεσ-ουράνημα** (Manetho, Plut.); **μετ-οικεσία** (LXX, *Anthol*.); **μισθ-απο-δοσία** and **-δότης** (eccl.); **μωρο-λογία** (Arist., Plut.); **νομο-διδάσκαλος** (eccl.); **νυχθ-ήμερον** (Alex., App., Geop.); **οἰκο-δεσπότης** (Alexis, Jos., Plut., Ign., etc.); **οἰκο-δομή** (possibly Arist., Theophr., certainly LXX, Diod., Philo, Jos., Plut., condemned by Phrynichus); **οἰνο-πότης** (Polyb., LXX, Anthol., Anacr.); **ὀλιγο-πιστία** (eccl. and Byz.); **ὁλο-κληρία** (LXX, Diog. Laert., Plut.); **ὁρκ-ωμοσία** (LXX, Jos., **τὰ ὁρκ-ωμόσια** in Attic); **ὁρο-θεσία** (eccl.); **ὀφθαλμο-δουλία** (only instance is in N. T.); **παλιν-γενεσία** (Philo, Longin., Lucian, Plut); **παντο-κράτωρ** (LXX, eccl., Anthol.); **παρά-κλητος** (Aq. Theod., Diog. Laert., Dio Cass., papyri, inscriptions); **παρα-χειμασία** (Polyb., Diod.); **παρτι-άρχης** (LXX); **περί-θεσις** (Arr., Gal., Sext.); **περι-κάθ-αρμα** (LXX, Epict., Curt.); **περι-οχή** (Theophr., Diod., Plut., etc.); **περι-τομή** (LXX, Jos., papyri); **περι-ψημα** (Tob., Ign.); **πραυ-παθία** (Philo, Ign.); **προ-αύλιον** (Pollux); **προ-σάββατον** (LXX, eccl.); **προσ-αίτης** (lit. **κοινή**); **πρόσ-κομμα** (LXX, Plut.); **προ-σάββατον** (inscriptions, 81 A.D.); **προσ-κυνητής** (inscriptions, eccl., Byz.); **προσ-φάγιον** (inscriptions, **ὄψον Ἀττικῶς, προσ-φάγιον Ἑλληνικῶς**, Moeris); **προσωπο-λήμπτης** (Chrys.); **προσωπο-λημψία** (eccl.); **πρωτο-καθεδρία** (eccl.; **πρωτο-κλισία** (eccl. writers); **πρωτο-τόκια** (LXX, Philo, Byz.); **ῥαβδ-οῦχος** (**ῥάβδος**, **ἔχω**, literary **κοινή**); **ῥαδι-ούργημα** (literary **κοινή**), eccl.); **σαρδ-όνυξ** (Jos., Plut., Ptol.); **σιτο-μέτριον** (Polyb., Diod., Jos., inscriptions); **σκηνο-πηγία** (Arist., LXX, Philo, inscriptions); **σκηνο-ποιός** (AElian, eccl.); **σκληρο-καρδία** (LXX); **στρατο-πέδ-αρχος, --άρχης** (reading of Syrian class in Ac. 28:16), though critical text rejects both (Dion. Hal., Jos., Lucian); **συκο-μορέα** (Geop.); various new words with **σύν**, like **συν-αιχμάλωτος, συν-κατά-θεσ-ις, συν-κληρονόμος** (Philo, inscriptions); **συν-κοινωνός, συν-οδία** (LXX, Strabo, Jos., Epict., Plut.); **συν-πρεσ-βύτερος, σύν-τροφος** (LXX), etc.; **ταπεινο-φροσύνη** (Jos., Epict.); **τεκνο-γονία** (Arist.); **τετρα-άρχης** (Strabo, Jos.); **υἱο-θεσία** (Diod., Diog. Laert., inscriptions); **ὑπερ-έκεινα** (Byz. and eccl.); **ὑπο-γραμμός** (2 Macc., Philo, eccl.); **ὑπό-λειμμα** (from **ὑπο-λείπω**, LXX, Arist., Theoph., Plut., Galen); **ὑπό-λήνιον** (LXX, Demioph.); **ὑπο-πόδιον** (LXX, Lucian, Att.); in **ὑπο-στολή** (Jos., Plut.); **ὑπο-ταγή** (Dion. Hal.); **ὑπο-τύπωσις** (Sext. Emp., Diog. Laert.); **φρεν-άπάτης** (papyri, eccl. writers); **χαλκο-λίβανον** (LXX); **χειρό-γραφον** (Polyb.;

Dion. Hal., Tob., Plut., Artem., papyri); χρε-οφειλέτης (from χρέος or χρέως and ὀφειλέτης, LXX, AEsop, Plut., Dion. Hal.); χρηστο-λογία (Eust., eccl. writers); χρυσό-λιθος (Diod., LXX, Jos.); χρυσό-πρασος (only in Rev. 21:20); ψευδ-αδελφός, ψευδ-απόστολος ψευδο-διδάσκαλος, ψευδό-χριστος are all compounds of ψευδής and are N.T. words; ψευδο-προφήτης (ancient Greek ψευδόμαντις) is found in LXX, Philo, Jos.; ψευδό-μαρτυς (LXX) and ψευδο-μαρτυρία both go back to Plato and Aristotle. The papyri show many examples of such compounds. Cf. κωμο-γραμματεύς, P. Tb 40 (B.C. 117).

3. *Adjectives*. It will not be necessary to repeat the adjectives formed with inseparable prefixes (ἀ--, etc. The method of many grammars in dividing the compounds according to the element in the first or second part has not been followed here. It is believed that the plan adopted is a simpler and more rational exposition of the facts. These adjectives are compounded of two adjectives like ὀλιγό-ψυχος, an adjective and substantive like ἀκρο-γωνιαῖος or vice versa ἀνθρωπ-άρεσκος; a substantive and a verbal like χειρο-ποιήτος; a preposition and a verb like συμ-παθής, with two prepositions and verbal like παρ-είς-ακτος; an adverb and a preposition and a verbal like εὐ-πρόσ-δεκτος, etc. The adjective compounds used in the N. T. characteristic of the κοινή are somewhat numerous. Ἀγαθο-ποιός (Sirach, Plut.); ἀγρι-έλαιος (Anthol.); ἀκρο-γωνιαῖος (eccl.); ἀλλο-γενής (LXX and Temple inscriptions meant for gentiles to read); ἀν-εξί-κακος (from ἀνά, ἔχομαι and κακός, Lucian, Justin M., Poll., papyri); ἀνθρωπ-άρεσκος (LXX, eccl.); ἀπό-δεκτος (Sext. Emp., Plut., inscriptions); ἀπο-συν-άγωγος (2 Esclr.); ἀρτι-γέννητος (Lucian, Long.); αὐτό-κατά-κριτος (eccl. writers); βαρύ-τιμος (Strabo); γρα-ώδης (from γραῦς, εἶδος, Strabo, Galen); δεξιο-λάβος (true reading in Ac. 23:23, late eccl. writers); δευτερο-πρῶτος (cf. δευτερ-έσχατος, only MSS. in Lu. 6:1); δι-θάλασσος (Strabo, Dio Chrys., eccl.); δί-ψυχος (eccl.); ἕκ-θαμβος (Polyb., eccl.); ἐκ-τενής (Polyb., Philo); ἔκ-τρομος (only in ℵD Heb. 12:21, other MSS., ἔν-τρομος, LXX, Plut.); ἔκ-φοβος (Arist., Plut.); ἐπι-θανάτιος (Dion. Hal.); ἐπι-πόθητος (eccl.); ἑτερό-γλωσσος (LXX, Strabo, Philo); εὐ-άρεστος (Wisd., eccl., inscr., but Xen. has εὐαρέστεως) εὔ-κοπος (Polyb., LXX); εὐ-λογητός (LXX, Philo); εὐ-μετά-δοτος (Anton.); εὐ-πάρ-εδρος (for Text. Rec. εὐ-πρόσ-εδρος, Hesych.); εὐ-περί-στατος (only in Heb. 12:1); εὐ-πρόσ-δεκτος Plut., eccl.); εὐρύ-χωρος (Arist., LXX, Diod., Jos.); εὔ-σπλαγχνος (Hippoc., LXX, eccl. writers); θεο-δίδακτος (eccl.); θεόπνευστος (Plut., Phoc., eccl. writers, inscriptions); ἰσ-άγγελος (cf. ἰσό-θεος,

Philo, eccl.); ἰσό-τιμος (cf. ἰσόψυχος, Philo, Jos., Plut., Lucian, AElia, etc.); καθημερινός (from καθ' ἡμέραν, Judith, Theophr., Athen., Plut., Alciph., Jos.); κατ-ει-δωλος (only in Ac. 17:16); κενό-δοξος (Polyb., Diod., Philo, Anton., eccl. writers); λα-ξευτός (LXX); λετι-ουργικός (LXX, eccl. writers); μακρο-χρόνιος (LXX, Hipp., Agath.); ματαιο-λόγος (Telest.); μογι-λάλος (LXX, schol. to Lucian); νεό-φυτος (LXX, papyri, Aristophanes?); ὀκτα-ήμερος (eccl. writers); ὀλιγό-πιστος (only in N. T.); ὀλιγό-ψυχος (LXX, Artem.); ὁλο-τελής (Plut., Hexapla, eccl. writers); παν-οῦργος (Arist., κοινή, LXX); παρα-λυτικός (eccl. writers); παρ-εἰς-ακτος (Strabo); παρ-επί-δημος (Polyb., Athen., LXX); πατρο-παρά-δοτος (Diod., Dion. Hal., eccl. writers); πεντε-και-δέκατος (Diod., Plut., etc.); πολλα-πλασίων (Polyb., Plut., etc.); πολύ-σπλαγχνος (LXX, Theod. Stud.); πολύ-τιμος (Plut., Herodian, *Anatol.*); ποτομο-φόρητος (only in Rev. 12:15 and Hesyeh.); προ-βατικός (from πρό-βατον, LXX, Jo. 5:2); πρόσ--καιρος (4 Macc., Jos., Dio Cass., Dion. Hal., Strabo, Plut., Herodian); προ-φητικός (Philo, Lucian, eccl.); πρωτό-τοκος (LXX, Philo, Anatol., inscriptions, eccl.); σητό-βρωτος (LXX, Sibyll. Or.); σκληρο-τράχηλος (LXX); σκωληκό-βρωτος (Theophr.); σύμ-μορφος (Lucian, Nicand.); συμ-παθής (LXX); σύν-ψυχος (eccl. writers); συν-εκ-λεκτός (only in 1 Pet. 5:13); σύν-σωμος (eccl. writers); συ-στατικός (Ding. Laert.); ταπεινό-φρων (from ταπεινός, φρήν, LXX, Plut.); τρί-στεγος (Dion. Hal., Jos., Symm.); φθιν-οπωρινός (Arist., Polyb., Strabo, Plut.); φιλ-αγαθός (Arist., Polyb., Wisd., Plut., Philo); φίλ-αυτος (Arist., Philo, Plut., Jos., Sext.); φιλ-ήδονος (Polyb., Plut., Lucian, etc.); φιλό-θεος (Arist., Philo, Lucian, etc.); φρεν-απάτης (eccl. writers); χειρ-αγωγός (Artem., Plut., etc.); χειρο-ποίητος (LXX, Polyb., Dion. Hal., papyri); χρυσο-δακτύλιος (Jas. 2:2, elsewhere only in Hesych.). It will be apparent from this list how many words used in the N. T. appear first in Aristotle or the literary κοινή. Aristotle was no Atticist and broke away from the narrow vocabulary of his contemporaries. Many of these late words are found in the papyri and inscriptions also, as is pointed out. But we must remember that we have not learned all that the papyri and inscriptions have to teach us. Cf. also the numeral adjective δεκα-τεσσαρες (LXX, Polyb., papyri).[1] See further chapter VII, Declensions.

4. *Adverbs*. The late Greek uses many new adverbs and new kinds of adverbs (especially compounds and prepositional adverbs). For list of the new prepositional adverbs see chapter on

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 70,

prepositions. These are usually formed either from adjectives like ἐν-ώπιον (neuter of ἐν-ώπιος) or by composition of preposition and adverb as in ὑπερ-άνω, or preposition and adjective as in ἐκ-περισσοῦ), or two or more prepositions (prepositional adverbs as in ἀπ-έν-αντι), or a preposition and a noun-root as in ἀπο-τόμως, or a substantive and a verb as in νουν-εχῶς, or an adjective and a substantive as in παν-πληθεί, or an adjective and an adverb as in πάν-τοτε, or a preposition and a pronoun as in ἐξ-αυτῆς. In a word, the compound adverb is made from compound adjectives, substantives, verbs with all sorts of combinations. The κοινή shows a distinct turn for new adverbial combinations and the N. T. illustrates it very clearly. Paul, especially, doubles his adverbs as in ὑπερ-εκ-περισσοῦ. These adverbs are generally formed by parathetic composition and are used as prepositions in the later Greek, incorrectly so according to Blass.[1] But it must be remembered that the κοινή developed according to its own genius and that even the Atticists could not check it. In Luke παν-πληθεί, (Lu. 23:18) and παν-οικεί (Ac. 16:34) are not derived from adjectives or previous adverbs, but from substantives (perhaps assoc. instr.). As to the use of adverbs as prepositions, all prepositions were originally adverbs (cf. ἐν-αντίον). In the later language we simply can see the process of development in a better state of preservation. No magical change has come over an adverb used with a case. It is merely a helper of the case-idea and is part of the analytic linguistic development.

The chief compound adverbs used in the N. T. characteristic of the κοινή are here given. As the list of adverbs is much smaller than those of verbs, substantives and adjectives, compounds with ἀ-- privative are included here. Ἀ-δια-λείπτως (Polyb., Diod., Strabo, 1 Macc., papyri); ἀνά-μεσον and ἀνά-μερος is the Text. Rec. in Rev. 7:17 and 1 Cor. 14:27, but this is not the modern editing, rather ἀνὰ μέσον, etc.; ἀν-αντι-ρήτως (Polyb., etc.); ἀντι-πέρα (Xen. ἀντι-πέραν, Polyb., etc.); ἀπ-έναντι (Polyb., LXX, papyri and inscriptions); ἀ-περι-σπάστως (Polyb., Plut.); ἀπο-τόμως (Polyb., Diod., Wisd., Longin.); δηλ-αυγῶς (so ℵCLΔ in Mk. 8:25 for τηλ-αυγῶς); δια-παντός is the way Griesbach and Tisch. print διὰ παντός; ἔκ-παλαι (Philo and on, inscriptions); ἐν-τενῶς (Polyb., LXX, inscriptions); ἔν-αντι (LXX, inscriptions); ἐν-ώπιον (Theoc., LXX, papyri); ἐξ-άπινα (LXX, Jamb., Byz.); ἐξ-αυτῆς (Theogn., Arat., Polyb., Jos., etc.); ἐφ-άπαξ (Lucian, Dio Cass.,

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 65. Cf. Mayser's Gr., pp. 485 ff. Jannaris, § 1490.

etc.); καθ-εξῆς (AElian, Plut.); κατ-έν-αντι (LXX, Hermas); κατ-εν-ώπιον (LXX); νουν-εχῶς (Arist., Polyb.); παν-πληθεί (Dio Cass.); παν-οικεί (rejected by the Atticists for πανοικίᾳ [LXX], Plato Eryx., Philo, Jos.); πάν-τοτε (Sap., Menand., Dion. Hal., condemned by the Atticists for ἑκάστοτε); παρ-εκτός (LXX); προσ-φάτως (LXX, Polyb., Alciph.); ὑπερ-άνω (Arist., LXX, Polyb., Jos., Plut., etc.); ὑπερ-έκεινα (Byz. and eccl.); ὑπερ-εκ-περισσοῦ (Dan. 2:22, Ald., Compl.); ὑπερ-εκ-περισσῶς (T, W. H. marg. 1 Th. 5 : 13, Clem. Rom.); ὑπερ-λίαν (Eust.); ὑπερ-περισσῶς (only Mk. 7:37). There are two ways of writing some of these compound adverbs, either as single words or as two or more words. The editors differ as to διὰ παντος, ἐφ᾽ ἅπαξ, ἐκ-πάλαι, καθ᾽ ἡμέραν, καθ᾽ ὅλου, ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνα etc. The editors do as they wish about it. These compound adverbs were still more numerous in the Byzantine writers.[1] For further list of verbs compounded with prepositions see "Language of the N. T." by Thayer, in Hastings' *D. B*. The κοινή was fond of compound words, some of which deserve the term sesquipedalian, like καταδυναστεύω, συναντιλαμβάνομαι, etc. We must not forget that after all these modern words from Aristotle onwards are only a small portion of the whole. Kennedy (*Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 62) claims that only about 20 per cent. of the words in the N. T. are post-Aristotelian. Many of this 20 per cent. reach back into the past, though we have no record as yet to observe. The bulk of the words in the N. T. are the old words of the ancients, some of which have a distinct classic flavour, literary and even poetic, like αἰσθητήριον, πολυποίκιλος. See list in Thayer's article in Hastings' *D. B*., III, p. 37.

These lists seem long, but will repay study. They are reasonably complete save in the case of verbs compounded with prepositions and substantives so compounded. As a rule only words used by Aristotle and later writers are given, while Demosthenes is not usually considered, since he was more purely Attic.

V. Personal Names Abbreviated or Hypocoristic. The chapter on Orthography will discuss the peculiarities of N. T. proper names in general. Here we are concerned only with the short names formed either from longer names that are preserved or from names not preserved. This custom of giving short pet-names is not a peculiarity of Greek alone. It belonged, moreover, to the early stages of the language and survives still.[2] It was used not merely with Greek names, but also with foreign names brought into the Greek. It is proof of the vernacular κοινή in the N. T.

[1] W.-M., p. 127. [2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 293.

Cf. English "Tom" and "Will." These abbreviated names are regularly from compounds, as **Ζηνᾶς** for **Ζηνό-δωρος** (Tit. 3:13). Of the various forms used in these abbreviated names only three occur in the N. T., —ας, —ῆς, --ῶς. The great majority belong to —ας or —ᾶς.[1] **᾽Αμπλίας** (or —ιᾶς) is the reading of the Western and Syrian classes in Ro. 16:8 for **᾽Αμπλιᾶτος** (Latin *Ampliatus*); **᾽Ανδρέας** is, according to Blass,[2] "a genuine old Greek form," while Schmiedel[3] thinks it can come from **᾽Ανδρομέδης**; **᾽Αντίπας** is an abbreviation of **᾽Αντίπατρος** (Rev. 2:13) (found in inscription iii/A.D. at Pergamum[4]); **᾽Απολλώς**, possibly[5] an abbreviation for **᾽Απολλώνιος**, is the reading of D in Ac. 18:24, though **א** 15, 180 read **᾽Απελλῆς** here, while **᾽Απελλῆς** is read by all MSS. in Ro. 16:10 (cf. Doric **᾽Απελλᾶς** in inscriptions, PAS, ii, 397); **᾽Αρτεμᾶς** (Tit. 3:12) is an abbreviation of **᾽Αρτεμίδωρος; Δημᾶς** (Col. 4:14; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. 4:10) is probably an abbreviation of **Δημήτριος**, though **Δήμαρχος** is possible (**Δημέας** also=**Δημᾶς**) not to mention **Δημάρατος, Δημόδοκος; ᾽Επαφρᾶς** (Col. 1:7; 4:12; Phil. 23) is (Ramsay so takes it, *Expositor*, Aug., 1906, p. 153. Cf. genitive **᾽Επαφρᾶδος**, PAS, iii, 375; Fick-Bechtel, p. 16) an abbreviation of **᾽Επαφρόδιτος** (Ph. 2:25; 4:18), but it does not follow that, if true, the same man is indicated in Ph. and Col.; **῾Ερμᾶς** (Ro. 16:14) is from the old Doric form abbreviated from **῾Ερμόδωρος; ῾Ερμῆς** (Ro. 16:14) may be merely the name of the god given to a man, though Blass doubts it.[6] Likewise we may note that **θευδᾶς** (Ac. 5:36) is possibly an abbreviation of **θεόδωρος**; **᾽Ιουνίας** (sometimes taken as feminine **᾽Ιουνία**, Ro. 16:7) may be **᾽Ιουνιᾶς** as abbreviation of **᾽Ιουνιανός**; **Κλεόπας** (Lu. 24:18) is apparently an abbreviation of **Κλεόπατρος; Λουκᾶς** (Col. 4:14; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. 4:11) is an abbreviation of **Λουκανός** and of **Λούκιος**[7]; **Νυμφᾶς** (Col. 4:15) is probably derived from **Νυμφόδωρος**; **᾽Ολυμπᾶς**

[1] See Fick-Bechtel, Die griech. Personennamen, 1894; Pape, Worterbuch der griech. Eigennamen, 1842, ed. Benseler, 1870; Neil, Beitr. zur Onomatolo gie; W. Schulze, Graeca Lat., 1901; Hoole, the Class. Elem. in the N. T., 1888; Kretsch., Gesell. der griech. Spr., Die kleinasiat. Personennamen, pp. 311-370.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 71.

[3] W.-Sch., p. 143.

[4] Deiss., B. S., p. 187.

[5] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 143 f., for objections to this derivation. In a Fayum pap: (Deiss., B. S., p. 149) **᾽Απολλώνιος** occurs **ὃς καὶ συριστὶ ᾽Ιωνάθας**. Cf. Brug., Griech. Or., 1900, p. 175.

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 71. Cf. also Fick-Bechtel, p. 304. Fick (xxxviii) takes it from **῾Ερμοκράτης**, as also **῾Ερμᾶς**.

[7] Ramsay (Exp., Dec., 1912, pp. 504 ff.) quotes inscription of Pisid. Antioch where **Λουκᾶς** and **Λούκιος** are used for the same person.

(Ro. 16:15) is apparently abbreviated from **Ὀλυμπιόδωρος**, though **Ὀλυμπιανός** is possible; **Παρμενᾶς** (Ac. 6:5) is probably an abbreviation of **Παρμενίδης**, though Blass[1] suggests **Παρμένων; Πατρόβας** (Ro. 16:14) is derived from **Πατρόβιος; Σίλας** (Ac. 15:22, etc.) is the same man as **Σιλουανός** (MSS. often **Σιλβανός**), as Paul always calls him (1 Th. 1:1, etc. So Peter in 1 Pet. 5:12); **Στεφανᾶς** (1 Cor. 1:16; 16:15, 17) may be either a modification of **Στέφανος** or an abbreviation of **Στεφανηφόρος; Σώπατρος** (Ac. 20:4) is read **Σωσίπατρος** by a dozen of the cursives and the Sah. Cop. Arm. versions, while **Σωσίπατρος** is the correct text in Ro. 16:21, but it is not certain that they represent the same man, for **Σώπατρος** is from Beroea and **Σωσίπατρος** from Corinth, though it is possible. **Ἀρχέλαος, Νικόλαος** appear in the N. T. in the unabbreviated forms, though in the Doric the abbreviated forms in –ας were used. On the subject of the N. T. proper names one can consult also Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maander und das N. T.*, 1906, p. 39 f. He finds twenty of the N. T. names in the Magnesia inscriptions, such as **Ἀπφία, Ἀρτεμᾶς** (**Ἀρτεμίδωρος**), etc. **Κυρία** is a common proper name (cf. Hatch, *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, 1908, p. 145). For the papyri illustrations see Mayser, *Gr. der griech. Papyri (Laut- und Wortlehre*, 1906), p. 253 f. Cf. also Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (1907), who shows that in both B and **א** as well as D the abbreviation IHC XPC is found as well as the more usual IC XC. Cf. Nestle, *Exp. Times*, Jan., 1908, p. 189. Moulton (*Cl. Quarterly*, April, 1908, p. 140) finds **Ἀκουσίλαος** in the body of a letter in a papyrus and **Ἀκοῦτι**, the abbreviated address, on the back. See also Burkitt, *Syriac Forms of N. T. Proper Names* (1912), and Lambertz, *Die griech. Sklavennamen* (1907).

VI. **The History of Words**. This subject concerns not merely the new words appearing in the N. T. but all words there used. This is the best place for a few remarks on it. It is not enough to know the etymology, the proper formation and the usage in a given writer. Before one has really learned a word, he must know its history up to the present time, certainly up to the period which he is studying. The resultant meaning of a word in any given instance will be determined by the etymology, the history and the immediate context.[2] The etymology and the history belong to the lexicon, but the insistence on these principles is within

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 71. Cf. Meisterh., Gr. der att. Inschr. (pp. 114-118), for formation of proper names.

[2] Cf. Heine, Synon. des neutest. Griech., p. 29. Goodell, The Gk. in Eng., 1886, gives a popular exhibition of the influence of Gk. on Eng.

the purview of grammar. The N. T. Greek on this point only calls for the same treatment granted all literature in all languages and ages.

Take σκάνδαλον, for instance. It is a shorter form of the old Greek word σκανδάληθρον, 'trap-stick.' The root σκανδ is seen in the Sanskrit *skandami*, 'to dart,' 'to leap.' The Latin has it in *scando*, *de-scendo*. The termination –άληθρον is possibly the suffix –τρον, (–θρον) for instrument and σκανδ-άλα(ν). The form σκανδάλη occurs in Alciphro, of which σκάνδ-αλο-ν is simply the neuter variation. Σκάνδ-αλο-ν occurs first in the LXX as a translation for מוֹקֵשׁ or מִכְשׁוֹל, 'a noose,' 'a snare,' as in Ps. 69 (68):23. It was the trap-stick, the trap, the impediment; then a stumbling-block or any person who was an occasion of stumbling, as in Josh. 23:13. So Peter became a stumbling-block to Jesus, σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ (Mt. 16:23). Christ crucified became a σκάνδαλον to the Jews (1 Cor. 1:23). Take again ἐκ-κλησία (from ἔκ-κλητος, ἐκκαλέω). The root καλ appears in the Latin *cal-endae, con-cil-ium, nomen-cha-tor*; in the Old High German *hal-on*, 'to call.' Originally ἐκ-κλησία was a calling-out of the people from their homes, but that usage soon passed away. It became the constitutional assembly of Athens and "we must banish from our minds all remembrance of its etymology."[1] In the LXX the word is used as the equivalent of קָהָל, the assembly of the Israelites as a whole. In the N. T. the word takes a further advance. It still appears in the sense of 'assembly' at times, as in 1 Cor. 11:18, but usually, as Thayer shows (*Lexicon*), the idea of the word is that of body or company of believers whether assembled or not, the body of Christ. This is true at times where the idea of assembly is impossible, as in Ac. 8:3. The word in this sense of body of Christians is used either in the local (Ac. 8:3) or the general sense (Mt. 16:18). In the general sense the word does not differ greatly from one aspect of the word βασιλεία. These examples must suffice.

VII. The Kinship of Greek Words. The study of the family tree of a word is very suggestive. Δείκ-νυ-μι is a good illustration in point. It has the root δικ which appears in the Sanskrit *dic-a-mi*, 'to show,' Latin *dic-o*, Gothic *teiho*, German *zeigen*, etc. On the root δικ a number of Greek words are built, as δίκ-η, 'the way pointed out,' 'right' or 'justice'; δίκην, 'after the way' or 'like'; δεῖξ-ις, 'a showing'; 'something shown'; δίκ-αιος, 'a man who seeks to go the right way,' 'righteous'; δικ-αιόω, 'to

[1] Hicks, Cl. Rev., 1887, p. 43. See also Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., pp. 57-60.

make or declare one to be righteous'; δικ-αίω-σις, 'the act of declaring one righteous'; δικ-αίω-μα, 'the thing declared to be right'; δικ-αιο-σύνη, 'the quality of being right,' 'righteousness'; δικ-αίως, 'righteously' or 'justly'; δικ-ασ-τήριον or δικ-**0**ασ-τῆς, one who decides righteously'; δικ-ασ-τήριον, 'the place for judging righteously.' Each of these words occurs in the N. T. save three, δίκην, δικ-αιωτής, δικασ-τήριον. With these twelve words the difference in meaning is not so much due to historical development (like ἐκκλησία) as to the idea of the various suffixes. It is, of course, true that the N. T. has a special doctrine of righteousness as the gift of God which colours most of these words. The point is that all these various points of view must be observed with each word. Another illustration that will not be followed up is λύτρον (Mt. 20:28), ἀπο-λύτρω-σις (Ro. 3:24). The ideas of action, agent, result, instrument, quality, plan, person, etc., as shown by the suffixes, differentiate words from each other.

Green in his *Handbook to Grammar of N. T. Greek*[1] illustrates this point well with the root κρι (κριν), giving only the examples that occur in the N. T. They will be found interesting: first, the verb,; κρίν-ω, ἀνα-κρίν-ω, ἀντ-απο-κρίν-ομαι, ἀπο-κρίν-ομαι, δια-κρίν-ω, ἐγ-κρίν-ω, ἐπι-κρίν-ω, κατα-κρίν-ω, συγ-κρίν-ω, συν-υπο-κρίν-ομαι, ὑποκρίν-ω; second, the substantive, κρίσις, κρί-μα, κρι-τῆριον, κρι-τής, ἀνάπκρι-σις, ἀπο-κρι-μα, ἀπό-κρι-σις, διάκρι-σις, εἰλι-κρίν-εια, κατά-κρι-μα, κατά-κρι-σις, πρό-κρι-μα, ὑπό-κρι-σις, ὑπο-κρι-τής; third, adjectives, κρι-τικός, ἀ-διά-κρι-τος, ἀ-κατά-κρι-τος, ἀν-υπό-κρι-τος, αὐτο-κατά-κρι-τος, εἰλι-κρι-νής.

The development of this line of study will amply repay the N. T. student.

VIII. Contrasts in Greek Words or Synonyms. The Greek is rich in synonyms. In English one often has a choice between the Anglo-Saxon word or its Norman-French equivalent, as "to ask" or "to inquire."[2] The Greeks made careful distinctions in words. Socrates tripped the Sophists on the exact meaning of words as often as anywhere. We are fortunate in N. T. study in the possession of two excellent treatises on this subject. Trench, *Synonyms of the N. T.*, 1890, is valuable, though not exhaustive. But he gives enough to teach one how to use this method of investigation. Heine, *Synon. des neatest. Griech.*, 1898, is more comprehensive and equally able. The matter can only be mentioned

[1] § 149, new ed., 1904.

[2] Cf. Skeat, Prin. of Eng. Etym., 1st ser. (Native Words, 1892); 2d ser. (Foreign Words, 1891).

here and illustrated. With δίκαιος, for instance, one should compare ἀγαθός, ἅγιος, καθαρός, καλός, ὅσιος, before he can obtain a complete idea of N. T. goodness or righteousness. We see Jesus himself insisting on the use of ἀγαθός for the idea of absolute goodness in Mk. 10:18, οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός. Both ἀγαθός and δίκαιος occur in Lu. 23:50. In Lu. 8:15 the phrase καρδία ἀγαθὴ καὶ καλὴ approaches Socrates' common use of καλὸς κ' ἀγαθός for "the beautiful and the good." It is also the Greek way of saying "gentleman" which no other language can translate. To go no further, τέρας, δύναμις and σημεῖον are all three used to describe the complete picture of a N. T. miracle. Νέος is 'young' and 'not yet old,' καινός is 'recent' and 'not ancient.'

CHAPTER VI

ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONETICS

The term orthography is used to include all that pertains to the spelling of Greek words. Phonetics deals with the sounds of the letters. The orthography was constantly changing, but not so rapidly as did the sounds. Each had an independent development as is seen very strikingly in the modern Greek vernacular (Thumb, *Handbook of the Mod. Gk. Vernac*., p. 6). There has never been a fixed orthography for the Greek tongue at any stage of its history. There has always been an effort to have new phonetic spelling to correspond to the sound-change. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk*., p. 6. The confusion in spelling grew with the centuries as in English. Many delicate questions confront us at once. It has not seemed possible to give the explanation of all the varied phonetic (true or merely analogical) and orthographic changes in the use of the vowels and consonants. An orderly collection of the facts with historical side-lights is all that is attempted.

I. The Uncertainty of the Evidence. It is difficult to tell what is the vernacular usage in N. T. times on many points, though somewhat less so since the discovery of the papyri.

(a) THE ANCIENT LITERARY SPELLING. The difficulty is much increased by the comparison of the phonetic spelling of the modern vernacular with the historical orthography of the ancient literary Greek.[1] This method applied to any language may lead one into error. Modern conversational English differs widely in orthography from Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. For most of the history of the Greek language no lexicons or grammars were in use. There were the schools and the books on the one hand and popular usage on the other. The movement of the Atticists was just the opposite of the modern phonetic spelling movement in English. The Atticists sought to check change rather than hasten it. It is to be remembered also that the Atticists were the cloister

[1] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 19 f.

copyists of the ancient Greek writings and of the N. T. Later copyists reflect local types, some more conservative, some less so. The law of life is best here, as always, without artificial impulse or restraint. In seeking to restore the orthography of the vernacular of the first century A.D. one must not be handicapped by the literary Attic nor the modern Greek vernacular, though each will be of service. In simple truth one has to be less dogmatic these days concerning what could or could not have been in the past. Breasted[1] calmly assures us that before 3000 B.C. "the alphabetic signs, each of which stood for one consonant," were in use in Egypt. He adds: "Had the Egyptian been less a creature of habit, he might have discarded his syllabic signs 3500 years before Christ, and have written with an alphabet of 24 letters." The Greek language was a growth and did not at first have 24 letters. E, even in early Attic,[2] not to mention Cretan, had the force of ε, η and sometimes ει. Indeed Jannaris[3] asserts that "the symbols η and ω, in numerous cases also ι, originated at school as mere compensatory marks, to represent positional or 'thetic' ε or ο." It is not surprising with this origin of vowels (and consonants do not differ) that variations always exist in the sound and use of the Greek letters. Blass[4] is clearly right when he points out that in changes in the sounds of words "it is usual for the spelling not to imitate the new sound off-hand," and in the case of the N. T. writers there was "no one fixed orthography in existence, but writers fluctuated between the old historical spelling and a new phonetic manner of writing." Moulton[5] adds that the N. T. writers had to choose "between the literary and illiterate Greek of their time," and "an artificial orthography left the door open for not a few uncertainties." Here is a "letter of a prodigal son" (B.G.U. 846 ii/A.D. See Milligan, *Gk. Papyri,* p. 93 f.) in which we have "phonetic" spelling in abundance: **Καὶ διὰ πάντω[ν] εὔχομαί σαι ὑγειαίνειν. Τὸ προσκύνημά σου** [ποι]ῶ **κατ᾽ αἰκάστην ἡμαίραν παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ** [Σερ]άπειδει**. Γεινώσκειν σαι θέλω κτλ.** There is here interchange of ε and αι, of ι and ει.

(b) THE DIALECT-COLOURED VERNACULAR. The dialects explain some variations in orthography. One copyist would be a better representative of the pure vernacular **κοινή** while another might

[1] A Hist. of Egypt, 1906, p. 45.

[2] Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 3; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 26 f.; Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae etc., pp. 52 ff.

[3] Op. cit., p. 27.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 6.

[5] Prol., p. 42.

live where Attic, Ionic, Doric or Northwest Greek had still positive influence. Often what looks like a breaking-down of the language is but the survival or revival of old dialectical forms or pronunciation. But these variations are mainly due to the personal equation. It was not till the time of Marcus Aurelius that the learned grammarians succeeded in formulating the artificial rules which afterwards prevailed for writing the old classical Greek. The first century A.D. was still an age of freedom in orthography. Even in the fourth century A.D. the scribe of ℵ prefers ι rather than ει, while in the case of B ει often occurs where ι, is the rule elsewhere. This is not mere itacism, but is also individual preference.[1] "The oldest scribes whose work we possess (centuries 4 to 6) always kept themselves much freer from the schools than the later."[2] But, even if Luke and Paul did not know the old historical spelling in the case of ι mute (subscript) and ει, it is merely cutting the Gordian knot to "follow the Byzantine school, and consistently employ the historical spelling in the N. T." and that "without any regard to the MS. evidence." It is not the spelling of the Byzantine school nor of the Attic dialect that we are after, but the vernacular Greek of the first century A.D., and this is not quite "the most unprofitable of tasks," as Blass would have us believe.[3]

(c) THE UNCIALS. They do complicate the situation. On some points, as noted above, the great uncials ℵ and B differ, but usually that is not true. There is a general agreement between the older uncials in orthography as against the later uncials and the cursives which fell under the spell of the Byzantine reformers, who sought to restore the classical literary spelling. The Syrian class of documents therefore fails to represent the orthography of

[1] Hort, The N. T. in Orig. Gk., App., Notes on Sel. Read., p. 152. But in the Intr. (p. 304) Hort is not willing to admit "peculiarities of a local or strictly dialectic nature" in the N. T. Still Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 151) allows the Doric ὁδαγέω (ὁδηγέω) in "single MS." like B and D, προσαχεῖν in B, ῥάσσω in D, etc. Hirt (Handb. d. Griech., p. 53) attributes much of the vocal change to dialect-mixing and analogy. On ℵ and B see Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 306 f.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 6 f.

[3] Ib., p. 7. Hort (p. 302 f. of the Intr. to the N. T. in Orig. Gk.) makes a strong defence of his effort to give as nearly as possible "the spelling of the autographs by means of documentary evidence." There must not be "slovenly neglect of philological truth." But Moulton (Prol., p. 47) does not "set much store by some of the minutiae which W. H. so conscientiously gather from the great uncials." Certainly "finality is impossible, notwithstanding the assistance now afforded by the papyri" (Thack., Gr., p. 71).

the vernacular κοινή of the first century A.D. The Syrian class, for instance, reads **Κ**αρερναούμ, not **Κ**αφαρναούμ. But do the MSS. which give us the pre-Syrian types of text preserve the autographic orthography? The fourth century is a long time from the first and the presumption might seem to be to some extent against the Neutral, Alexandrian and Western classes also. The temptation is constant to spell as people of one's time do. This difficulty is felt by every editor of classical Greek texts and often purely arbitrary rules are used, rules made by modern critics. Hort[1] is willing to admit that in some instances the spellings found in the great uncials which are at variance with the Textus Receptus are due to the "literary spellings of the time" when the MSS. were written, "but for the most part they belong to the 'vulgar' or popular form of the language." Hort could see that before we had the new knowledge from the papyri and inscriptions. He adds[2]: "A large proportion of the peculiar spellings of the N. T. are simply spellings of common life. In most cases either identical or analogous spellings occur frequently in inscriptions written in different countries, by no means always of the more illiterate sort." This fact showed that the unclassical spellings in the uncials were current in the Apostolic age and were the most trustworthy even if sometimes doubtful. "Absolute uniformity belongs only to artificial times," Hort[3] argues, and hence it is not strange to find this confusion in the MSS. The confusion existed in fact in the first century A.D. and probably the autographs did not follow uniform rules in spelling. Certain it is that the N. T. writings as preserved in the MSS. vary. But itacism applies to all the MSS. to a certain extent and makes it difficult to know what vowel or diphthong was really before the scribe. In general the N. T., like the LXX, is grounded in matters of orthography on the rules of the grammarians of the time of the Caesars (Apollonius and Herodian) rather than upon those of the time of Hadrian, when they had an archaistic or Atticistic tendency (Helbing, *Grammatik* d. LKX, p. 1). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 42) thinks that "there are some suggestive signs that the great uncials, in this respect as in others, are not far away from the autographs." But Thackeray (*op. cit*., p. 56) denies that this

[1] *Op. cit.,*. p. 303 f. Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 35) calls attention to the fact that the professional copyists not only had to copy accurately, but "in the received uniform spelling." Cf. also Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 2. For further remarks on the phenomena in the LXX MSS. see Swete, 0. T. in Gk. p. 300 f.

[2] *Op. cit*., p. 304.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 308.

conclusion can be drawn *ipso facto* of the LXX, since it was translated (the Pentateuch certainly) some three centuries earlier than the N. T. was written.

(d) THE PAPYRI. They strengthen the case for the uncials. Deissmann[1] and Moulton[2] show that the great uncials correspond in orthography not only with the contemporaneous inscriptions as Hort had seen, but also with the papyri of the better-educated writers. Among the strictly illiterate papyri writers one can find almost anything. The case of ἐάν=ἄν in relative clauses is worked out well by Moulton to prove this point. In the papyri dated B.C. the proportion of ἐάν to ἄν in such cases is 13 to 29, while in the first century A.D. it is 76 to 9. But in the fourth century A.D. it is 4 to 8 and the usage disappears in the sixth century A.D. Thackeray (*Grammar*, vol. I, pp. 65 ff.) shows (after Deissmann[3]) how the LXX confirms this conclusion for ἐάν=ἄν. The usage appears in B.C. 133; copyists are divided in different parts of the same book as in Exodus or Leviticus; it is predominant in the first and second centuries A.D., and then disappears. Thackeray (p. 58) traces **οὐθείς (μηθείς)** "from its cradle to its grave" (from 378 B.C. to end of ii/A.D.) and shows how in ii/A.D. **οὐδείς** is supreme again. This point very strikingly confirms the faithfulness of the uncials in orthography in a matter out of harmony with the time when the MSS. were written. We may conclude then that Hort is right and the uncials, inscriptions and papyri give us the vernacular orthography of the **κοινή** with reasonable correctness.

II. **Vowel-Changes** (στοιχεῖα φωνήεντα). In the old times the vowels underwent many changes, for orthography was not fixed. Indeed is it ever fixed? If the Atticists had let the **κοινή** have a normal development, Dr. Rutherford would not have complained that Greek was ruined by their persistence "in an obsolete orthography instead of spelling as they speak."[4] But as early as 403 B.C. the orator Archinos[5] had a law passed in Attica prescribing the use of the Ionic alphabet in the schools. The early Greek used only **α, ε, ι, ο, υ,** and no distinction was made in writing be-

[1] B. S., pp. 202 ff. [2] Prol., pp. 42 ff.

[3] B. S., pp. 202 ff. On the whole subject of the difficulty of N. T. orthog. see W.-Sch., pp. 31 ff. Deiss. (B. S., p. 180) is clearly right in denying a "N. T. orthography" save as individual writers, as now, have their peculiarities. For general remarks about vowel changes in LXX MSS. see Swete, 0. T. in Gk., p. 301 f.; Thack., Gr., vol. I, pp. 71-100; Helbing, Gr., Laut- u. Wortl., pp. 3-14.

[4] Nicklin, Cl. Rev., 1906, p. 115, in review of Rutherford's A Chap. in the Hist. of Annotation, 1905. [5] Cf. Bekker, Anec. Gr., vol. II, p. 783.

tween long and short vowels, as indeed was never done in "the case of ι and υ. The Ionic invented[1] Ω for long ο. Before the introduction of the Ionic alphabet, I.E. a and e were represented by ε. H was at first the aspirate like Hebrew ה and then now aspirate and now long ε or α as the inscriptions amply show. It is very common in the early inscriptions to see ε thus used as long and o likewise, as in ἓναι and τος. Cf. ε, ο for spurious diphthongs ει, ου. The kinship of these vowels with the Phoenician alphabet is plain, as α is from א, ε from ה, ι from י, ο from ע, υ from the doubling of ו (and so a Greek invention). It is interesting to note that the Sanskrit has three pure vowels, a, i, u, while *e* and *o* are diphthongs in origin. In Sanskrit *a* far surpasses all other vowel-sounds, more than twice as many as all other vowel-sounds put together.[2] Schleicher[3] speaks of the weakening of a into *i* and *u*, and thus he, goes back to an original *a* sound for all the vowels. In Latin also *a* breaks into *e*, *i* and *u*.[4] Even in Attica in the first century B.C., in spite of Archinos' law, the inscriptions use sometimes αι and αε, ει and ι, η and ι, υ and ι, υ and υι, ι and ει interchangeably.[5] Uniformity did not exist in one dialect, not to mention the persistent differences between the various Greek dialects. These changes were going on constantly all over the Greek world in the first century A.D. For the alphabetical changes in the dialects see Buck's *Greek Dialects*, pp. 15 ff. These interchanges between vowels are interesting.

(a) THE CHANGES (INTERCHANGES) WITH α. The first sound made by a baby is α. These changes became dialectical peculiarities in many words like the Lesbian κρέτος (κράτος, "ablaut" variations), the Boeotian ἄτερος (ἕτερος), Doric ἰαρός (ἱερός).[6] So in the vernacular Attic we find , ἐρετή (ἀρετή) where a breaks to ε before ε (vowel assimilation), as in the Ionic-Attic a sometimes changes to ε after ι and υ.[7] See Kuhner-Blass[6] for many examples.

[1] Riem. and Goelzer, Gr. Comp. du Grec et du Lat., Phonét., p. 38. Cf. also Donaldson, The New Crat., pp. 207 ff.; K.-B1., Griech. Gr., Tl. I, Bd. I, pp. 39 ff.; Earle, Names of the Orig. Letters of the Gk. Alph. (Class-Papers, 1912, pp. 257 ff.); Flin.-Pet., Form. of the Gk. Alph. (1912). But Sir Arthur Evans gets the Gk. Alph. from Crete.

[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 10.

[3] Vergl. Gr., p. 55. His opinion is now considered antiquated.

[4] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 149 f.

[5] Telfy, Chron. and Topog. d. griech. Ausspr. etc., 1893, p. 39. See also Larsfeld, Griech. Epig., 1892, pp. 494 ff.; King and Cookson, Sounds and Inflex. in Gk. and Lat., 1888.

[6] K.-B1., Tl. I, Bd. I, p. 115 f.

[7] Hirt, Handb. der griech. Laut- u. Formenl., pp. 115, 119. Γά, is the form

α and ε. **Ἀ**γγαρεύω appears as ἐγγαρ. in ℵ (Mt. 5:41) and ℵB (Mk. 15:21).[1] The New Ionic εἵνεκεν (more commonly ἕνεκεν) has nearly displaced the Attic ἕνεκα which Blass[2] admits only in Ac. 26:21. **Εἶ**τεν for εἶτα appears in Mk. 4:28 as a rare Ionic form. Herodotus[3] had both εἶτα and ἔπειτα. **Κ**αθαρίζω in the aorist (active and passive) and perfect middle has ε for the second α in many of the best MSS. both in LXX and N. T. (cf. Mk. 1:42; Mt. 8: 3 W. H.). Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 82, gives the facts. Blass[4] points out that **Π**άτερα **(Π**άταρα) occurs in AC in Ac. 21:1. **Τ**εσσεράκοντα is the form given always by W. H. This is an Ionic form (vowel assimilation) which is not so common in the papyri as in the N. T. MSS.[5] In modern Greek both σαράντα and σεράντα survive. Likewise W. H. always give the preference to τέσσερα, though the papyri do not use it till the fourth century A.D.[6] But in the inscriptions τέσσερα is found several times,[7] one case in the first century A.D.[8] **Τ**έσσερας, however, does not occur in the N. T. MSS., though the papyri have it in the Byzantine age.[9] The Ionic and the modern Greek have τέσσαρες and τέσσερα. The N. T. thus differs from the κοινή papyri, but is in harmony with the Ionic literature and inscriptions. In some MSS. in both LXX and N. T.

in Doric and Boeotian, while γε is found in the Ionic, Attic and Cypriote (Meister, Griech. Dial., Bd. II, p. 29).

[1] Deiss., B. S., p. 182, gives εὐγαρίας in a pap. (iv/A.D.).

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 20. Cf. Note in W.-Sch., p. 50; Thack., pp. 82, 135; Mays., p. 14.

[3] According to Phrynichus (Rutherford, New Phryn., p. 204) both of these words are ἐσχάτως βὰρβαρα.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 20. [5] Moulton, Prol., p. 46.

[6] Ib. For assimilation between a and E in modern Gk. dialects see Dieterich, Unters. etc., pp. 272, 274. In mod. Gk. vernacular a frequently displaces initial ε or ο. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 14.

[7] Dieterich, Unters. zur Gesch. der griech. Spr., p. 4; also Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 163.

[8] Nachm., Laute and Formen d. magn. Inschr., p. 146.

[9] Moulton, Prol., p. 46. For further evidence see Cronert, Mem. Graeca Hercul., 1903, p. 199. In the Apostolic Fathers and the N. T. Apoc. τέσσερα and τεσσεράκοντα are common as well as ἐκαθερίσθη (Reinhold, De Graecitate Patr. Apostol. etc., p. 38 f. On the whole subject of α and ε in the papyri see careful discussion of Mayser, Gr., pp. 54-60, where he mentions **ἐκούω, ἐγγαρεύω, ἐπελεύσασθαι** (for similar confusion of aorist and fut. inf. see **ἐκφεύ**ξασθαι, 2 Macc. 9:22 V). **Τ**έσσερα and τεσσεράκοντα are very common also in the LXX MSS. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 5; Thack., Gr., p. 62f. This spelling occurs as early as iv/B.C. in Pergamum (Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 163 f.). In Egypt it hardly appears before i/A.D. and is not common till ii/A.D. (Thack., Gr., p. 62). The uncials give the later spelling. See "Additional Notes."

τέσσαρες is accusative as well as nominative, like the Achaean dialect, but this is another story. ℵ in Rev. 3:16 has χλιερός. The common (Ionic and Northwest Greek) use of —έω instead of –άω with verbs as in ἐρωτέω will be discussed in the chapter on Verbs.

Conversely ε is sometimes changed to α. **Ἀμφιάζει** is accepted by W. H. in Lu. 12:28 rather than either the late **ἀμφιέζει** or the early **ἀμφιέννυσι**. The form **ἐραυνάω** instead of **ἐρευνάω** W. H. have everywhere received into the text, and so with **ἐξερανυνάω** and **ἀνεξεραύνητος**. ℵB always read it so, sometimes AC. It is supported by the papyri. Cf. Mayser, *Gr*., p. 113; Helbing, *Gr. d*. LXX, p. 7, for similar phenomena in the LXX.

Initial ε often becomes α in modern Greek vernacular, as **ἀλαφρός (ἐλαφρός), ἄντερα (ἔντερα)**, etc. Cf. Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 14. So the Doric πιάζω is used in the N. T. everywhere save in Lu. 6:38, where, however, πεπιεσμένος has the original idea ('pressed down,' not 'seized'). Both occur in the LXX. The Attic forms **φιάλη, ὕαλος** are retained in the N. T. (as in LXX) rather than the Ionic and vernacular **κοινή** forms in ε, a mark of the influence of the literary[1] **κοινή**.

Some verbs in —έω also use –αω forms, like **ἐλεάω, ἐλλογάω, ξυράω.** See the chapter on Verbs.

Changes in α take place in a few Hebrew proper names. **Καπερναούμ**, is the Syrian reading for **Καφαρναούμ** (W. H.). So W. H. read **Μαλελεήλ** in Lu. 3:37, not **Μελ**. (Tisch.), and **Ναθαναήλ**. **Σελαθιήλ** (instead of **Σαλ**.) appears in B. Thumb[2] remarks that these changes between α and ε occur to-day in the Kappadocian dialect.

α *and* **η.** The Doric forms **ὁδαγός, ὁδαγῶ** are found in the **κοινή**, though Schweizer[3] calls it hardly a Dorism. So in N. T. MSS. we have προσαχέω in B (Ac. 27:27) and ῥάσσω in D (Mk. 9:18). The Ptolemaic papyri regularly have **ἀνηλίσκειν** till ii/A.D. (Mayser, *Gr*., p. 345). For α and ᾳ see η and ῃ under (c).

α *and* **ο**. The changes[4] between these two vowels are seen in the Lesbian **ὐπά (ὑπό)**, Arcadian **τριακάσιοι**, Doric **εἴκατι (εἴκοσι)**, etc. W. H. give βατταλογέω in Mt. 6:7 (cf. βατταρίζω) instead of βαττολογέω. ABK and twice ℵ and many cursives have πρὸς **Κ**ολασσαεῖς

[1] Dieterich Unters. etc., p. 70. Cf. Thack., Gr., vol. I, p. 75 f. So **Δαλματία** in 2 Tim. 4:10, though C has **Δελμ**. as Lat. has both. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 21. Both forms are in the pap., Deiss., B. S., p. 182.

[2] Hellen. (Griech. Spr.), p. 76. See also Rademacher, N. T. Gr., pp. 34 ff.

[3] Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 49. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 62, χρᾶσθαι for χρῆσθαι. So A in 2 Macc. 6:21.

[4] K.-B1., Tl. I, Bd. I, p. 117 f. Cf. Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 117, where Attic inscr. are shown to have **Νεοπολίτης**.

as the title, while in Col. 1:2 nearly all MSS. read ἐν **Κ**ολοσσαῖς. Blass finds the title in **ο** also in accordance with the coins and the profane writers; Xen., *Anab*. I, 2. 6, has a variant reading in **Κ**ολασσαί. In Mk. 13:35 B has μεσανύκτιον and D in Lu. 11:5 instead of μεσονύκτιον.[1] In 1 Tim. 1:9 W. H. give μητρολῴαις and πατρολῴαις (instead of –αλοίαις) on the authority of ℵDFGL. Blass[2] compares πατρο-κτόνος.

α *and* ω. ᾽Ανάγαιον is read by the most and the best MSS. in Mk. 14:15; Lu. 22:12. ᾽**Α**νώγεον, ἀνώγαιον, ἀνώγεων, ἀνάγεον have only "trifling authority."[3] Γαῖος is Doric and Ionic.

α *and* αι. The papyri[4] sometimes have the Epic and Ionic αἰεί, though the N. T. only reads ἀεί. The ι early dropped out between the vowels. Cf. Mayser, *Gr*., p. 103. B has αἰεί in 1 Esd. 1:30. The N. T., like the LXX, has καίω and κλαίω, though the Ptolemaic papyri rarely have κάω and κλάω.

α *and* αυ. In Lu. 2:1 ℵCΔ have ᾽**Α**γούστου instead of **Α**ὐγούστου. This spelling of α for αυ is found in Pergamum by Schweizer[5] in the reflexive pronoun ἑατόν, while Meisterhans[6] gives examples of it as early as 74 B.C. in the Attic inscriptions. Moulton[7] is probably correct in saying that we need not assume the existence of this spelling in the N. T. autographs, though it is not impossible. He indorses Mayor's suggestion (Exp., VI, x, 289) "that ἀκαταπάστους in 2 Pet. 2:14 AB may be thus explained: he compares ἀχμηρῷ 1:19 A." This dropping of **υ** between vowels extended to the dropping of **υ** before consonants. In the modern Greek we have αὐτός (*aftos*) and ἀτός (in Pontus), whence comes τό (not the article).[8] The examples of ᾽**Α**γοῦστος and ἀτός (ἀτογεννητόν, once) in the papyri are very common.[9] Thackeray (*Gr*., p. 79) finds no instances in the LXX.

[1] Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 152) compares **μ**έσαβον, and Blass (Gr., p. 21) μεσαστύλιον. **Μ**ετοξύ (μεταξύ) is in 1 Clem. and Barn. (Reinhold, De Grace., p. 40 . Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 60 f., ὅλλοι for ἄλλοι. Illiterate scribes confused α and **ο**, α and **ε** in the LXX (as μετοξί) and in the pap. (Thack., Gr., p. 77).

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 21.

[3] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 151. p. 51, compare κατα-φαγᾶς and κατω-φαγᾶς as as parallel. Cf. Meisterh., Gr., p. 17.

[4] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 31, 1904, p. 107. [5] Gr. etc., p. 91 f.

[6] Gr. etc., p. 61. Cf. also Dieterich, linters. etc., p. 78. [7] Prol., p. 47.

[8] Moulton, Exp., 1904, p. 363. So also in the Rom. period occasionally ἐματοῦ, ἑατοῦ. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 35; Wack., Kuhn's Zeitschr., xxxiii, pp. 2

[9] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 33; 1904, p. 107. He quotes Laurent (B.C.H., 1903, p. 356) as saying that this phenomenon was very common in the latter half of i/B.C.

αι *and* ε. αι was written αε in early Boeotian and Attic inscriptions (cf. Latin transliteration) and so gradually was pronounced as ε (Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 28). By 100 A.D. in the κοινή αι was the mere equivalent of ε. The Egyptian papyri show abundant illustrations of it. Especially do the LXX MSS. exhibit it (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 78). The modern Greek pronounces both these vowel-sounds alike, as indeed did the Boeotian dialect long before the κοινή. Numerous examples of this interchange of spelling exist in the Pompeian wall-inscriptions and in the vernacular κοινή from 100 A.D. on.[1] Indeed in the N. T. MSS. it is very common to find –σθαι and –σθε used indiscriminately, probably representing the common later pronunciation which was already developing in the first century A.D. Hort[2] compares this "shortening of an identical sound" to the late στύλος for στῦλος and κρίμα for κρῖμα. So common did this blending become that Blass[3] places little confidence in the N. T. MSS. on this point. Such readings occur as ἐτεῖσθε for αἰτεῖσθε and γυνῆκαις for γυναῖκες. Sometimes only the context[4] can decide between ε and αι where different forms result, as in ἀνάπεσε or –αι (Lu. 14:10), ἔγειρε or —αι (Mt. 9:5), ἐπάναγκες (Ac. 15:28),[5] ἔρχεσθε or –σθαι in אADL (Lu. 14:17), ἑτέροις or ἑταίροις (Mt. 11:16 Syrian reading), παρένεγκε or –αι (Mk. 14:36), etc. In Gal. 4:18 both א and B read ζηλοῦσθε for ζηλοῦσθαι. B reads **Α**ἰλαμῖται in Ac. 2:9, from עֵילָם, the rest **Ε**λ. The authority according to Hort[6] is "usually preponderant" for ἐξέφνης and ἐφνίδιος instead of αἰφ. So κερέα, for κεραία is accepted[7] in Mt. 5:18; Lu. 16:17, and κρεπάλη for κραιπάλη in Lu. 21:34. Likewise W. H. receive Λασέα for λαῖλαψ in Ac. 27:8. אAC in 2 Pet. 2:17 read λέλαπος, but λαῖλαψ is the undoubted reading in Matthew, Luke. The uncials all have ῥέδη, not ῥαίδη, in Rev. 18:13. So all the early uncials but A have Συκομορέα (not –αία) in Lu. 19:4. Hort[8] accepts also φελόνης for φαιλόνης (2 Tim. 4:13), though Moulton[9] doubts, because of the Latin *paenula*.

[1] W.-Sch., p. 47.

[2] Notes on Orth., p. 150. Cf. on at and E, Mayser, Gr., p. 107.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 9.

[4] W.-Sch., p. 47.

[5] **Ε**π' ἀνάγκαις "Alexandrian only" according to Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 151.

[6] Ib.

[7] Ib. Cf. the Western καινοφωνίας for κενοφωνίας in 1 Tim. 6:20. In 1 Th. 3:3 instead of σαίνεσθαι FG read σιένεσθαι. Nestle (Neut.-Zeit., 1906, p. 361) finds parallels in the forms σιανομένων and σιανθείς.

[8] Notes on Orth., p. 151.

[9] Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 107. The pap. give φαινόλιον.

(b) THE CHANGES WITH ε. The interchanges of ε and α have already been discussed under (a), but others took place with **η, ι, ο**.

ε *and* ει In the Boeotian these were freely interchanged[1] and the same interchange occurs in the Doric, New Ionic and Attic as πλέων, or πλείων. The Attic inscriptions[2] show this common phenomenon. The ι before a vowel easily and early loses its force and drops out. Before the adoption of the scholastic orthography at Athens (B.C. 403) ε stood for **ε, η, ει**. Sooner or later ει became everywhere a monophthong (Buck, *Greek Dialects*, p. 28). But the κοινή usually wrote ει before vowels rather than ε (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 81). The LXX MSS. reveal the same traits as the N. T. **Ἀρεοπαγίτης** is in Acts 17:34, but **Ἄρειος** occurs (Ac. 17:19, 22). **Ἀχρεῖος** is uniform in the N. T., but in Ro. 3:12 we have **ἠχρεώθησαν** (ℵABDG). In Lu. 3:13; Jo. 21:15; Ac. 15:28, W. H. print πλέον (Attic has even πλέονος),[3] but elsewhere the N. T. has forms in ει. The derivatives all have ε like πλεονεκτέω. But the N. T. has only **τέλειος, τελειόω**, though Herodotus always and the Attic usually used τελεόω. D^c has τελεῶσαι in Heb. 10:1.[4] Of words with ε and ει before consonants one may note that **ἀποστείλω** in Ac. 7:34 is aorist subjunctive. (Cf. Ex. 3:10.) Both **ἕνεκεν** and **εἵνεκεν** occur in the N. T. (both Ionic and Attic). The N. T. never has **ἐς**, but always **εἰς**. However, **ἔσω** is the uniform reading in the N. T. Homer used either **εἴσαω** or **ἔσω**.

ε *and* η. Numerous examples of long ε occur in the inscriptions like **μετε (μήτε)**.[5] These changes are probably all analogical and not phonetic. But in the N. T. we have only the shortening of η, back to short ε in some words like **ἀνάθεμα**, though this particular word ('curse') came to be distinct from **ἀνάθημα** ('votive offering'). **Ἀνάθημα** occurs only once in the N. T. (Lu. 21:5), and even here ℵADX, etc., have **ἀνάθεμα**. Tisch. quotes Moeris as saying **ἀνάθημα ἀττικῶς, ἀνάθεμα ἑλληνικῶς**. But the use of **ἀνάθεμα** as 'curse'

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 28, as θειός = θεός; Thumb, Handb., p. 220.

[2] Meisterh., Gr., p. 20 f. Cf. Schweizer, Gr. etc., p. 44 f. The change in ε and ει was very common in vi/iii B.C. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 37.

[3] But even the Arcadian dial. has **πλέονα, πλεόνων** (Solmsen, Inscr. Grace., p. 4). **Πλέον** is common in the N. T. Apoc. (Reinhold, De Grace. Patr. Apost. etc., p. 40). Cf. Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 40 f. On the whole subject of ε and ει in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 67-73. They arc very numerous indeed, these changes in the pap., both ways. [4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22.

[5] Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae etc., p. 1. Arcadian dial. Cf. also Meisterh., Gr., p. 3. In the Pontic dial. to-day there is a wide-spread use of ε instead of η, as in **σέπομαι** (Thumb, Hellen. [Griech. Spr., referred to hereafter usually as Hellen.] p. 149).

"is not an innovation of biblical Greek" (Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 46). In Ac. 11:11 ℵABD^{Gr} read ἦμεν, not ἤμην. Perhaps this exchange between ε and η bears on the use of στήκετε with ἵνα in Mk. 11:25; 1 Th. 3:8, and of MS. evidence for θαυμάζετε in Jo. 5:20 and ἐξομολογήσεται in Ph. 2:11. Cf. also ὄψησθε and ὄψεσθε in Lu. 13:28. So in 13:25. Mayser (*Gr.*, p. 64) thinks that sometimes ε represents an original open η as in παρεστεκότες. The κοινή shows quite a preference for words in —εμα rather than --ημα (Mayser, *Gr.*, p. 65 f.), and the LXX has new words in —εμα, though some words have both forms (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 80).

In the papyri this shortening (as in the LXX) appears in words like ἐπίθεμα, πρόσθεμα, etc.[1] The interchanges between η and ει, ηι, and ει will be discussed under η (c). Mayser (*Gr.*, p. 63 f.) thus (η for ε) explains πλήρης as an indeclinable neuter form.

ε *and* ι. Dieterich[2] mentions as one of the marks of the Attic and Egyptian κοινή the fact that ι and ε interchange when used with λ and ν. Cf. the modern Greek, and the Lesbian Greek used τέρτος for τρίτος, and the Thessalian θιός for θεός. It is a Doric characteristic. This variation appears in the inscriptions[3] and in the papyri,[4] especially in the case of λεγιών, which is also λεγεών and even λεγειών, not to mention a genitive λεγιῶνως (ο and ω having the same sound). Λεγιών, is the reading of the best N. T. MSS. (ℵBDL; cf. Latin *legio*), as in the papyri. Especially in the case of the Latin short i does the κοινή have ε. Ἀλεεῖς, not ἁλιεῖς, is the reading in the N. T. according to the best MSS. (Mk. 1:16, etc.).[5] This is a natural assimilation after a liquid. The frequency of ε for ι in the Egyptian papyri may be due in part to the Coptic, which has no short i (Steindorff, *Kopt. Gr.*, p. 13). Note a soldier's use of χῆραν for χεῖρα(ν), B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). Λέτιον (Jo. 13:4, Latin *linteum*) is a change in the other direction, Latin i to Greek ε. Blass[6] says that λέντεον would have looked

[1] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 108. Cf. also Moulton, Prol., p. 46, and Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., pp. 47 ff., has good discussion of this shortening of η to ε and also ω to ο. "E and η interchange times without number from v/B.C. down to ix/A.D." (Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 36). Reinhold (De Graec. Patr. etc., p. 101 f.) shows howl the confusion between η and ε led to forms like ἐὰν ἀγάγετε. Cf. the mod. Gk. στέκω (στήκω) and θέτω (θήτω).

[2] Unters. etc., p. 136. [3] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., P. 43 f.

[4] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 33, 434; 1904, p. 107. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 80 f.

[5] Ἁλιεῖς occurs in pap. also. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 307; Thackeray, p. 84.

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22.

unnatural to a Greek. **Νηφάλιος** also is alone well-attested,[1] not **νηφάλεος** (1 Tim. 3:2, etc.). **Ποτίολοι** in Ac. 28:13 represents the Latin *Puteoli*, using **ι** for **ε** (cf. Dittenberger, p. 145). **Σιμικίνθιον** (not —**εον**) is the N. T. reading (Ac. 19:12) for Latin *semicinctium*. So **Τιβέριος** (not **Τεβέριος**) is the N. T. rendition of *Tiberius* in Lu. 3:1, though the later Greek writers used **Τεβέριος**, **Δομέτριος**, etc.[2] It is really surprising that more examples of this exchange of **ε** and **ι** do not appear. The interchanges between **ει** and **ι** are discussed under (d), those between **ευ** and **υ** under (f).

ε *and* o. The Lesbian AEolic had *στρόφω* for the Doric *στράφω*. The Ionic-Attic made it *στρέφω*. Meisterhans[3] gives numerous examples of this change in **ε** and o: **ὀβολός** for **ὀβελός** as early as the middle of the fourth century B.C. Dieterich[4] mentions the assimilation of **ε** and o as one of the marks of the Egyptian **κοινή**. In Ac. 18:24 **א** 15. 180. Cop. arm. and in 19:1 **א** 180. read **᾽Απελλῆς** for **᾽Απολώς**, though D has **᾽Απολλώνιος** in 18:24. The Doric and the Attic inscriptions[5] had **᾽Απέλλω, ᾽Απελλώνιος, ᾽Απέλλιος**, etc. In 1 Cor. and Titus we have only **᾽Απολλώς**. Indeed Blass[6] suggests that **᾽Απελλῆς** is the reading of the α text in Acts and that **᾽Απολλώς** is an interpolation from 1 Cor. It is more likely to think that the two old forms of the name were still in use, though **᾽Απολλώς** is the correct text in Acts also. The MSS. of the N. T., even good uncials, have **ὀλοθρεύω, ἐξολοθρεύω, ὀλοθρευτής** as well as the usual **ὀλεθρεύω**, etc. (cf. **ὀβολός** for **ὀβελός** by assimilation), and Hort[7] accepts the **ε** form only in Ac. 3:23. The Syrian class has the o form. Blass,[8] who usually cares little for such points, properly insists on the documentary evidence. In Heb. 11:28 only ADE have the **ε** form, while in 1 Cor. 10:10 DFG read **ε**.

[1] Notes on Orth., p. 151.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 21. But always **Τίτος**. Cf. Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 22, in discussion of **ε** for Lat. i. Both **λεγιών** and **λέντιον** are read in Magn. inscr. (Thieme, Die Inschr. von Magn. etc., p. 8). Cf. also Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 46. For assimilation between **ε** and **ι** in mod. Gk. see Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 272 f.

[3] Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 22. Cf. also K.-B1., Tl. I, Bd. I, p. 118.

[4] Unters. etc., p. 135 f. Cf. Hirt, Handb. d. Griech. etc., p. 115.

[5] K.-B1., Tl. I, Bd. I, p. 118, and Hirt, *op. cit*., p. 115.

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 21. Cf. Mayser (Gr., pp. 94-97) for a discussion of the pap. situation.

[7] Notes on Orth., p. 152.

[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 21. He quotes Buresch, Rhein. Mus., p. 216 f., as in favour of **ε** in the N. T. as well as the LXX. **᾽Ολεθ**. appears in the Apost. Fathers (Goodspeed, Index) and **ὀλοθ**. in N. T. Apoc. (Reinhold, p. 40). For assimilation between **ε** and o in mod. Gk. see Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 274.

The LXX according to ℵAB reads ε, though the modern Greek has ξολοθρεύω. But ὄλεθρος is the uniform spelling in the N. T. and is the rule in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 88).

In Mk. 8:14 B has ἐπελάθεντο as is common in the LXX (Thackeray, Gr., p. 89). Cf. also ἀπέδετο (Heb. 12:16, LXX), ἐξέδετο (Mk. 12:1), διεδίδετο (Ac. 4:35), παρεδίδετο (1 Cor. 11:23), and ἐξεκρέμετο (Lu. 19:48 ℵB). Hort (Appendix, p. 167 f.) explains these changes as "euphonic," but it is a change of the root-vowel of δο, a confusion of thematic and athematic conjugations.

ἐάν and ἄν. See also I (d) under Papyri. This is as good a place as any to say a word further on the interchange of these two forms, not strictly vowel-changes, however. We have also εἰάν, (really εἰ+ ἄν) as in P Eleph. 1 (B.c. 311). See also αἰάν for ἐάν, B.G.U. 530 (i/A.D.). The use of ἐάν= modal ἄν in relative sentences, so common in the LXX, N. T. and papyri of i/ii A.D., is not an exchange of vowels, but possibly a slurring over of the ε before α. Ἄν=ἐάν survives from the ancient Greek in a few instances, as Jo. 5:19 (ℵB); 12:32 (B and accepted by W. H.); 13:20 DEFG, etc., have ἐάν, but ℵBC ἄν and accepted by W. H.); 16:23 (BACD, accepted by W. H.); 20:23 (twice and accepted by W. H., though AD have first ἐάν and ℵAD second). In Ac. 9:2 only ℵE have ἄν and W. H. read ἐάν. Blass[1] thinks that as ἐάν made encroachment into the province of ἄν "a kind of interchange of meaning between the two words" grew up. The modern Greek vernacular uses ἄν for 'if.' Hort[2] considers the whole subject of the interchange between ἐάν and ἄν after relatives "peculiarly irregular and perplexing. Predominantly ἄν is found after consonants, and ἐάν after vowels, but there are many exceptions." Cf. ἐάν in Mt. 20:4 and ἄν in Mt. 20:26 f. Moulton[3] has shown that ἐάν= ἄν is scarce in the papyri save from 100 B.C. to 200 A.D. In the Magnesian inscriptions[4] only ἐάν appears, not ἄν nor ἤν, ἤν=ἐάν is not in the N. T. But in the Herculaneum papyri these particles interchange freely.[5] The Attic inscriptions uniformly have ἄν with relatives.[6]

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 60. Omitted by Debrunner in ed. 4.

[2] Notes on Orth., p. 173. Hort has a curious error here, for the references under ἄν and ἐάν should be exactly reversed. Ἄν =ἐάν ('if') is rarely found in the pap. also. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 434) gives ἂν μὴ ἀποδῶι. (AP 43, ii/B.C.). Cf. also Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 32; Mayser, Gr., p. 152 f. Mayser gives exx. of ἐὰν=ἄν and of ἄν=ἐάν.

[3] Prol., p. 43; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 32, etc.

[4] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 68. See Gregory, Prol. (Nov. Test. Gr.), p. 96, for the facts about the N. T. MSS. and ἐάν.

[5] Cronert, Mem. Graeca Here., p. 130.

[6] Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 326.

Indeed Attic often contracts this particle ἐάν= ἤν.[1] But modal ἄν is found in Xen. Mem., ᾧ ἐὰν ἁρμόττῃ, in Lysias, οὓς ἐὰν βουληθῶσιν, etc. (see Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 421). This use of ἐὰν occurs sixty-one times in the N. T. Examples occur in late Greek of εἰ— ἐάν, as well as εἰ — ἄν, instead of ἐάν. Cf. Reinhold, *De Graecitate Patrum Apost*. etc., p. 35; Moulton, *Classical Review*, 1901, p. 32. Thackeray (*Gr.*, pp. 65 ff.) finds that in the ii/B.C. the papyri nearly always have ὃς ἄν, while in the i/A.D. they nearly always have ὃς ἐάν. In the books of Exodus and Leviticus he notes that in the first half of each book both forms occur while in the second part ὃς ἐάν almost vanishes. Each book may have been written on two rolls.

(c) THE CHANGES WITH η. The changes between η and α, η and ε have already been discussed.

η *and* ι. As already stated, originally H was merely the rough breathing, but the Ionic psilosis left a symbol useless, and *heta* was called *eta*.[2] Thus the new letter took the old long ε value in Ionic and Attic and also largely supplanted the long α where α became e. The Sanskrit used long *a*, the Greek η and the Latin either *e* or *i* This new (in spelling) η (v/B.c.) gradually turned more to the *i* sound in harmony with the growing itacism of the language, though there was some etacism on the other hand.[3] As early as 150 B.C. the Egyptian papyri show evidence of the use of ι for η.[4] By the middle of the second century A.D. the confusion between η and ι, η and ει, ηι and ει is very general. By the Byzantine times it is complete and the itacism is triumphant in the modern Greek.[5] Reinhold[6] thinks that the exchange between η and ι was natural in view of the relation between η and ε and the interchange between ε and ι. As early as the fifth century B.C. the change between η and ι is seen on vases and inscriptions. But the Ptolemaic papyri show little of it and it is rare in the LXX MSS. ℵAB (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 85). In the N. T. times the interchanges between η and ι, η and ει, ηι and ει are not many. In 1 Cor. 4:11 W. H. read γυμνιτεύω, though L and most of the cursives have η.

[1] Thumb, Hellen., p. 92.

[2] Hirt, Handb. d. Griech. etc., p. 63.

[3] Thumb, Hellen., p. 98 f.

[4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 29. Cf. also Thumb, Hellen., p. 138. In Boeotia also η and ι interchange in ii/B.C. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 46. Mayser (Gr., p. 82) cites from a Hom. pap. of i/B.C. ἔθικε for ἔθηκε, and *per contra* (p. 84) ἀφήκετο

[5] Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 47. He gives ἐπή for ἐπί from a Byz. inscr.

[6] De Graec. Patr. etc., p. 41. Cf. also Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 34 f.

The N. T. always has δηνάριον, though δινάριον appears very early.[1] For κάμηλος in Mt. 19:24 and Lu. 18:25 a few late cursive MSS. substitute κάμιλος ('rope'), a word found only in Suidas and a scholium on Arist. But "it is certainly wrong,"[2] a mere effort to explain away the difficulty in the text, an effort as old as Cyril of Alexandria on Luke. For **Κυρήνιος** B[3] it. vg. sah. have **Κυρῖνος**, while B* has **Κυρεῖνος** and A has **Κηρύνιος**, a striking example of itacism, **η, ι, ει, υ** having the same sound in these MSS. The N. T. MSS. give σιμικίνθιον in Ads 19:12, but Liddell and Thayer both suggest σημ. as an alternative spelling like the Latin *semicinctium.* So also the best MSS. in Rev. 18:12 read σιρικός, though some cursives have σηρικός (like Jos. and others), and still others συρικός.[3] Indeed in 1 Pet. 2:3 for χρηστός L and many cursives have **Χριστός**. The heathen misunderstood the word **Χριστός** and confounded it with the familiar χρηστός, pronounced much alike. Suetonius (Claudius 25) probably confused *Christus* with *Chrestus*. In Ac. 11:26 **א** 61 have **Χρηστιανούς**, while B has **Χρειστ**. So in Ac. 26:28 **א** has **Χρηστιανόν** for **Χριστ.,** while B has again **ει**. The same thing occurs in 1 Pet. 4:16.

η *and* **ει**. The Boeotian and the Thessalian dialects early changed[4] **η** for **ει**, **τίθειμι=τίθημι**. Schweizer[5] gives παράδησος for παράδεισος (Byzantine inscription). In Lu. 14:13 (21) we have ἀνάπειρος (ABDEL), ἀνάπηρος (GHK, etc.), and --πιρ— (**א**R). This itacism is condemned by Phrynichus the Atticist as vulgar.[6] In the LXX **א** has ἀνάπειρος in Tob. 14:2 and AV show it in 2 Macc. 8:24 (Thackeray, Gr., p. 83). In Heb. 6:14 W. H. follow **א**ABD in reading **εἰ μήν** rather than **ἦ μήν**. This form occurs in the LXX and in the papyri. Moulton[7] has shown that several times in the papyri it is obviously for **ἦ μήν** by mere itacism, and so is not due to a confusion between the Hebraistic use of **εἰ μή** =אִם לֹא, thus correcting Hort. The uncials and the

[1] Blass, Ausspr. d. Griech., pp. 37, 94.

[2] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 151.

[3] Ib., refers to σιρικοποιός in Neap. inscr. (C. I. G. 5834). In the mod. Gk. **η=ι** in pronunciation. Cf. Thumb, Handb. d. neugr. Volkerspr., p. 2. W.-Sch. (p. 46) mention **θήβην, θίβην, θείβην**, in Ex. 2:3-6.

[4] Cf. Blass, K.-B1., Tl. I, Bd. I, p. 135.

[5] Perg. Inschr., p. 47. Cf. also p. 56. See numerous exx. of this change in Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 47 f.

[6] Cf. Bekker, Anec., I, pp. 9, 22. It is found also in 2 Macc. 8:24. Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 15) shows that ἄπειρος (not ἄπηρος) is read in Herod. i. 32.

[7] Prol., p. 46; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 33. See also Thackeray, p. 83.

papyri here agree. Deissmann[1] calls attention to the use of εἰ μάν in a Doric inscription of the first century B.C. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 306) observes that a papyrus reads κηρία for κειρία (cf. Jo. 11:44, κειρ–, κηρ—, κιρ-ίαις).

ηι *and* ει. In the old Attic there was no ηι in writing, only ει, since η was not used as a vowel. As early as 400 B.C. the Attic used ηι and ει interchangeably, κλῄω becoming κλείω, κλῄς=κλείς, λητουργός=λειτουργός, etc.[2] This usage was not very common in Pergamum[3] nor in Magnesia.[4] Cronert finds this interchange in the Herculaneum papyri only in the papyri copies of Epicurus and Polystratus.[5] In the N. T λειτουργός, —ία, —εῖν, --ικός are taken over from the Attic, but they occur also in Pergamum[6] and Magnesia.[7] The Attic indeed carried the fondness for ει so far that it was used always in writing in the second singular indicative middle everywhere, the other dialects using η save the Ionic. The κοινή has η save in βούλει, οἴει, ὄψει. In the N. T. η is universal according to W. H. save in Lu. 22:42 where βούλει is genuine, though some MSS. have ει in other passages. Blass[8] observes that this is a literary touch in Luke for the colloquial θέλεις. Hatzidakis[9] notes how difficult this process made it to tell the difference between ποιήσῃς and ποιήσεις, for instance, because of this Attic intermixture of the diphthongs. Blass[10] will not hear of this as a possible explanation in any cases, but one must remark how well this vowel-blending harmonized with the kinship in meaning between the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative (cf. δώσῃ in some MSS. for δώσει in Jo. 17:2) and made it easy for the later so-called future subjunctive (cf. Latin) to develop. Winer-Schmiedel indeed accept as possible this vowel confusion in several instances.[11] In Mk. 8:35 (Lu. 17:33) ὃς ἂν ἀπολέσει, Lu. 12:8 ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσει, 2 Cor. 12:21 μὴ ταπεινώσει, Ro. 3:4 (Ps. 51:6)

[1] B. S., pp. 205-8. Cf. Dittenb., Syll., No. 388, p. 570. See also Mayser, Gr., pp. 74-79, for careful discussion.

[2] Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., pp. 36 ff. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 39 and 49. See also Mayser, Gr., pp. 79 f., 126-131.

[3] Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 60 f.

[4] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 50 f.

[5] Mem. Graeca Hercul., p. 37.

[6] Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

[7] Nachm., *op. cit.,* p. 51.

[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 8. βούλει, οἴει, ὄψει in Ap. Fathers (Goodspeed, Index).

[9] Einl. in d. neugr. Gr., p. 306. He gives exx. from the N. T. Apoc.

[10] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 8.

[11] W.-Sch., p. 47. Moulton (Prol., p. 168) would take indifferently ὑπάγει or ὑπάγῃ in Rev. 14:4. For many similar exx. in the inscr. see Dittenb., ὅπως ἂν ὑπάρχει (117. 17), εἰρέθησαν (352. 66), etc.

νικήσεις (cf. διακιωθῇς), Ac. 5:15 ἵνα ἐπισκιάσει, 8:31 ἐὰν ὁδηγήσει. Winer-Schmiedel would find the aorist subjunctive and not the future indicative. This is possible but by no means certain, since the future indicative was undoubtedly used both with ἐάν and ἵνα (ὅπως). W. H. read Ἰωάνει instead of ῃ in Mt. 11:4 = Lu. 7:18. Τῷ διοκητεῖ occurs in papyri Brit. Mus. I, Nr. 2. 135. In 2 Coy. 2:9 AB 109 have ᾖ where εἰ is probably correct.

ῃ *and* η. *Irrational Iota.* The iota subscript was iota adscript till the twelfth century A.D., but as early as the third century B.C. it was not pronounced.[1] When a was practically equal to η in sound, it was natural that ῃ (ηι) should be. The ι was then dropped in sound long before it was subscript.[2] Gradually it was felt to be a matter of indifference in some words whether this iota was written or not. Examples of η instead of ῃ occur in the inscriptions of Pergamum[3] as ἐν ᾗ as well as in the Attic.[4] Moulton finds irrational ι adscript (ἔχωι, for instance) abundant in the Ptolemaic Tebt. Papyri (*Classical Review*, 1904, p. 106). Cf. Mayser (*Gr.*, pp. 122-126) who gives many examples. In the N. T. ι has dropped from θνήσκω. Indeed since the second century B.C. ι adscript in the diphthongs ᾳ, ῃ, ῳ had become mute. Hort,[5] however, argues for the retention of ι in ζῆν[6] and infinitives in —ᾶν instead of the Doric-Attic form, as well as in ἀθῷος, εἰκῇ, ζῷον, Ἡρῴδης, κρυφῇ, λάθρᾳ, πανταχῇ πάντῃ, πρῴρα, σῴζω, ὑπερῷον, ζῷον, though he hesitated to put *σῴζω* in the text. It is just as well to finish the discussion of the iota subscript here, though some of these examples go beyond the range of ῃ. The best editors print also σημοσίᾳ, ἰδίᾳ, μητρολῴαις, πατρολῴαις, πατρῷος, πεζῇ, Σαμοθρᾴκη, Τρῳάς, though μιμνήσκω and πρᾶος. W. H. have forms in –οῖν also, as κατασκηνοῖν (Mt. 13:32). Moulton[7] gives a curious example of the loss of the irrational ι in the case of the subjunctive ᾖ which sometimes in the papyri appears as ᾖν, having lost the ι, and taken on irrational ν. As a matter of fact iota adscript (iota

[1] Blass, Pronun., etc., p. 50. [2] Hirt, Handb. d. Griech., p. 114.

[3] Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 65.

[4] Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 64. In the iv/n.e. the Attic often wrote ει for ηι, but not for ῃ. In the Thess., AEol and Ionic inscriptions the ι with α, η, ω is freely omitted or wrongly inserted (irrational ι), as in τῆ πόλει, τὰ ὄρῃ, as early as vi/B.C. Cf. K.-B1., Tl. I, Bd. I, p. 183 f. Strabo (14. 41) says that many regularly dropped the ι in spurious diphthongs. πολλοὶ γὰρ χωρὶς τοῦ ι γράφουσι τὰς δοτικάς, καὶ ἐκβάλλουσι δὲ τὸ ἔθος φυσικὴν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἔχον. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 29 f. Schweizer (Perg. Inschr., p. 47) cites τὴιν εὔνοιαν. [5] Introd. to N. T. Gk., p. 314.

[6] Mayser, Gr., p. 121, finds no ι with ᾶν in the pap. [7] Prol., pp. 49, 168, 187.

subscript not yet, of course) does not appear in the great uncials save ἤιδισαν in D (Mk. 1:34) and ξύλωι in **K** (Lu. 23:31).[1] Forms with and without the mute iota appear in the Herculaneum papyri,[2] as εἰκῆι or εἰκῆ. Blass[3] would also restore ι to ἀντιπέρα(ι). He doubts if ι was written in such new optative forms as δώην (δοίην Attic) though it should be put in the text.

η *and* υ. Since these two vowels came to be pronounced alike as in modern Greek,[4] it was to be expected that some interchange would come, though any early examples are wanting. However, by the second century A.D. the inscriptions give many instances such as θήρα (θύρα), μηστήριον (μυστ.), σκῦπτρον (σκῆπτρον), etc.[5] It is already in the Egyptian κοινή according to Thumb.[6] Hence we are not surprised to see the N. T. MSS. get mixed over ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς. Especially in 1 Peter does this itacism lead to a mixing of the historical[7] standpoint as in 1:12, where ὑμῖν is read by ℵABCL, etc., ἡμῖν by K and most cursives Syr^{sch} Cop. In 1 Pet. 5:10 the MSS. similarly support ὑμᾶς and ἡμᾶς. In 2 Cor. the personal relations of Paul and his converts are involved in this piece of orthography as in 8:7 ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμῖν (ℵCDE, etc.) or ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν (B 30, 31, 37, etc.). See especially καθ' ἡμᾶς in Ac. 17:28 (B 33 Cop., etc.) which reading would make Paul identify himself with the Greeks on this occasion.

(d) THE CHANGES WITH ι. For ι and ε see under (b); for ι and η see under (c); for iota subscript (adscript), mute or irrational ι, see under (c). For irrational iota see also Infinitive under Verb. The papyri show it in queer forms like ἀληθῆι, λέγωι, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49).

ι *and* ει. The interchange between these vowel-symbols began very early (certainly by the sixth century B.C.[8]) and has been very persistent to the present day. The inscriptions give numerous examples[9] in the fifth century B.C., such as ἀποκτινη, Ἐπαφρόδειτος. This was apparently the beginning[10] of itacism which was extended to υ, η, and then to ῃ, οι, υι. Jannaris[11] thinks that the introduc-

[1] Gregory, Prol. (New Test. Gr.), p. 109.

[2] Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., pp. 41 ff.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 7. The LXX phenomena are similar. Cf. Helbing, Griech. d. LXX, pp. 3

[4] Hatz., Einl. in neugr. Gr., p. 304.

[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 48. [6] Hellen., p. 171.

[7] Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 310. On the subject of η and υ see Mayser, Gr., p. 85 f. He denies (p. 86) that the itacising pronunciation of η prevailed in the Ptolemaic period.

[8] Jann., Hist. Gk. Or., p. 47. [9] Ib. [10] Ib. [11] Ib., p. 41.

tion and rapid spread of η contributed to this confusion as by that time ει was pronounced like ι, and η was taken by many, not as long ε, but equal to ι. The confusion apparently began in the Boeotian dialect[1] and in postclassical times, but swept the field in all the dialects till every ει (closed and open) was pronounced as ι. By 100 B.C. the Attic inscriptions show a general interchange between ει and ι, and in the second century A.D.[2] the confusion exists between ει and ι. Dieterich[3] thinks that this itacism had its widest development in Egypt. The Ptolemaic papyri of ii/B.C. show itacism very frequently. It is only the more illiterate scribes that use ει for ι, though B has ὄρειον (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 86 f.). Thumb[4] considers the interchange between ι and ει in the κοινή on a par with that between ο and ω. In Pergamum[5] the change from ι to ει is much more common than that from ει to ι, though forms in –ία for –εία occur, as ἀμελία. The same thing is true in Magnesia, where ἡμεῖν (ἡμῖν) is common.[6] The Herculaneum papyri tell the same story,[7] while it is so common in the Egyptian papyri that Moulton[8] is unable to set much store by the minutiae gathered by W. H. from the great uncials, "for even W. H. admit that their paramount witness, B, 'has little authority on behalf of ει as against ι.'" Clearly the partiality of ℵ for ι and of B for ει throw them both out of court as decisive witnesses on this point.[9] So it is not merely itacism that we have to deal with in the numerous N. T. examples of exchange between ι and ει, but "genuine peculiarities of original orthography" also.[10] Whatever Dr. Hort meant, all that is true is that different scribes merely preferred one or the other method of representing ι. The whole matter therefore remains in doubt and one is prepared for all sorts of variations in the N. T. MSS., because the κοινή no

[1] K.-B1., p. 131. Mayser (Gr., pp. 87-94) has a full discussion of the problem in the pap. of the first three centuries B.C. and finds that in Egypt the pronunciation of ει closely approached that of ι.

[2] Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 49. In the succeeding pages he gives numerous exx. in chron. order of the various interchanges between ι and ει, many of them identical with the N. T. exx.

[3] Unters. etc., p. 45.

[4] Hellen., p. 172. The next most common interchange of vowels in the N. T. MSS. are αι and ε, η and ι or ει, οι and υ (Warfield, Text. Crit. of the N. T., p. 103).

[5] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 53 f.

[6] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 35 f. Cf. Egyp. pap. also.

[7] Cronert, Mem. Grace. Hercul., pp. 27 ff.

[8] Prol., p. 47. For the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, pp. 7 Thack. (Gr., p. 86 f.) thinks that the orthography in this point is older than that of ℵ and A.

[9] Warfield, Text. Crit. of the N. T., p. 103.

[10] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 152.

longer insisted in the vernacular on the distinction between long or short ι and ει. The examples here presented will give a fair idea of the situation. For the textual evidence see careful discussion by Gregory.[1] Where ει is written for ι it is to be pronounced like ι. **Ει** is shortened to ι in some abstract substantives, --ία instead of –εία, as[2] **Ἀτταλία, ἀγνία** (possibly), perhaps **ἀκριβία, ἀλαζονία, ἀναδία, ἀρεσκία,** perhaps **ἀπειθία, ἐθελοθρησκία** (but **θρησκεία**), **εἰδωλολατρία** (but **λατρεία**), **εἰλικρινία,** perhaps **ἐκτενία, ἐπιεικία, ἐριθία, ἑρμηνία, ἱερατία, Καισαρία, κακοηθία, κακοπαθία, κολακία, κυβία, Λαοδικία, μαγία, μεθοδία, ὀφθαλμοδουλία (δουλία** doubtful), possibly **παιδία** (cf. Ps. 53:5), **πολιτία, πορία, πτωχία, πραγματία, πραϋπαθία,** probably **Σαμαρία, Σελευκία,** perhaps **στρατία, φαρμακία, Φιλαδελφία, ὠφελία.** Deissmann[3] shows that it is **λογεία**, not **λογία** in the papyri and so in 1 Cor. 16:1 f. Some MSS. have **ἐπάρχεια** (for –ια), **εὐτρταπέλεια** (for –ια), late MSS. **κολωνεία**.

The endings —**ειον**, and –**ειος** appear sometimes as –**ιον**, --**ιος**. So **αἴγιος, Ἄριος (Πάγος), ἄστιος, δάνιον** (cf. **δανίζω, δανιστής**), **εἰδώλιον, Ἐπικούριος, ἐπιτήδιος, μεγάλια** (cf. **μεγαλιότης**), **πανδοκίον, στοιχίον.** Strong testimony exists for all these. So also –**ινός** for —**εινός** appears in **ὀρινός, σκοτινός, φωτινός**.

Further examples of ι for ει are found as in the MSS. in **ἀδιάλιπτος, ἀνέκλιπτος, ἀλίφω, ἀπιθέω, ἀπιθής, ἀπιθία, ἀποδεδιγμένος, Ἀρεοπαγίτης, δίγμα, ἐξαλίφω, καταλελιμμένος** (Ac. 25:14), even **κρίσσων, λίμμα, λιτουργός, μαργαρίτης** (cf. **πολίτης, τεχνίτης**), **μεσίτης, οἰκτίρω, παραδιγματίζω, πιθός ὑπόλιμμα, φιλόνικος, φιλονικία, χρεοφιλέτης.** This is not to mention the verb-forms **ἴδον, ἴδαν, ἴδεν** which W. H. count alternate forms in Revelation, but which are pure examples of itacism. In the case of **Ἰκόνιον** (Ac. 13:51; 14:1) the inscriptions give both **Ἰκ.** and **Εἰκ.**[4]

The use of **εἰ** for ι is seen in several ways also in N. T. MSS. In Mt. 28:3 W. H. give **εἰδέα**, not **ἰδέα. Γείνομαι** and **γεινώσκω** are very common in the best MSS. **Ἡμεῖν** and **ὑμεῖν** are rarely seen, however. **Ἀξείνη, Γαλειλαία, Ἐλαμείτης, Λευείτης, Λευειτικός, λείαν, Νινευείτης, Πειλᾶτος, Σαμαρείτης** all are found, as well as **τραπεζείτης, Φαρεισαῖοι. Τάχειον** appears in John and Hebrews. In the Pastoral Epistles, Hort[5] finds —**λειπ**— for —**λιπ**— forms. **Κειρίαις** is correct in Jo. 11:44. Hort[6] also prefers **πανοικεί**, but **παμπληθεί** is undisputed. Such verb-forms occur as **μείγνυμι, τειμάω, τείσω.**

[1] Prol., pp. 83-90.
[2] According to Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 153.
[3] B. S., pp. 142 f., 219 f.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 8.
[5] Notes on Orth., p. 155.
[6] Ib., p. 154.

Semitic proper names in ᾽ have ει as **᾽Αδδεί, ᾽Αρνει, ᾽Εσλεί, ᾽Ηλεί, Μελχεί, Νηρεί.** Cf. also[1] **᾽Αδμεῖν, ᾽Αχείμ,** βενιαμείν, **Δαυείδ, ᾽Ελιακείμ, ᾽Ιωρείμ, Κείς, Λευείς, Νεφθαλείμ, Σαλείμ, Σεμεείν,** χερουβείν, **Χοραζεὶν.** So also **᾽Ελεισαβέτ, ᾽Ηλείας, θυάτειρα, ᾽Ιάειρος, ᾽Ιερειχώ, ᾽Ιωσείς, ᾽Οζείας, Σάπφειρα, Ταβειθά.** Cf. also ἠλεί ῥαββεί ῥαββουνεί, σαβαχθανεί. But ᾽ appears as ι in **᾽Αμιναδάβ, Μελχισεδέκ, Σινά, Σιών.** Likewise the MSS. usually read **᾽Ανανίας, Βαραχίας, ᾽Εζεκίας, Ζαχαρίας, ᾽Ιερεμίας, ᾽Ιερχονίας, Μαθθίας, Ματταθίας, Οὐρίας.**

In many of these examples of changes in **ι** and **ει** the testimony is greatly divided and one must not stickle too much for either spelling. The papyri and the inscriptions have nearly all of them. See 1 (c) for remarks on the difficulty of relying on the uncials in the matter of orthography. It is impossible to be dogmatic on the subject.

ι. *and* **ο.** It is a peculiar change, as Blass[2] observes, that we have in **ὀμειρόμενοι** for **ἱμειρόμενοι** (1 Th. 2:8). It appears in the LXX (some MSS. for Job 3:21 and Symm. at Ps. 62:2). The only example so far brought to light is **ὑπερομείρεσθαι** in Iren. 60. Winer-Schmiedel[3] sees no comparison in **καταντροκύ** for **καταντικρύ**. Meisterhans[4] gives **ἀπαντροκύ** for **ἀπαντικρύ**.

ι *and* **ο.** Jannaris[5] defends the exchange of **ι** and **οι** possibly as early as the fifth century B.C. Certainly in the first century B.C. **Αὐγουστοῖνος** occurs in the inscriptions.[6] **Οι** was exchanged with **ει** and **η** as well as with **ι.** In the N. T. the only example is in Mk. 11:8 where ACSVTXΓ Or. have **στοιβάς** for the usual **στιβάς** (from **στείβω**). N and a few other MSS. read **στυβάς**. Zonar. illustrates this also by using **στοιβάς**. Cf. also **στοιβή, στοιβάζω,** etc. This word thus illustrates well the common itacistic tendency, showing forms in **–ι, –οι, –υ** and **—ει** (in the verb). The LXX has only **στίχος** and **στιχίζω**, not **στοιχ**. (Thackeray, Gr., p. 92).

ι *and* **υ.** These two vowels sometimes have the force of the consonants[7] *j* (*y*) and **υ** (cf. Latin). Cf. **αυ–** (af) and **ευ--** (ef) in modern Greek, and **ε** in **πόλεως.** In modern Greek "every **ι-** or e-sound which collides in the middle of a word with a succeeding

[1] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 155.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22. But it is quite possible (see *j*) that this is a case of prothetic o.

[3] W.-Sch., p. 52.

[4] Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 81.

[5] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 53. Cf. on the other side K.-BI., I, 3, p. 53.

[6] Jann., ib., p. 52. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 112.

[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 27, 55, etc.

vowel, loses its syllabic value and becomes consonanted" (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 10). So ἅγιος = *ayos*. The **ι** is the last of the five original vowel-sounds in this order: **α, ο, υ, ε, ι**. This relative value has persisted in modern Greek (Thumb's Handbook, p. 12 f.). Jannaris[1] gives **ἀπωθούμενοι** as an illustration of this gradation in sound. But as a matter of fact the interchange between **ι** and **υ** is not frequent. Meisterhans[2] finds only five examples in the Attic inscriptions, two of which, **βυβλιον** and **Μιτυληναῖος**, are found in N. T. MSS. (assimilation). Examples occur in the **κοινή** of Asia Minor, though Thumb[3] agrees with Kretschmer in calling it a "barbarism." Still the old distinction in sound between **ι** and **υ** slowly broke down till in modern Greek the two vowels have the same sound. **βήρυλλος** in Rev. 21:20 is spelled also in MSS. **βήριλλος, βύριλλος, βιρύλλιος**, a fine illustration of itacism. D reads **βύβλος** for **βίβλος** in Mk. 12:26 and Lu. 20:42: In Ac. 20:14 **Μιτυλήνη** is the correct text for the old **Μυτ**., but AE have **Μιτυλίνη** and L **Μυτυλίνη**. For the **Τρωγίλιον** of Strabo and the Byzantine writers the Textus Receptus addition to Ac. 20:15 has **Τρωγυλία**, other MSS. **Τρωγύλλιον, Τρωγύλιον**.[4] The LXX shows also **ἤμυσυ** in θ Dan. 7:25 (13). The Ptolemaic papyri vary in this word (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 95). In Lu. 19:8 D has **ἤμυσοι**.

(e) THE CHANGES WITH **ο**. For changes with **α** see under (a), for **ο** and **ε** under (b), for **ο** and **ι** under (d).

ο *and* **ου**. The old Attic used **Διόσκορος**, which Phrynichus[5] prefers, though Thucyd. and Plato have the form in **–ουρος** also (Epic or Ionic). In Ac. 28:11 only some of the cursives have the form in **–ορος**. Both forms appear in the inscriptions.[6] This exchange is rather common in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser, Gr., pp. 10 f., 116 f.). In the LXX **א** shows sometimes **ὀκ** for **οὐκ** (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 91). The modern Greek dialects have much diversity of usage on this point. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 8.

[1] Ib., p. 84. [2] Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 28 f.

[3] Hellen., pp. 139, 193 ff. Cf. Kretschmer, Einl. in d. Gesch. d. griech. Spr., p. 225 f. Cronert (Mem. Grace. Hercul., p. 21 f.) gives exx. in Hercul. pap. Cf. Mayser, Gr., pp. 100-103, for exx. like **βύβλος, βυβλίον**, etc., in the pap.

[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22. In Athens before 403 B.C. **ο** stood for **ο, ω, ου** (Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 24).

[5] Lobeck, p. 235; The New. Phryn., p. 310. Cf. K.-BI., I, p. 140 f., for this change in Old Attic and New Ionic. The N. T. Apoc. (Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 41) has exx. like **ἐβολὸμην** as the mod. Gk. vernac. (Thumb, Neugr. Volksspr., p. 6). Cf. Buresch, Phil. li, 89. Most common bet. vi/iii B.C. acc. to Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 37.

[6] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 66 f.

o *and* υ. The MSS. vary between[1] πρᾶος (Syrian) and πραΰς in Mt. 11:29; 1 Pet. 3:4, as well as between πραότης and πραΰτης Pauline Epistles. W. H. adopt the form in –υ. Von Soden varies between these forms, giving no reasons. It is the old distinction surviving in the κοινή. The LXX has the υ form. The papyri have other illustrations (Mayser, Gr., p. 97). Cf. **Ποτίολοι** in Ac. 28:13 for the Latin *Puteoli*.

o *and* ω. Originally o represented both the short and long noun so that it was easy with careless pronunciation for more or less confusion to exist after ω came into use. The Boeotian Pindar, for instance, has **Διώνυσος** instead of **Διόνυσος**.[2] The New Ionic ζόη (parox.) appears in lieu of ζωή. However, the introduction of the Ionic alphabet in 403 B.C. kept the two vowels pretty distinct in Attic till the Roman time, though the change began in the third century B.C.[3] After the second century B.C. the exchange of these two vowels was indiscriminate in the more illiterate vernacular.[4] The confusion was earliest in Egypt, but the Attic inscriptions kept the distinction well till 100 A.D. The early uncials for the LXX and the N.T. show little evidence of the interchange (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 89). Jannaris finds it common. The modern Greek makes no difference in sound between o and ω except medial o as in *not*. "In the early papyri the instances of confusion between o and ω are innumerable."[5] The inscriptions tell the same story about the κοινή in Magnesia[6] and Pergamum.[7] In some instances,[8] like δόμα for δῶμα and πρόδομα an ω is shortened to o after the analogy of ε from η in θέμα. In the N. T. MSS. "probably the commonest permutation is that of o and ω, chiefly exemplified in the endings —**ομεν**, and –**ωμεν**."[9] It is useless to follow the MSS. through their variations on this point. In Ro. 5:1 ἔχωμεν is supported by all the best documents and gives a difficult sense at first, though a better one on reflection than ἔχομεν. In 1 Cor. 15:49 the evidence is so nearly balanced that

[1] Gregory, Prol., p. 82. [2] K.-B1., I, p. 141.

[3] Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 24 f., gives numerous exx. of the exchange in inscr. of various dates.

[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 37. Jann. quotes a Louvre pap. (165 B.C.) which has **τῶ αὐτῶ τρόπωι**. Mayser (Gr., pp. 97 ff.) finds only two exx. of this confusion of o and ω in the Ptol. pap. of iii/B.C., but seventy in the next two.

[5] Ib. Cf. Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 19 f.

[6] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 64.

[7] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 95. Cf. Thumb, Hellen., pp. 143, 172.

[8] Reinhold, De Graec. Patr., p. 41, and Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 108.

[9] Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 309.

W. H. cannot decide between φορέσωμεν and φορέσομεν (the latter in the margin). Von Soden gives –σω–. This difficulty of distinguishing between o and ω in the indicative and subjunctive increased in later κοινή times.[1] Several further N. T. examples of interest are ἀγοράσωμεν (Lu. 9:13), is ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται (Rev. 14:13), ἵνα ἀναπαύσονται, (Rev. 6:11), ἐὰν ἀποθνήσκομεν as read by Lachmann (Ro. 14:8), ἵνα γινώσκομεν (1 Jo. 5:20), ἵνα διώκονται according to Tisch. (Gal. 6:12), ἵνα διέρχομαι according to Treg. (Jo. 4:15), δώσωμεν according to Treg. and Tisch., and preceded by ἀγοράσωμεν (Mk. 6:37), ἰάσομαι (Mt. 13:15; cf. Is. 6:10), ἵνα καυθήσωμαι or καυχήσωμαι (1 Cor. 13:3), ἵνα ξυρήσονται (Ac. 21:24). In all these instances syntactical questions enter also besides the mere question of vowel interchange.[2]

The o appears instead of ω in πόμα (1 Cor. 10:4; Heb. 9:10), πρόϊμος (Jas. 5:7), Στοϊκός (Ac. 17:18),[3] συκομορέα, not –μωρέα (Lu. 19:4), χρεοφιλέτης according to W. H. and not χρεοφειλέτης (Soden) nor χρεωφειλέτης according to LU, etc. (Lu. 7:41; 16:5). But ω is correct apparently in ἀγαθωσύνη, ἁγιωσύνη, ἐνδώμησις (Rev. 21:18, Soden —δόμ--), ἱερωσύνη, μεγαλωσύνη, πρωϊνός. So also the LXX, but πρόϊμος (Thack., *Gr*., p. 90). Codex B shows others in the LXX (ib.). In Lu. 18:5 and 1 Cor. 9:27 the MSS. vary between ὑπωπιάζω (from ὑπ-ώπιον) and ὑποπιάζω (--πείζω old form), though the best MSS. read ὑπωπ.[4] In Ro. 13:3 τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ may possibly be τῷ ἀγαθοεργῷ. So in 2 Pet. 3:6. δι᾽ ὧν may be[5] for δι᾽ ὅν. In Rev. 4:7 f. ἔχων, not ἔχον (Soden), is read by the best MSS., though the substantive is ζῷον. Now second century B.C. papyri have ὑπόμνημα ἔχων where ω and o are exchanged.[6]

(f) THE CHANGES WITH υ. For the changes with υ and ι see under (d), υ and o under (e).

υ *and* ευ. Only one example of this exchange appears in the N. T., that of πρεσβύτης in Phil. 9. Here the sense seems to demand πρεσβευτής. Bentley suggested it long ago and Lightfoot (comm. *in loco*) collected a number of instances of the omission

[1] Cf. Reinhold, De Graec. Patr., p. 102; Hatz., Einl. etc., p. 306.

[2] W.-Sch., p. 48.

[3] Hort thinks so "perhaps." The Doric had στοιά. Blass (Gr. N. T. Gk., p. 22) prefers the correct Στωϊκός, Von Soden Στοϊκός

[4] Acc. to W.-Sch. (p. 48 f.) this is not orthographical at all, but etymological. Why not both?

[5] Ib., p. 48.

[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 37. Doubtless other vowel-exchanges in Rev. may have a similar explanation and so do not violate concord of gender.

of ε from ευ, in single MSS. Hort[1] thinks it due to a scribe and not to Paul, since the earlier Greek shows no examples of this interchange. However, Wood[2] has found πρεσβεύτερος for πρεσβύτερος in an Ephesian inscription (analogy: in modern Greek ευ=ef). Thackeray (*Gr.*, p. 97) finds this "natural error" in the LXX MSS.

υ *and* ου. This has always been a rare exchange in the Greek, the Boeotian dialect having retained the original υ sound of υ after the Attic gave it up.[3] The Zaconian preserves it in the modern Greek.[4] The κοινή has sometimes χρουσός for χρυσός.[5] But ου was rather frequent in the κοινή to represent the Latin *u* as Δροῦσος.[6] In Rev. 3:18 the MSS. have κολλούριον, κολλύριον, κουλλούριον, etc. (Latin *collyrium*). W. H. prefer κολλούριον, though ℵBC read –ύριον (so Soden).—Blass[7] observes that we have long υ —ύριον. B in the LXX shows the same variations (Thack., *Gr.*, p. 92). The Ptolemaic papyri have few instances. Cf. change of υ and ου (Mayser, *Gr.*, p. 118). Thumb (*Hellen.*, p. 193 f.) thinks that υ in the κοινή was pronounced like German *ü, i* and also *u*. In Rev. 1:5 the distinction between λύσαντι (ℵAC) and λούσαντι (BP) is more than mere orthography, though the confusion was rendered easy. ΥΙ is always so written in the N. T. uncial MSS.,[8] though the iota was sometimes dropped in, the inscriptions.

(g) THE CHANGES WITH ω. For changes with ω and α see under (a), for ω and o under (e).

ω *and* ου. The Thessalian dialect[9] changed ω to ου as in τοῦ κοινοῦ for τῷ κοινῷ. This change reappears in Rhodes and the AEolic-Doric.[10] Buresch[11] finds the change between ω and ου common in the Egyptian vernacular, as in the Sahidic dialect oo is often used for ω.[12] It is, of course, possible, according to the view of Winer-Schmiedel,[13] that some indicatives in ου may really

[1] Notes on Sel. Read., p. 136. [2] Disc. at Ephesus, App., p. 24.
[3] Thumb, Hellen., p. 31. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., 4th ed., p. 32 f.
[4] Hatz., Einl. etc., p. 103. [5] Thumb, Hellen., p. 85.
[6] Cf. Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 62. Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 71 f.
[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 118.
[8] Cf. Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 46 f.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 9 f., observes that B occasionally divides thus ὑ/ιός at end of a line and so practically A and D.
[9] K.-B1., p. 135. Common in mod. Gk. (Thumb, Handb., p. 8).
[10] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 70 f.
[11] Jahrb. f. klass. Philol., 1891, p. 434. [12] Tattam's Egyp. Gr., p. 5.
[13] P. 52. Reinhold (De Graec. Patr. Apost., p. 41) gives similar exx. Συνκυρῶντα a appears in Egyp. pap. (B. M., vol. II, cliv). Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 99 f.

be subjunctive as a result of this vowel-interchange. The contract form for the present participle τῷ νικοῦντι is read by AC in Rev. 2:17 and A in 2:7, a change more likely due to confusion of –άω and –έω verbs. So with ἵνα ζηλοῦτε (Gal. 4:17) and ἵνα φυσιοῦσθε (1 Cor. 4:6), but the present indicative can be used with ἵνα, and one is slow to credit this form to a mere vowel-exchange. The same remark applies to ἵνα τρέφουσιν (W. H. marg. Rev. 12:6) as well as ἵνα γινώσκουσιν (Tisch. and Treg., Jo. 17:3) and ἵνα σωφρονίζουσιν (Tisch. and Treg., Tit. 2:4). The future indicative with ἵνα as καταδουλώσουσιν (Gal. 2:4), προσκυνήσουσιν (Rev. 9:20), σταυρώσουσιν (Tisch., Treg., Lach., Mk. 15:20), σφάξουσιν (Rev. 6:4) has rival readings with ω, aorist subjunctive. It is hardly mere vocal similarity. Similar instances are μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν (Mt. 7:6), ἐὰν μετανοήσουσιν (Rev. 2:22), ᾧ ἐάν δουλεύσουσιν (Ac. 7:7). In these and similar examples where the MSS. vary between ω and ου it is probable that, as with η and ε, ο and ω, the difference in mode may have been blurred by the tendency to exchange these vowels. But the syntactical question is not essentially altered by this incidental orthographical problem.

ω *and* ωϋ. Lachmann, Tregelles, W. H. all write ωυ in **Μ**ωυσῆς, but Thayer urges that the word is a trisyllable **Μ**ωϋσῆς (Fritzsche, Gesenius, Tisch., Soden). The Ionic ἑωυτοῦ is a trisyllable. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 138. Blass[1] indeed says that the diphthong ωυ is non-existent in the N. T. as in the Attic. The Text. Rec. reads **Μ**ωσῆς, following Strabo and Josephus in the Antiquities, though in the LXX and Josephus elsewhere we have **Μ**ωϋσῆς.

(h) CONTRACTION AND SYNCOPE. In general the κοινή uses contraction of vowels from the standpoint of the Attic,[2] though a strong Ionic infusion[3] is present also as in forms like χειλέων, ὀρέων, etc. The N. T. examples of unusual contraction find illustration[4] in the κοινή. In the N. T. contraction is rarely neglected, as Winer saw, though ἐδέετο (**א**C for Lu. 8:38, though BL 33 read ἐδεῖτο), νοΐ (1 Cor. 1 : 10, etc.), ὀστέα (Lu. 24:39), ὀστέων (Mt. 23:27, etc.), ὀρέων (Rev. 6:15, Attic as well as Ionic), χειλέων (Heb. 13:15), χρυσέων (Rev. 2:1, Lach., Treg.) show that the N. T. in this respect was like the κοινή and not the literary Attic. Blass[5] observes that the N. T. Greek did not go quite as far in

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 10. [2] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 100.

[3] Thumb, Hellen., p. 237. Cf. also ib., p. 63. For the mod. Gk. contraction see p. 249. Cf. K.-B1., Bd. I, pp. 201-218.

[4] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., pp. 100 ff.; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., pp. 68 ff.

[5] W.-Th., p. 46; W.-M., p. 51. [6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 22 f.

contracting vowels as the Attic did. In illustration can be mentioned ἀγαθοεργεῖν (1 Tim. 6:18), though ἀγαθουργῶν is the correct text in Ac. 14:17. But we have ἀμπελουργός, ἱερουργεῖν, κακοῦργος, οἰκουργός, πανοῦργος, not to mention the conjectural reading ἀγαθοεργός for Ro. 13:3 on the other hand. In Col. 2:16 νεομηνία for the Attic νουμηνία is read by W. H., though supported only by BFG 121 f g vg. So the LXX (Thack., *Gr.*, p. 98). In the case of ἐλεινός W. H. have the regular form in Rev. 3:17, but ἐλεεινός in 1 Cor. 15:19. Blass[1] reminds us, however, that even ἐλεινός may represent ἐλεϊνός. The N. T. likewise has νοσσός in Lu. 2:24 (like the LXX) and νοσσία (or νοσσιά) in Lu. 13:34; Mt. 23:37. Phrynichus[2] condemned this dropping of ε in νεοσσός. Καμμύω (Mt. 13:15; Ac. 28:27, both from Is. 6:10) comes from the Epic and the old vernacular. Κατ was an old form parallel with Κατά.

There are several noteworthy points about ι. The ι is retained in ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος (1 Pet. 4:15). The same thing is true with ἡμίωρον (Rev. 8:1), like ἡμιώβολον in the Attic inscriptions.[3] The form ἔστων in Mk. 1:6 (already in Homer) is a twin rather than a syncopated form of ἐσθίων (Mt. 11:19).[4] In the N. T. the ι is not dropped in such forms as βιώσεσθε, ἐνύπνιον, σιωπᾶν, υἱός. Blass[5] calls the contraction of ιει=ii=ι "an entirely new kind," though it appears in the κοινή, as in ἐπεικῶς, ταμεῖον, ὑγεῖα, etc.[6] When ει came to be equal to ι, the two sounds naturally blended into one. Cf. the Ionic dative πόλι for πόλιι. So in the N. T. we find πεῖν (BCD), even πῖν (ℵAL) for πιεῖν in Jo. 4:9, and elsewhere in the N. T. In Mt. 6:6, etc., ταμεῖον is read for ταμεῖον.[7] On the other hand in Rev. 21:20 A reads σαρδιόνυξ for σαρδόνυξ. W. H. read τετραραρχέω, τετραάρχης rather than τετραρχέω, etc. The use of γλωσσόκομον instead of the earlier γλωσσοκόμειον (—ιον) should be noticed also. For the use of ἐάν = modal ἄν see under (b), p. 190.

(i) DIPHTHONGS AND DIAERESIS. The Boeotians monophthongized the diphthongs αι, ει, οι, ου in the fourth and fifth

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 23.

[2] Rutherford, New Phryn., p. 287. For other syncopated forms in the LXX see Thack., Gr., p. 99.

[3] Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 23.

[4] Hort., Notes on Orth., p. 145.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 23. Omitted by Debrunner.

[6] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 101. Cf. Dittenb., Or. Graec. Inscr. Sel., ἐπεικῶς (565. 19), ταμεῖον, (515. 26 ff.), ὑγείας (618. 2). For the same phenomena in the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 10 f.

[7] See Deiss., B. S., p. 183, for pap. illustrations of πεῖν, πῖν, ταμεῖον. Moulton, Prol., p. 45, calls this coalescence of two successive ι sounds "a universal law of Hellenistic phonology." Cf, for the LXX Thack., Gr., pp. 22, 63 f., 98.

centuries B.C.[1] The Boeotians pronounced χαίρει=*cheri* as the vernacular κοινή did. Thumb (*Hellenismus*, p. 228) objects to "this emphasizing of Boeotian" by Kretschmer (*Die griech. Vaseninschriften; Einleit. in d. Gesch.*). Moulton (*Prolegomena*, p. 33 f.) allows this Boeotian influence on the κοινή with a "perhaps." The itacising process still further developed this use of the diphthongs as monophthongs. Indeed Jannaris[2] insists that the term δίφθογγος as applied to συλλαβή concerned the eye rather than the ear and meant more biliteral than bivocal. The spurious diphthongs show the process in a state of completion. The papyri, unlike the inscriptions, do not dissect a diphthong at the close of a line.[3] Where two vowels do not blend into one syllable, it is necessary to indicate it. Hence from very early times marks of diaeresis were used to show that each vowel has its own sound. The mark is put over the ι or υ which might otherwise be considered to unite with the preceding vowel. These marks are found in the oldest N. T. MSS. with such words as ἀλληλούϊα, (Rev. 19:1; but in the case of proper names transliterated from the Hebrew or Aramaic W. H. follow the Hebrew or Aramaic spelling. Cf. Hort, Intr., p. 313. So in other examples below), **Ἀχαΐα**, **Ἀχαϊκός** (1 Cor. 16:17), **Βηθσαϊδά, Γάϊος** (also **Γαΐος** in Ac. 20:4, etc., but cf. Allen, *Harvard Studies in Class. Philol.*, ii, 1891, pp. 71 ff.), διϋλίζειν (Mt. 23:24), **Ἑβραϊτί, ἐλωΐ** (Mk. 15:34), **Ἐφραίμ**, however, or **Ἐφρέμ** (**א**L in Jo. 11:54), **Ἡσαΐας**, though B usually without,[4] **Ἰουδαϊκῶς, ἰσχΰι** (2 Pet. 2:11), **Καϊάφας, Καΐν** (W. H. **Καίν**), so W. H. **Καινάν** (not **Καϊνάν** nor —άμ), **Λευείτης** and not **Λευΐτης** in W. H., **Λωΐς** (W. H. –ίς), **Μωυσῆς** in W. H., not **Μωϋσῆς, Νινευείτης** and not **Νινευΐτης, πρΰϊμος** according to W. H., but **πρωί, πρωινός**. W. H. have **Πτολεμαΐδα** in Ac. 21:7 and **Ῥωμαϊστί** in Jo. 19:20. D reads **Χοραζαΐν**. The Semitic etymology complicates the matter with some of these words.[5] Many of the MSS. use diaeresis at the beginning of words as in ἵνα.[6] **א**A regularly write ηϋ, while ωϋ is correct also.[7] See Giles[8] on the subject of diphthongs. For iota subscript see under (c).

(j) APHAERESIS AND PROTHETIC VOWELS. θέλω, not ἐθέλω, is the only form in the N. T., as it is the common form in the κοινή and is that used in modern Greek. It is as old as Homer, and since

[1] Hatz., Einl. etc., p. 304. Cf. K.-Bl., Bd. I, pp. 243 ff.
[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 29. [3] Ib., p. 43. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 153 f.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 17. So **Ἰεσσαί**.
[5] Ib. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 34. [7] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 10.
[6] Gregory, Prol. etc., p. 108. [8] Comp. Philol., pp. 158 ff.

250 B.C. is the only form in the Attic[1] and Ionic[2] inscriptions. The augment, however, is always η. Cronert[3] finds ἐθέλω after consonants. The κοινή does not follow the Ionic in the use of κεῖνος for ἐκεῖνος. Aphaeresis is frequent[4] in the modern Greek vernacular, κεῖ and ἐκεῖ, δέν for οὐδέν, etc. But the N. T. has only ἐχθές (so LXX) in the best MSS. (cf. Jo. 4:52 אABCD; Ac. 7:28 אBCD; Heb. 13:8 אACD), the usual Attic form, though the papyri sometimes have χθές instead of the common ἐχθές. The N. T. does not have δύρομαι, κέλλω, μείρομαι, where o is dropped. Cf. Kuhner-Blass, Tl. I, Bd. 1, p. 186. The form μείρομαι (cf. ὀμειρόμενοι, in 1 Th. 2:8) occurs in Nicander for ἱμείρομαι. It is possible that in ὀ(ὀ)μείρομαι we have prothetic o instead of apharesis. Cf. Hort, *Notes on Orth*., p. 152; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 141. See Additional Notes for full list.

(k) ELISION. Besides the use of the movable final ν and ς the Greeks had two other methods of obviating hiatus (elision, crasis). The hiatus was distasteful to the finished writers, though more freedom was exercised in poetry. The avoidance of hiatus was always a more or less artificial matter and hiatus was unavoidable in the most careful Attic writers, as in the case of ὅτι, περί, πρό, τί τι, the article, relative, the small "form-words" (καί, εἰ, μή), etc. But the harsher hiatus like ἐδίδοτο αὐτῷ would be avoided by the literary κοινή writers as well as by the Atticists. The inscriptions and the papyri show far less concern about hiatus than do the literary writers of the κοινή. As might be expected the N. T. books agree in this matter with the vernacular κοινή and the MSS. vary greatly among themselves. Blass[5] considers this situation in harmony with the tendency to greater isolation of the words in the later language. Indeed he thinks that only one[6] book in the N. T. (Hebrews) shows the care of an artistic writer in the avoidance of hiatus. By omitting the 0. T. quotations and chapter 13 he finds that hiatus where there is a pause is a matter of indifference, as also with καί. He finds fifty-two other instances of hiatus, whereas Romans goes beyond that num-

[1] Meisterh., Gr., p. ,178.
[2] Smyth, Ionic Dial., p. 482. Cf. Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 155.
[3] Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 133 f.
[4] Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 13.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18. Cf. on hiatus K.-B1., I, pp. 190 ff.
[6] Ib., p. 296 f. On indifference of later Gk. to hiatus see Bischoff, Neut. Wiss., 1906, p. 268; Thieme, ib., p. 265. Moulton (Prol., p. 92) quotes Kaelker (Qumst., p. 245 f.) as saying that Polyb. uses ὅστις for ὅς merely to avoid hiatus. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 160.

ber as far as ch. 4:18. But even then Blass has to admit cases of harsher hiatus in Hebrews, like ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, ἔνοχοι ἦσαν, etc.

The Attic inscriptions show that the vernacular tongue did not care much about hiatus.[1] The lighter elisions like δ᾽ were used or not at will, while the heavier ones like δίκαι᾽ ὅπως were rare. The same indifference to elision appears in the κοινή inscriptions[2] and in the papyri.[3] In general in the N. T. elision takes place regularly before pronouns and particles and before nouns in combinations of frequent occurrence[4] like κατ᾽ οἶκον. Blass[5] has carefully worked out the following facts in the N. T. MSS. **Τε, οὔτε, μήτε, ἅμα, ἄρα, γε, ἐμέ ἔτι, ἵνα, ὥστε**, etc., do not undergo elision nor do noun- or verb-forms . The verse of Menander quoted in 1 Cor. 15:33 is properly printed χρηστὰ ὁμιλίαι by W. H.[6] Even the compound words τεσσερακονταετής (Ac. 7:23) and ἑκατονταετής (Ro. 4:19) do not suffer elision, while τετρα-άρχης has no elision in ℵCΔ (Alexandrian, Hort). **Τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι** or **τουτέστι** is the only example in the pronouns that we have in the N. T.[7] It is in the particles then that most N. T. elisions occur, though there are comparatively few. **Ἀ**λλά, according to Gregory,[8] has elision in 215 cases and fails to have it in 130, though the MSS. vary much. Hort[9] observes that in ἀλλά elision is usual before articles, pronouns and particles, but rare before nouns and verbs. Ro. 6: 14-8:32 has many non-elisions of ἀλλά, and the elision varies before the different vowels except that it is constant before rarely suffers elision outside of ὅς δ᾽ ἄν, but here frequently, while W. H. read δὲ αὐτό in Ph. 2:18 after ℵBP. In 2 Cor. 3:16 W. H. put ἡνίκα δ᾽ ἄν in the margin, text ἡν. δὲ ἐάν (so Tisch, Nestle). In οὐδέ elision takes place several times, as in **οὐδ᾽ ἄν** (Heb. 8:4), **οὐδ᾽ εἰ** (Ac. 19:2, ℵAB), **οὐδ᾽ ἵνα** (Heb. 9:25), **οὐδ᾽ ὅτι** (Ro. 9:7), **οὐδ᾽ οὐ** (Mt. 24:21; Heb. 13:5), **οὐδ᾽ οὕτως** (1 Cor. 14:21). Blass[10] further notes that prepositions seldom use elision

[1] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 69 f.

[2] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 134; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 71 f.

[3] Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 138 f. Cf. also Thumb, Hellen. etc., p. 82.

[4] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 146.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18. Cf. also Gregory, p. 93 f.

[6] Moulton (Cl. Rev., Feb. 31, 1901) finds that the pap. like the Lat. have a vowel not used in the metre. The inscr. concur in this practice. Moulton, Prol., p. 45. Cf. also Mayser, Gr., pp. 155-158, 160-162. He shows that in the pap. it is largely a matter of indifference. On the scarcity of elision in the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 12 f.; Thackeray, pp. 22, 136 f.

[7] Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 306) refers to the Oxyrhynchus pap., which have **τοῦτ εἰπών** in Jo. 20:22

[8] Prol., p. 93 f.

[9] Notes, p. 146.

[10] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18.

with proper names, since it was thought better, as on the inscriptions, to keep the name distinct and readily discernible, though W. H. read δι᾽ Ἀβραάμ in Heb. 7:9. Elision is most common with διά as δι᾽ ἐσόπτρου (1 Cor. 13:12), "because there were already two vowels adjacent to each other" Blass[1] thinks. Ἀντί has elision only in ἀνθ᾽ ὧν (Lu. 1:20, etc.). Elsewhere the prepositions show elision with pronouns and in current phrases, as in ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ἀπ᾽ἄρτι, ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ, κατ᾽ ἐμέ, κατ᾽ ἰδίαν (καθ᾽ ἰδίαν), κατ᾽ οἶκον, μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ, παρ᾽ ὧν, ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν᾽ (ὑμῶν), ὑπ᾽ οὐδενός (1 Cor. 2:15).[2] So the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 137).

(1) CRASIS. The Attic official inscriptions make little use of crasis, though it is fairly common in the vase-inscriptions of the fifth century B.C.[3] In Magnesia Nachmanson finds only a few examples of καί and the article.[4] The same thing is true of Pergamum.[5] In the N. T. it is confined also to καί and the article. And in the case of καί crasis only occurs if the following word is a pronoun or a particle. Καί thus often, though not always, coalesces with ἐγώ and the oblique cases, as κἀγώ, κἀμοί, κἀμέ. If there is a "distinct co-ordination of ἐγὼ with another pronoun or a substantive," crasis does not take place.[6] Even the MSS. vary greatly.[7] Κἀκεῖνος also is found as well as κἀκεῖ and κἀκεῖθεν. Καί likewise blends only occasionally with ἐάν in the sense of 'and if,' as in Mk. 16:18; Lu. 13:9; Jas. 5:15. In the sense of 'even if' the crasis is more common, as in Mt. 26:35; Jo. 8:14. In the sense of 'if it be but' or 'if only' the crasis is uniform as in Mk. 5:28; 6:56; 2 Cor. 11:16.[8] Cf. κἄν--καὶ ἐάν (Jo. 8:14, 16). The article suffers crasis very often in the older Greek, but in the N. T. it is seldom so. Hort [9] declines to accent ταὐτά for ταῦτα in 1 Cor. 9:8 or ταὐτά for τὰ αὐτά in Lu. 6:23, 26; 17:30, though supported in Luke by some good MSS. He does, however, accept τοὔνομα in Mt. 27:57 and τοὐναντίον in 2 Cor. 2:7; Gal. 2:7; 1 Pet. 3:9 ("stereotyped as a single word," Blass[10]). Crasis is quite rare in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 137).

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18. See Additional Notes.

[2] For more minute details about the prep. see Gregory, Prol., pp. 94 ff.

[3] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., pp. 70 ff. [4] Magn. Inschr., p. 74.

[5] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 133. Cf. Mayser, Gr., pp. 158 ff., for the common pap. exx. like κἀγώ, τἀληθές, etc. [6] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 145.

[7] See Gregory, Prol., p. 96; Von Soden, I, p. 1380.

[8] See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18, and W.-Sch., p. 38; Von Soden, I, p. 1380. Blass gives κἀπεθύμει from D (Lu. 15:16). [9] Notes on Orth., p. 145.

[10] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19. For scarcity in LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. LXX, p. 13 f.

III. Consonant-Changes (στοιχεῖα σύμφωνα). The Greek, like other Indo-Germanic tongues, wrote out both vowels and consonants save in the case of iota adscript, which was not always used. But, as with the Phoenician and Hebrew, which wrote only consonants, the consonants form the backbone of the language. Both consonants and vowels are originally pictographic. "Beth" (βῆτα) is 'house,' "gimul" (γάμμα) is 'camel,' "daleth" (δέλτα) is 'door,' etc.[1] The Greek indeed developed the vowels **α, ε, ι, ο** out of the Phoenician consonants *aleph, he, yod, ayin*.[2]

(a) ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE CONSONANTS. Though the Greek consonants undoubtedly come chiefly from the Phoenician symbols, they were not all used at once nor in the same places. At first the digraphs K□, T□ , Π□ were used for the later X, **Θ**, **Φ**, and even after these letters won a foothold **ΚΣ, ΧΣ**, **ΠΣ, ΦΣ** were used in Attic for **ξ, ψ**. It is only since 403 B.C. that the Greek alphabet (ἄλφα βῆτα) has had regularly twenty-four letters. Jannaris[3] gives an interesting study of the way the Greek letters looked in eighth, sixth, fifth and fourth centuries B.C. as shown by the inscriptions. In the inscriptions, however, **κόππα** continued to be used (like Latin Q) and **βαῦ** or **δίγαμμα**. This last, though called double **γάμμα**, perhaps represents the Phoenician *vau*. On the use of digamma in Homer see Kuhner-Blass.[4] It is a half-vowel in fact, as **ι** and **υ** are partly consonant in force, like Latin u (u) and i (j).[5] The dropping of digamma affected many words, some of which have the rough breathing, though Thumb[6] and Moulton[7] think that this is an accident simply, and the rough breathing is due to analogy and not to the digamma in cases like **καθ' ἕτος**, etc. But changes in the use of the consonants did not cease when the Euclidean spelling reform was instituted 403 B.C. As the vowels underwent steady development, so it was and is with the consonants. B early began occasionally to have the force of **υ**, and **γ** sometimes the j value of **ι** as in modern Greek, and it was even inserted (irrational **γ**).[8] In general in the **κοινή** the

[1] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 21. [2] Ib. Cf. Meisterh., Gr. etc., p. 3.

[3] Ib., p. 24 f. On the whole subj. of changes in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 163-248. For general remarks about consonant-changes in LXX MSS. see Swete, 0. T. in Gk., p. 301. [4] Bd. I, pp. 85-101.

[5] Ib., pp. 77-85, 101-103. The mod. Gk. pronounces **αὐτός** =aftos. The inscr. give the form **ἀ*F*υτοῦ**. Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 34.

[6] Hellen., pp. 245 ff.

[7] Prol., p. 44. But Sommer, Gr. Lautstudien, shows that the rough breathing is sometimes due to digamma.

[8] Thumb, Hellen., p. 187 f.; cf. p. 134 f. for intervocal **γ**.

consonant-changes are much fewer thhn those of the vowel. Such peculiarities as σσ, **γίνομαι,** λήμψομαι are common (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 100).

(b) THE INSERTION OF CONSONANTS. In the older Greek δ is inserted in ἀν-δ-ρός, and so with β in **μεσημ-β-ρία**.[1] The Attic used either form in **ἐμπί(μ)πλημι, ἐμπί(μ)πρημι**. So in Ac. 14: 17 DEP read **ἐμπιμπλῶν**, (D ἐν--), and in Ac. 28:6 **א**^{c}BHLP most cursives have **πίμπρασθαι**. The LXX MSS. show the same variation. D in Lu. 2:32, etc., has **Ἰσ-τ-ραήλ**. The retention of **μ** in all the forms (derivatives also) of λαμβάνω (root λαβ) is in accord with the usage of the papyri ("almost invariably")[2] and the inscriptions of the **κοινή**, and is due to the Ionic λάμψομαι.[3] Hence λήμψομαι, **ἐλήμφθην**, etc. In the Ptolemaic age (iii/i B.C.) the papyri give both forms. From i/iv A.D. the papyri and uncials (LXX and N. T.) give almost wholly forms. In the Byzantine period (vi/viii A.D.) the classic **λήψομαι** reappears. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 108 f.; Mayser, Gr., p. 194 f.; Cronert, *Mem*., p. 66. In the LXX the uncials give the spelling of their own date, not that of the translation. In Mk. 7:32 the extra γ in **μογ(γ)ιλάλον** is inserted by the Syrian class only and is not to be accepted. In Heb. 11:32 π is added to **Σαμισών (Σαμψών)**. So also in Ac. 3:7 (**א**ABC) δ is added to **σφυ(δ)ρόν** which is as yet "unexplained."[4] In the case of **Ἀδραμυντηνῷ** (Ac. 27:2), read by W. H. on authority of AB 16 Copt. instead of **Ἀδραμυττηνῷ**, a slightly different situation exists. Two ways of pronouncing and spelling the name of the city existed.

(c) THE OMISSION OF CONSONANTS. There are not many cases where a consonant drops out of a N. T. word. In Rev. 13:2 the correct reading (all the uncials) is undoubtedly **ἄρκου**, not **ἄρκτου**. This form is found also in the LXX and in inscriptions of the first or second century A.D.[5] W. H., following B and **א**, also (save in Mk. 3:22) read **βεεζεβούλ** instead of **βεελζεβούλ**. **Γίνομαι** and **γινώσκω** are the exclusive forms in the N. T., though some MSS., as in the papyri and inscriptions, have **γειν**–. Nach-

[1] Blass compares the insertion of consonants in Semitic names like **Ἔα-δ-ρας, Μαμ-β-ρῆ**.

[2] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.

[3] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 179 f. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 64, for full references concerning the use of **μ** with λαμβάνω. Cf. Gregory (Prol., p. 72) for list and references of the various compounds of λαμβάνω and λῆμψις in the N. T., **ἀνα--, ἀνεπι--, ἀντι--, ἀπο--, κατα--, μετα--, παρα--, προ--, προσ--.** The LXX MSS. have λήμψομαι (Q λήψονται) and **ἐλήμφθην**. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 22.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 24; W.-Sch., p. 64.

5 Ib., p. 65.

manson[1] states clearly the facts. The Ionic as early as the fifth century B.C. used the γιν forms, and the Doric shows the same situation in the fourth century. Even in Athens the γιν, forms appear, and in the κοινή the γιγν forms vanish. Γολγοθά follows the Hebrew גֻּלְגֹּלֶת rather than the Chaldaic גֻּלְגָּלְתָּא in having only one λ. According to Winer-Schmiedel[2] the two forms καῦδα and κλαῦδα (Ac. 27:16) represent two different islands near each other, which were confused in the MSS. It is hardly worth while to remark that σάρδιον (correct text in Rev. 4:3) is a substantive, while σάρδινος (Text. Rec.) is an adjective.

(d) SINGLE OR DOUBLE CONSONANTS. Blass[3] and Winer-Schmiedel[4] comment on the obscurity concerning the use of single or double consonants in the κοινή. The phenomena in the N. T. in general correspond to the situation in the κοινή.[5] In the modern Greek vernacular (cf. Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 27) the double consonants, except in Southeastern Greek dialects, have the value of only one. In the oldest Attic inscriptions in most cases where the doubling of consonants was possible the single consonant was used.[6] The rule with initial ῥ was that when it passed to the middle of a word as a result of reduplication or the prefixing of a preposition, etc., it was doubled. But ῥεραντισμένος is read by אACDP in Heb. 10:22 as in Ionic and late Greek, ῥεριμμένοι in D (Mt. 9:36), and περιρεραμμένος in א (Rev. 19:13). Blass[7] observes

[1] Magn. Inschr., p. 108. Cf. also Hoffmann, Griech. Dial., Bd. III, p. 173; Meisterh., p. 128; Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 165; Schmid, Atticismus, Bd. IV., p. 579 (for the Atticistic γιγν); Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 91 f.; Reinhold, De Graec. Patr. etc., pp. 46-48. In the LXX γίνομαι and γινώσκω are uniform. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 21. Thack. (Gr., p. 111 f.) finds illustrations of the omission of intervocalic 7 in the LXX uncials as in the pap. (Mayser, Gr., p. 167 f.).

[2] P. 65, where a full discussion of the geographical points is given.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 10.

[4] P. 55; cf. also Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., pp. 225 ff.

[5] See Thumb, Hellen., pp. 20 ff.; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., pp. 122 ff.; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., pp. 88 ff.; Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., pp. 74 ff. Cf. Mayser, Gr., pp. 211-219. For the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 14-16. The MSS. of the LXX are largely the same as those of the N. T. and show similar phenomena in orthography. So in Ex. 7:10 B has ἔριψεν, ᾽Αρρ. Both ἀρραβών, and ἀραβών occur, and it is in the pap. that we can often find the true Ptolemaic spelling. A curiously has usually γένημα and B γέννημα.

[6] Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 93.

[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 10, 328. Similar variations in usage as to ρ or ρρ appear in the inscr. of the κοινή (Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 124, ἀναντιρήτως, etc.; Nachm., Magn. etc., p. 91) and even in the Attic inscr. (Meisterh., p. 95, ἀναρηθέντες, etc.). Cf. Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p.42, for exx. of ἐρύσατο, etc.

that the Syriac versions use רהומא for **Ῥ**ώμη, though some Attic inscriptions use initial pp. In Mt. 9:20 αἱμορροοῦσα is correct (**א**L one ρ). In Ac. 10:29 BD 61 read ἀνατιρήτως, and in Ac. 19:36 BL have ἀναντιρήτων. In Ac. 27:43 W. H. follow **א**C in ἀπορίψαντας, and in Lu. 19:35 all but the Syrian class read ἐπιρίψαντες and **א**AB have the same form in 1 Pet. 5:7. In Mt. 9:36 the Neutral (and Alexandrian) class has ἐριμμένοι, the Syrian ἐρρ., while D has ῥεριμμ–. In Mt. 15:30 **א**DL read ἔριψαν, while B and the rest have ἔρριψαν, but see Ac. 27:19. But in Lu. 17:2 ἔρριπται is supported by all MSS. save II and p^{scr}. In Jo. 19:23 ἄραφος is read by W. H., though B has app. In 2 Cor. 12:4 ἄρρητα is right as ἄρρωστος in Mk. 6:5, 13, etc. In 2 Cor. 1:22 W. H. follow BCD vs. **א**AL in reading ἀρραβῶνα, a Semitic word which in its Semitic form has the doubling of the consonant and the metrical prosody – ˘ – according to Blass,[1] who compares also the Latin *arrha*. W. H. have διαρξας in Mk. 14:63 after BN, while in Lu. 8:29 διαρήσσων is supported by ABCRU**Δ**. In Mt. 26:65 W. H. give διέρηξεν on the authority of only θ^{f} according to Tisch., though BL read διερήσσετο in Lu. 5:6. But προσέρηξεν in Lu. 6:48 is supported by **א**BDL and in 6:49 by BDL. In Ac. 16:22 περιρήξαντες is the reading of all uncials save P, but most cursives follow P. But in Ac. 14:14 all MSS. have διαρρήξαντες and in Lu. 9:42 the same thing is true of ἔρρηξεν. In Mk. 2:21 ἐπιράπτει is read by all the best MSS. and the Syrian class is divided, and the same is true of Mt. 26:67 ἐράπισαν. In 2 Cor. 11:25 ἐραβδίσθην, is correct, while likewise ἐράντισεν (Heb. 9:19, 21) has all save late Syrian support. So –ρρ– in ἐρρέθη (BD ἐρρήθη, not W. H., Mt. 5:21, etc.) is the constant reading in the N. T. In Eph. 3:17 (18) and Col. 2:7, all MSS. have ἐρριζωμένοι. W. H. follow B alone in 2 Cor. 1:10; 2 Pet. 2:7 with ἐρύσατο, while in Col. 1:13 B is joined by FGP. In 2 Tim. 3:11 AD read ἐρύσατο, and **א**AC 37 give ἐρύσθην in 2 Tim. 4:17. All MSS. have ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29). **Μ**ύρρα (B) is changed to **Μ**ύρα in the Syrian text (Ac. 27:5; cf. Hort, *Notes on Orth*., p. 160), but Winer-Schmiedel (p. 58) found only **Μ**ύρα in the inscriptions. **Π**αραρυῶμεν (Heb. 2:1) is read by all the pre-Syrian classes. **Π**αρρησία, παρρησιάζομαι (from πανρησία), not παρη–, is the usual reading in the N. T. (see Additional Notes), as occasionally in the inscriptions.[2] W. H. read πυρρός in

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 10. **Ἀ**ραβών "only Western," Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 148. But the pap. (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 33; Deiss., B. S., p. 183 f.) frequently have ἀραβών, and, as Deissmann remarks, people are not always particular to preserve mere etymology. [2] CIGII, 2722. 5. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 56,

Rev. 6:4 and 12:3, though the evidence is pretty evenly balanced.[1] The Alexandrian class has πυράζει in Mt. 16 : 2, but W. H. reject the passage. The MSS. all have **Χειμάρρου** in Jo. 18:1.

The other instances outside of ρ are not so numerous. The MSS. (all but late Syrian) support (βαλλάντιον, not βαλάντιον, as do the papyri.[2] Blass[3] argues for it also on metrical grounds. **Γένημα**, because given by no grammarian, was "attributed by Fritzsche (on Mark, pp. 619 ff.) to the carelessness of transcribers" (Thayer), but as sometimes in the LXX (Ezek. 36:30) so in the N. T. the best MSS. distinguish between γέννημα (from γεννάω), 'living creatures,' as γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν (Mt. 3:7) and γένημα (from γινόμαι, 'the fruits of the earth,' as **ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου** (Mk. 14:25). Phrynichus[4] condemns the use of γέννημα=καρπός (Diodorus, Polybius, etc.). Root of both verbs is γεν. This distinction between γένημα and γέννημα appears in the papyri also, though γενηθέντα occurs in the Fayum Papyri (B.U. 110. 14) "undoubtedly from γεννάω."[5] So N. T. MSS. vary[6] about γέννημα. The grammarians (Lobeck, ad Phrynichum, p. 726) reject **ἐκχύνω** for ἐκχέω, but the best MSS. give **ἐκχύννω** everywhere in the N. T. W. H. accept this AEolic form in Mt. 23:35; 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lu. 11:50 marg.); Lu. 22:20 (bracket the passage); and Ac. 22:20. So also *συνχύννω* (W. H.) in Ac. 9:22; 21:31. Cf. **ὑπερεκχυννόμενον** in Lu. 6:38. Likewise MSS. support **ἀναβαίννω, ὀπτάννομαι,** while the AEolic **ἀποκτέννω** is received by W. H. in Rev. 6:11 and ἀποκτεννύω in Mk. 12:5, though rejected elsewhere in N. T. on divided testimony. **Ἔνατος** has been restored throughout the N. T. by W. H. instead of ἔννατος of the Text. Rec. The inscriptions support the N. T. MSS. in this change (Thayer). So W. H. give ἐνενήκοντα (Mt. 18:12 ff.; Lu. 15:4, 7) but ἐννέα always. **Ἐνεός**, not ἐννεός, W. H. give (Ac. 9:7) as the LXX (Is. 56:10), a word possibly identical with ἄνεως (ἄναος). W. H. present[7] **κράβαττος** instead of the κραββατος of the Text. Rec., though κράβατος would more nearly represent the Latin *grabatus* as it appears in Etym. M. (154. 34; 376. 36). **Κ**ραβάτριος is found also for the

[1] The inscr. show πυρός also (Dittenb., 177. 15; 748. 20).
[2] Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 76. [3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 11.
[4] Rutherford, New Phryn., p. 348.
[5] Deiss., B. S., pp. 109 f., 184. Cf. Thackeray, p. 118.
[6] Gregory, Prol., p. 79.
[7] In Mk. B (5) has **κράβατος**, but is not followed by W. H. in Jo. and Ac. (6). Thumb, Hellen., p. 22, argues for ββ as the correct form from mod. Gk. usage. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 328) cites both **κράβαττος** and **κραβάτιον** from Arrian's Diss. Epict. and **κράβαττος** from the pap. Cf. Moulton's note in Einl.

Latin *grabatarius* (CIGII 2114 d ι). **א**, however, has 10/11 times the strange form κράβακτος (–ττ– only in Ac. 5:15). Λασέα (Ac. 27:8) is Λασσαία in some MSS. **Μαμωνᾶς**, from Aramaic מָאמוֹנָא, is correct. **Μασάομαι** is the right reading in Rev. 16:10 (**א**ACP). Only the Western class has πλημύρης for πλημμύρης in Lu. 6:48. W. H. properly have ῥάκος, not ῥάκκος, from ῥήγνυμι (Mt. 9:16; Mk. 2:21). In the Western interpolation in Ac. 20:15, W. H. read **Τρωγύλιον**, not –**ύλλιον** nor –**ίλιον**. Some Latin MSS. read *hysopus* for **ὕσσωπος** in Jo. 19:29 and Heb. 9:19. **Φύγελος**, not –**ελλος**, is read in 2 Tim. 1:15 by all save A and most cursives. Cf. **Φυγέλιος** in CIGII 3027.

The Hebrew and Aramaic proper names call for special remark. **᾽Αννας** =חָנָן (Josephus **᾽Ανανος**) may be due to the dropping of α or to the analogy of **᾽Αννα**=חַנָּה. W. H. (Ac. 1:23; 15:22) prefer **Βαρσαββᾶς** (from בַּרשַׁבָּא, 'son of the Sabbath') to **Βαρσαβᾶς** (from בַּר שְׁבָא, 'son of Saba').[1] The Text. Rec. has **Φενησαρέτ** (W. H. **Γεννησαρέτ**) in Mk. 6:53, elsewhere –**νν**–.[2] **Γόμορρα** is read in LXX and N. T. (Mt. 10:15, etc.), עֲמֹרָה. W. H. accept **᾽Ελισαῖος**, not **᾽Ελισσ**. (Syrian) in Lu. 4:27=אֱלִישָׁע. **᾽Ιεσσαί** (Lu. 3:32, etc.) comes from יִשַׁי. The N. T. and 1 Macc. have **᾽Ιόππη**, but the ancient grammarians and lexicographers prefer **᾽Ιόπη**.[3] In Lu. 3:27 **᾽Ιωανάν** (indeclinable) is the right text. W. H. prefer **᾽Ιωάνα** (יוֹחָנָן) to **᾽Ιωάνης** in Lu. 8:3; 24:10. But more doubt exists concerning **᾽Ιωάνης**, which W. H. read everywhere save in Ac. 4:6; 13:5; Rev. 22:8, following B and sometimes D. The single **ν** prevails in D in Luke and Acts, while **᾽Ιωάννης** is more common in D in Matthew, Mark, John.[4] **א** has the single **ν** in the part written by the scribe of B.[5] The inscriptions have it both ways. Blass[6] finds the explanation in the Hebrew termination –an, which was treated as a variable inflection in the Greek, the LXX MSS. having now **᾽Ιωανάν** and now **᾽Ιωάνον**. This fact opposes the derivation of the name **᾽Ιωάννης** from **᾽Ιωανάν-ης**, leaving the –**ης** unexplained.[7] **Μαριάμ (מִרְיָם)** = **Μαριάμμη** in Josephus.[8] **Μεσσίας** is from the Aramaic מְשִׁיחָא = Hebrew הַמָּשִׁיחַ but the Syr-

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 57.

[2] Cf. Pliny (Nat. Hist., V, 15. 71 for **Γενη**.) also. In W.-Sch., p. 57, the point is made that the unpointed Targums do not distinguish between גִּנֵּיסַר and גִּנֵּיסַר.

[3] W.-Sch., p. 56, =יָפוֹ or יָבְנֶה. Cf. on this subject Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 26 f.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 328, quoting E. Lippett.

[5] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 159.

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 11 .

[7] W.-Sch., p. 57; E. Bibl., p. 2504 f.

[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 11.

ian class reads **Μεσίας** in Jo. 1:41 (42); 4:25. **Σάρρα**, Heb. שָׂרָה: (feminine of שַׂר), is read by MSS. generally in N. T., though L has **Σάρας** in Ro. 4:19 (vulg. *Sarae*). All the MSS. have **νν** in **Σουσάννα** (Lu. 8:3) after the Heb. שׁוֹשַׁנָּה ('a lily'). **Χαρράν** is supported by most MSS., though D and a few cursives have **Χαράν** in Ac. 7:2 after the Hebrew חָרָן. The LXX has **Χαρράν** and the Greek writers (Strabo, etc.) have **Κάρραι**, Latin *Carrhae*.

Doubling of the Aspirate. As a rule the aspirated mutes (θ, χ, φ) are not doubled in more correct writing either in early or late Greek, but N. T. MSS. give examples of θθ, χχ, φφ. In Philemon 2 D has **᾽Αφφία**, while 3 has **᾽Απφία** (so vulg.) and FG, etc., even **᾽Αμφία**. In Mk. 7:34 all MSS. have **ὀφφαθά** (or **ἐφφεθά**) save **Δ** and two Coptic MSS. which have **ἐπφαθά**. W. H. give **Μαθθαῖος**= Hebrew מַתִּתְיָה; in the N. T. (Mt. 9:9 ff., etc.), and **Μαθθάν** in Mt. 1:15. W. H. read **Ματθάτ** in Lu. 3:24, but **Μαθθάτ** in Lu. 3:29. In Ac. 1:23, 26 W. H. have **Μαθθίας**, but in Lu. 3:25 f. they prefer **Ματταθίας** to **Μαθθαθίας**. In Ac. 5:1, W. H. consider **Σαφφειρα** Western and read **Σαπφειρα** (either Aramaic סַפִּירָא, ' beautiful,' or Hebrew סַפִּיר 'precious stone').[1] The LXX MSS. show the same variations. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 121.

(e) ASSIMILATION OF CONSONANTS. In the early period of the Greek language the inscriptions often show assimilation of consonants between separate words. The words all ran together in the writing (*scriptura continua*) and to some extent in pronunciation like the modern French vernacular. Usage varied very early, but the tendency was constantly towards the distinctness of the separate words (dissimilation). However, ἐξ came finally to be written **ἐκ** before consonants, though **ἐγ, ἐκκ, ἐχ, ἐγκ** and even **ἐ** (cf. Latin) are found in Attic inscriptions,[2] as **ἐγ νήσων**, etc. Only sporadic examples outside of **ἐξ** and **ἐκ** appear in the N. T. as **ἀνέγλιπτος** in D (Lu. 12:33), **ἀπεγδύσει** in B (Col. 2:11), **ἔγγονα** in D (1 Tim. 5:4), *eggona*, not *engona*.[3] The Attic inscriptions even have ς assimilated in **τοὺλ λίθους**. The most

[1] On the whole subject see Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 159, and Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 11. Cf. also Schweizer, Perg. etc., pp. 110 f., 114 f. Cf. for the pap., Mayser, Gr., pp. 190-224; Soden, I, pp. 1372 ff.

[2] Cf. Meisterh., pp. 105-109. In North Engl. one hears "ith wood" for "in the wood." The MSS. of the LXX show the same phenomena as one sees in the N. T. MSS. and the pap., like **ἐγ γαστρί, ἐμ μέσῳ, συγγράφειν,** etc. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 16 f.; Thack., Gr., pp. 130 ff.

[3] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 12; Ausspr, etc., p. 123. Alexandrian writers followed the Attic in this assimilation. Blass compares the guttural use of α in **ἀήλί** (Mt. 27:46) in L and in the LXX **᾽Αερμών, ᾽Αενδώρ**.

common assimilation between separate words is in words ending in --ν especially with the article and ἐν. Examples like τὴμ πόλιν, τὸλ λόγον, τὸρ ῾Ρόδιον, ἐλ Λέσβῳ, ἐσ Σιδῶνι, etc., are very common.[1] Similar phenomena occur in the κοινή inscriptions, though the failure to assimilate is far more noticeable. See list of examples in Nachmanson.[2] As a rule the papyri do not assimilate such cases.[3] In the N. T., as in the later κοινή generally, only a few remnants survive of this assimilation of ν between words. Blass,[4] who has used the MSS. to good purpose, finds several, as, for instance, ἐγ γαστρί in A (Lu. 21:23), ἐγ Κανᾶ in AF (Jo. 2:11), ἐμ μέσῳ in AC (Rev. 1:13; 2:1, etc.), in AP (Heb. 2:12), in LΔ (Mt. 18:2; Lu. 8:7), ἐμ πραύτητι in ℵ (Jas. 1:21), σὺμ Μαριάμ in AE, etc. (Lu. 2:5), σὺμ πᾶσιν in EG, etc. (Lu. 24:21). The earlier papyri (up to 150 B.C.) show a good deal of this assimilation between words (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 131). This assimilation between separate words is common in modern Greek (cf. Thumb, *Handb.*, pp. 16 ff.). So τὸν πατέρα=*tombatera*. But a much more difficult matter is presented in the case of ἐν and σύν in composition, though in general "assimilation is the rule in compounds of ἐν, retention of ν in those of σύν."[5] But in 1 and 2 Peter assimilation is the rule (only two clear exceptions) for both σύν and ἐν due possibly[6] to the absence of uncials. The later papyri as a rule do not assimilate σύν, though often ἐν.[7] In the N. T. no examples occur of ἐν or σύν before ξ or ρ.[8] Hort[9] gives a list of what he considers "the certain and constant forms" of ἐν and σύν in composition. "All other compounds of σύν and ἐν are included in the list of alternative readings." Hort thus reads ἐμ– before the labials (π, β, φ) and the liquid μ except ἐνπεριπατήσω (2 Cor. 6:16), possibly ἐνπνέων (Ac. 9:1), and ἔνπροσθεν once (Rev. 4:6) and Western class elsewhere. So assimilation takes place before the liquid λ, as ἐλλογάω). But before the palatals κ, γ the usage varies, though before χ we have ἐγχρῖσαι (Rev. 3:18) with reading ἐν.

[1] Meisterh., p. 110 f. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 97.

[2] Magn. Inschr., p. 100 f. Cf. also Schweizer, Perg. etc., p. 127; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 92.

[3] Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 57; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 12.

[4] Ib., pp. 11 f., 306.

[5] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 149.

[6] Ib. In general see Wecklein, Curae Epigr. ad Gr. Graeca.e etc., 1869, p. 47 f.

[7] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 12. Cf. Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 61.

[8] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 149. See for LXX Thackeray, pp. 132

[9] Ib. For the inscr. see Nachm., Magn., p. 104 f. The Coptic shows similar variation. For the loss of final ν in mod. Gk. vernac. see Thumb, Handb., p. 24 f.

We read ἐνγεγραμμένη in 2 Cor. 3:2 f. (אABCDFG) and ἐνκαίνια, ἐνκαινίζω, ἐνκατοικέω, ἐνκαυχῶμαι, ἐνκεντρίζω, ἐνκρίνω, though ἐγκαλέω, ἔγκλημα, etc., and ἐγκαταλείπω except in Acts.[1] As to σύν here is Hort's decision. Συνπ– he accepts save in συμπόσια. On the other hand Hort has only συνβασιλεύω, συνβιβάζω, elsewhere συμβ— as in συμβαίνω; only σύνφημι, συνφύω, but συμφ— as in συμφέρω. With the palatals Hort reads συνκ– always, as in συνκάθημαι, only συγγενής, συγκαλύπτω, but συνχρῶμαι and σύγχυσις. He has both συνλαλέω, συνλυποῦμαι and συλλαμβάνω, συλλέγω; συνμαθητής, etc., but συμμορφιζω, σύμμορφος. Hort has συνζῶ, etc., but σύζυγε; σύνψυχος, but has both συνσταυρόω, etc., and συστρέφω, etc. For the detailed W. evidence see Gregory.[2] Hort also prefers παλινγενεσία, but is doubtful about κενχρεαί, πανπληθεί.

(f) INTERCHANGE AND CHANGING VALUE OF CONSONANTS. One cannot here go into the discussion of the labial, palatal, dental, velar stops, the spirants, liquids, nasals. One can give only the special variations in the N. T. The *b* sound was rare in the older Indo-Germanic languages and easily glided into *u* or *v*.[3] The Greek βαίνω is like *venio* in Latin, βίος is like *vivus* though different in history. In modern Greek β has sound of *v*. In the N. T. as in the LXX all the uncials have υ in Δαυείδ (W. H.) where the minuscules read Δαβίδ.[4] In the case of βελίαρ (2 Cor. 6:15) it is from בֶּל יַעַר ('lord of the forest'), while the Text. Rec. βελίαλ is from בְּלִיַּעַל ('worthlessness').[5] The variation between ρσ and ρρ, Moulton[6] observes, runs down to modern Greek. The Attic ρρ did not displace the Ionic and early Attic ρσ entirely in the Attic inscriptions.[7] In the N. T., like the rest of the κοινή, usage is divided.[8] Hort (p. 149) prefers ἄρσην except ἄρρην perhaps 4/4 times in Paul. In the Gospels and Acts θάρσος and the two imperatives θάρσει, θαρσεῖτε are uniform, but in 2 Cor. (5:6, 8; 7:16; 10:1, 2) and Heb. (13:6)

[1] About ἐν, in composition see Gregory, Prol. etc., p. 76 f.; Soden, I, p. 1383. Ἐν in MSS. appears in composition as ἐν--, ἐγ-- and even ἐκ--, as ἐκκόπην. On ἔνπροσθεν in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., p. 45.

[2] Prol. etc., p. 73 f. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 91-97, for the history of this subject during various stages of the language.

[3] Cf. Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 98, 124

[4] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 66 note.

[5] Cf. ib., p. 58 note, for further discussion.

[6] Prol., p. 45. Cf. also Thumb, Theol. Literaturzeit., XXVIII, p. 422.

[7] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., pp. 99 f.

[8] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 125; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 94. In the pap. ἄρρην "greatly preponderates over. ἄρσην" (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 33). Cf. also Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 44 f. Thumb, Hellen., p. 77 f.

θαρρεῖν is the correct text. ζ displaces σ in a few words. Voiced σ in union with voiced consonants had the sound of z, and ζ was pronounced σδ.[1] Ἄζωτος (Ac. 8:40) אַשְׁדּוֹד, Ashdod. Lagarde's LXX has Ἀσεδδώδ in Josh. 11:22 (A has Ἀσηδώδ, B Ἀσελδώ). עֶזְרָא is rendered also Ἔζρας or Ἔσδρας. But in the N. T. period ζ is changing from the *ds* sound to *z*. Ἁρμόζω, not the Attic ἁρμόττω, is the N. T. form.[2] Lachmann has μαζός for μαστός in Rev. 1:13. In 1 Th. 5:19 BDFG (Western class) read ζβέννυτε,[3] simply phonetic spelling. Hort[4] considers Ζμύρνα as Western only in Rev. 1:11; 2:8, but the papyri and inscriptions both give it.[5] The most noticeable feature of all is, however, that the Attic and Boeotian ττ did not hold against the Ionic σσ (though even Thucydides and the Tragic poets used σσ). Papyri, inscriptions and N. T. MSS. all unite in using σσ as the rule, though all occasionally have ττ. It does not seem possible to reduce the usage to an intelligent rule.[6] Ἐκπληττόμενος is accepted by W. H. in Ac. 13:12, elsewhere σσ. Both ἐλάσσων (Jo. 2:10; Ro. 9:12) and ἐλάττων (1 Tim. 5:9; Heb. 7:7) are found, but only the "literary" (so Blass) words ἐλαττόω (Jo. 3: 30; Heb. 2:7, 9) and ἐλαττονέω (2 Cor. 8:15). Similar diversity exists between ἧσσον (1 Cor. 11:17; 2 Cor. 12:15) and ἡσσώθητε (2 Cor. 12:13) on the one hand and ἥττημα (1 Cor. 6 : 7; Ro. 11:12) and ἡττᾶσθαι (2 Pet. 2:19 f.) on the other. In Heb. 6:9; 10:34 W. H. read κρείσσονα, elsewhere κρείττονα (Heb. 1 : 4; 7: 7, 19, 22; 8: 6; 9:23; 11:16, 35, 40; 12:24), and Hebrews has some literary influence, an argument for Blass' idea above. Paul has κρεῖττον only in 1 Cor. 7:9, while κρεῖσσον is found in 1 Cor. 7:38; 11:17; Ph. 1:23. Hort accepts κρεῖττον in 1 Pet. 3:17

[1] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 113, 115. On the whole subject of the exchange of consonants in the pap. see Mayser, Gr., pp. 169-188, 219-224. For the LXX exx. (**οὐδέν, οὐθέν;** γλῶσσα, γλῶττα; **φυλάσσω, φυλάττω; ἐλάσσων, ἐλάττων; ἄρρην,** θαρρῶ), etc.) see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 17-20; Thack., Gr., pp. 100-124.

[2] Cf. Rutherford, New Phyrn., p. 14.

[3] Cf. ἄζβεστος in N (Mk. 9:43), ἐγνωζμένος, etc., in pap. (W.-Sch., p. 59).

[4] Notes on Orth., p. 148.

[5] Deiss., B. S., p. 185. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 45; Dittenb., 458. 41, iv **Ζμύρνῃ**.

[6] Cf. Thumb, Hellen., pp. 53, 78 ff.; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 125; Nachm., Magn. etc., p. 95 f.; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 32; Prol., p. 45; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 23; Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 148; Reinhold, De Grace. etc., p. 43 f. Giles (Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 115) thinks that the σσ in Athens was a literary mannerism and pronounced just like ττ.

and 2 Pet. 2:21 (doubtful). Cf. σήμερον for the Attic τήμερον. **Ὄρνιξ** (Lu. 13:34) is called Western by Hort, though Moulton,[1] observes that it has some papyrus support and is like the modern Greek (Cappadocian) ὀρνίχ.

(g) ASPIRATION OF CONSONANTS. There is besides some fluctuation in the aspiration of consonants. See under (d) for the double aspirates like **Ἀφφία**, etc. This uncertainty of aspiration is very old and very common in the inscriptions and papyri,[2] though the N. T. has only a few specimens. W. H. read **Ἁκελδαμάχ** in Ac. 1:19, חֲקַל דְּמָא. So ῥακά (Mt. 5:22), רֵיקָא but σαβαχθανεί (B has -κτ-) in Mt. 27:46. Γεννησαρέτ is correct; the Syrian class has –έθ in Mt. 14:34. W. H. have uniformly **Καφαρναούμ**, and read **Ν**αζαρέτ save in four passages, **Ν**αζαρέθ in Mt. 21:11; Ac. 10:38, and **Ν**αζαρά in Mt. 4:13; Lu. 4:16. In Lu. 11:27; 23:29 DFG have **μασθοι** for **μαστοί**, likewise **א** in Rev. 1:13. **Ἐθύθη** is read by cursives, Clem., Or., etc., in 1 Cor. 5:7. In **οὐθείς** and **μηθείς** after elision of ε the δ has blended with the εἷς as if it were τ and become θ. It is first found in an inscr. 378 B.C. and is the usual form in the pap. in iii/B.C. and first half of ii/B.C. By i/A.D. the δ forms are supreme again (Thack., *Gr.*, pp. 58 ff). Blass[3] finds **οὐθενός** in Lu. 22:35 (ABQT); 2 Cor. 11:8 (**א**BMP); **οὐθέν**, in Lu. 23:14 (**א**BT); Ac. 15:9 (BHLP); 19:27 (**א**ABHP); 26:26 (**א**B); 1 Cor. 13:2 (**א**ABCL); **μηθέν** in Ac. 27:33 (**א**AB). But **ἐξουθενέω** in the LXX and the N. T. prevails, though W. H. (after BD) read **ἐξουδενηθῇ** in Mk. 9:12. **א** and **א**D read the Attic **πανδοκεῖον**, **-εύς** in Lu. 10:34 f., but W. H. accept **πανδοχεῖον, ---εύς** (from δέχομαι). **Σάρεπτα** in Lu. 4:26 is the LXX rendering of **צָרְפַּת**. **Τ**ροποφορέω and **τροφοφορέω** are two distinct words, though the MSS. differ widely in Ac. 13:18, the Neutral and Western supporting **τροπ-** Hort considers **σφυρίς** for **σπυρίς** right (Mt. 15:37, etc.). It is well attested by the papyri.[4] W. H. read **φόβηθρον**, not **φοβητρον**, in Lu. 21:11.

(h) VARIABLE FINAL CONSONANTS. The use of **ν ἐφελκυστικόν** (paragogic ν) cannot be reduced to any clear rule. The desire to avoid hiatus extended this usage, though it probably originally had a meaning and was extended by analogy to cases where it had none. Cf. English articles *a, an* (Giles, *Man. of Comp. Philol.*, p. 208).

[1] Prol., p. 45. Cf. Thumb, Hellen., p. 90. [2] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 59..

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 24; W.-Sch., p. 61. Cf. Meisterh., p. 48, for this interaspiration in the old Attic inscr. Cf. Mayser, pp. 180

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 45. The Ptol. pap. have both spellings, Deiss., B. S., p. 185. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 173.

The same thing is true of movable final ς. In the old Attic before 403 B.C. this movable ν was seldom used. It is more frequent in the new Attic up to 336 B.C., and most common in the κοινή, vanishing again in the modern Greek, as ν easily disappears in pronunciation. Meisterhans[1] has an interesting table on the subject, showing the relative frequency in different centuries. This table proves that in the κοινή it came to be the rule to use the movable ν both before consonants and vowels. This is shown also by the inscriptions[2] and the Ptolemaic papyri. *Per contra* note the disappearance of final ν in modern Greek vernacular, when not pronounced (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 24 ff.). However, as a rule, this movable final ν occurs only with the same classes of words as in the Attic as after –σι, εστί and ε in verbs (3d sing. past tenses). The irrational ν mentioned as common later by Hatzidakis[3] is rare. The older N. T. MSS. (אABC) are in harmony with the κοινή and have the movable ν and ς both before consonants and vowels with a few exceptions. The later N. T. MSS. seem to feel the tendency to drop these variable consonants. Moulton[4] mentions μείζων (Jo. 5:36) as a good example of the irrational ν in N. T. MSS. (ABEGMA). Cf. also the irrational ν with the subjunctive in the papyri. So ἐὰν ἦν ἄρσενον P. Oxy. 744 (i/B.C.) for ᾖ. See Moulton, *Prol*., pp. 168, 187, for further examples. The failure to use this ν was originally most common in pause, sometimes even before vowels.[5] Blass[6] observes that it was only the Byzantine grammarians who made the rule that this ν should be used before vowels and not before consonants, a rule of which their predecessors did not have the benefit, a thing true of many other grammatical rules. We moderns can teach the ancients much Greek! Since the N. T. MSS.[7] show no knowledge of this later grammatical "rule," W. H. follow a mechanical one indeed,

[1] Att. Inschr., p. 114.

[2] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 137, whose. table confirms that of Meisterh. Cf. also Thieme, Inschr. von Magn., p. 8; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 110, with similar table. The pap. agree, Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 137, and Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 236 ff. In the LXX ν ἐφελκ. occurs before consonants also. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 22 ff.; Thack., Gr., pp. 134 ff. So as to movable ς. Cf. μέχρι ὑμῶν and μέχρις οὗ in LXX.

[3] Einl. etc., p. 111, like ἱστορήθην ὁ ναός. Cf. Schweiz., Perg. Inschr., p. 137.

[4] Prol., p. 49. Cf. also Reinhold, De Graec., p. 37.

[5] W.--Sch., p. 62. [6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19.

[7] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 147 f.; Gregory, Prol., p. 97 f. In simple truth ν movable was not so uniform in the earlier Gk. (esp. Thuc.) as the grammars imply. Cf. Maasson, De littera v Graec. parag., 1881, pp. 47, 61.

but the only practical guide under the circumstances. They go by the testimony of the oldest uncials. Hort gives a considerable list of examples where the ν is wanting in one or more of the older uncials, but where W. H. have ν, as in ἀροῦσιν (Mt. 4:6), πᾶσιν (Mt. 5:15), etc. But in Lu. 1:3 ἔδοξε is read by ℵBCD. In Ac. 24:27 κατέλιπε is supported by ℵB. There are about a dozen more instances in Hort's long list of alternative readings where W. H. prefer the form without ν, rather more frequently after at, than after ε.[1] W. H., however, have εἴκοσι everywhere, as was usually the case in the Attic inscriptions and always in the Ptolemaic papyri and the LXX MSS. both before vowels and consonants.[2] So ἔμπροσθεν, ἔξωθεν, ὄπισθεν in the N. T. Likewise πέρυσι is correct in 2 Cor. 8:10; 9:2.[3]

The variables calls for a few words more. All good MSS. give ἄντικρυς **Χίου** in Ac. 20:15.[4] But as in Attic, the N. T. MSS. usually have ἄχρι and μέχρι even before vowels. **Ἄ**χρι (always before consonants) thus precedes vowels some fifteen times, and once only do we certainly[5] have ἄχρις (Gal. 3:19), though it is uncertain whether it is followed by ἄν or οὗ. **Μ**έχρι is always used in the N. T. before a consonant and once before a vowel, μέχρι **Ἰ**ωάνου (Lu. 16:16). The early N. T. editors used to print οὕτω before consonants and οὕτως before vowels, but W. H. print οὕτως 196 times before consonants and vowels and only ten times οὕτω (all before consonants). These ten instances are Mk. 2:7; Mt. 3:15; 7:17; Ac. 13:47; 23:11; Ro. 1:15; 6:19; Ph. 3:17; Heb. 12:21; Rev. 16:18.[6]

(i) METATHESIS. Φαιλόνης (2 Tim. 4:13), Latin *paenula*. See Additional Notes.

IV. Breathings.

(a) ORIGIN OF THE ASPIRATE. As is well known, in the modern Greek no distinction is made in pronunciation between *spiritus asper and spiritus lenis*, or πνεῦμα δασύ and πνεῦμα ψιλόν. That

[1] See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19; Gregory, Prol., p. 97.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 328, and references there given. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 135.

[3] Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 19) quotes Attic usage for πέρυσιν before vowels.

[4] For the Hom. ἄντικρυ and further items see W.-Sch., p. 63 and note. **Ἄ**ντικρυς (καταντικρύ) in Attic is 'downright,' not 'over against' (Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 20). Cf. for the pap. Mayser, Gr., pp. 242 ff.

[5] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 148. But W. H. read ἄχρις οὗ in Heb. 3:13, elsewhere ἄχρι οὗ. For further discussions of ἄχρι and μέχρι see W.-Sch., p. 63 note.

[6] For illustrations from the κοινή inscr. see Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 112. Cf. Reinhold, p. 37 f.

is to say, the "rough" breathing is only a conventional sign used in writing. This sign is indeed a comparatively modern device, 'and', in use in the MSS. generally since the eleventh century A.D.[1] This form was an evolution from H (Phoenician □, *he*), then ├ and ┤, then ∟ and ⌋.[2] This breathing (rough or smooth) did not find a place in the Greek alphabet, and so is not found in the early uncial MSS. It becomes therefore a difficult question to tell whether the modern ignoring of the rough breathing was the rule in the first century A.D. The MSS., as Hort[3] points out, are practically worthless on this point. The original use of H as equal to *h* or the rough breathing was general in the old Attic and the Doric, not the AEolic and Ionic. And even in the Attic inscriptions the usage is very irregular and uncertain. Numerous examples like HEKATON occur, but some like HEN also, so that even H was not always rough.[4] The modern English cockneys have no monopoly of trouble with h's. In French h is silent as *l'homme.* The Greeks always found the matter a knotty problem. The use of H=η in the Ionic and Attic (after 403 B.C.) left the Greeks without a literary sign for h. The inscriptions show that in the vernacular H continued to be so used for some time.

(b) INCREASING DE-ASPIRATION (*Psilosis*). But there was a steady decrease in the use of the h sound. The Ionic, like the AEolic, was distinguished by psilosis, and the **κοινή** largely[5] followed the Ionic in this respect. More certain is the use of the aspirated consonants **χ, θ, φ**, which succeeded the older KH, TH, **Π**H.[6] But certainly the rough breathing was in early use as the

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 63. The marking of the rough breathing was general in the earlier forms in vii/A.D., ib., p. 65.

[2] Cf. Bekker, Anec., II. 692, and Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 63.

[3] Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 310. Cf. also Sitterley, Praxis in MSS. of the Gk. Test., 1898, p. 32. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 25 f., for remarks on breathings in the LXX MSS., where Aolic and Ionic psilosis occur in **ἐπ᾽ ὁδοῦ κατ᾽ ἕνα** as well as exx. of aspirated consonants like **καθ᾽ ὀφθαλμούς, καθ᾽ ἑνιαυτόν, ἐφ᾽ εἶδεν**, not to mention **οὐκ ἑωράκασιν** and **οὐχ ἰδού**. For further remarks on breathings in the LXX see Swete, 0. T. in Gk., p. 302.

[4] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 81, 91. The stop for the opening of the glottis (lenis) easily becomes breathed (rough). Cf. also Thumb, Unters. uber d. Spir. Asper. im Griech., 1888, p. 63.

[5] Cf. Thumb., p. 73 f. The Laconic Gk. used H in interaspiration as well as at the beginning (ib., p. 8). Dawes (Pronun. of the Gk. Aspirates, 1894, p. 103) is not able to reach a final decision as to whether the Gk. aspirates are genuine aspirates like the Sans. according to Brugmann, Curtius, etc.

[6] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 91. On the whole subject of the aspirated

inscriptions show, though not with much consistency.[1] Sometimes the rough breathing may be due to the disappearance of a digamma, though sometimes a smooth breathing displaces it, as ἔργον from *F*έργον[2] (cf. English 'work'). Then again the disappearance of σ has the same result, as ἰσαρός=ἱερός.[3] It is not strange therefore that usage in the κοινή is not uniform. Examples like ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ὑφ᾽ αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἐωρῶμεν, etc., appear in the Pergamum inscriptions, not to mention καθ᾽ ἔτος, καθ᾽ ἰδίαν, etc.[4] The same story of uncertainty is told elsewhere in the κοινή as in Magnesia,[5] Herculaneum.[6] Some of this variation is probably due to analogy,[7] so that though "de-aspiration was the prevailing tendency,"[8] yet the N. T. shows several examples in the opposite direction.

(c) VARIATIONS IN THE MSS. (*Aspiration and Psilosis*). The aspiration of the consonants κ, π, τ in case of elision is therefore a matter of documentary evidence[9] and occurs in the case of ἀντί, ἐπί, κατά, μετά, οὐκ, ὑπό. The N. T. MSS. vary considerably among themselves as in the LXX, though some like D in the Gospels and Acts are wholly untrustworthy about aspiration.[10] In general Attic literary usage cannot be assumed to be the κοινή vernacular. Hort[11] prefers Ἀδραμυντηνός (Ac. 27:2) like Hadrumetum. Ἀλοάω (1 Cor. 9:9 f.; 1 Tim. 5:18) is connected with ἅλως or ἀλωή and may be compared with ἀπηλιώτης (ἥλιος).[12] Hort (p. 144) prefers avats (Mk. 5:3), but εἰλικρινής and εἰλικρινία, though εἰλ. has ancient authority. Ἀφελπίζοντες is read by DP in Lu. 6:35 and the LXX has several similar instances,[13] not to mention one

consonants see Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., pp. 194 ff., and for the dialects and interaspiration see K.-B1., Bd. I, pp. 107-114.

[1] Cecil Bendall, Jour. of Philol., 1904, pp. 199 ff.

[2] R. Weiss, De Dig. etc., 1889, p. 47. Cf. also Paues, De Dig. Hesiodes Quest., 1887, p. 48.

[3] Cf. Sommer, Griech. Lautstudien, 1905, p. 2. On metathesis in aspiration, as ἔχω (ἔχω), see Meisterh., p. 102, exx. of ἔχω in Attic inscr. v/B.C. See also article by Pernot in Rev. des Et. Grq., 1906, pp. 10-23, on La Metathese dans les Dial. de Chio.

[4] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr. etc., pp. 116 ff. The Attic had only ἴδιος, but (Meisterh., p. 87).

[5] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 83.

[6] Cronert, Mem. Graec. Hercul., p. 152 f.

[7] Thumb, Hellen. etc., p. 64.

[8] Moulton, Prol., p. 44. Cf. also for the inscr., Dittenb., ἐφ᾽ ἕτος (458. 71), καθ᾽ ἰδίαν (233. 49), and for the pap., Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901 (pp. 33, 434) and 1904 (p. 106). Cf. also Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 312.

[9] Ib., p. 311.

[10] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15.

[11] Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 313; App., p. 160.

[12] W.-Sch., p. 40.

[13] Gregory, Prol., p. 91; Thack., p. 125.

in Hermas and in the Attic.[1] In Ro. 8:20 W. H. accept ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι, while various MSS. support it in Ac. 2:26; 1 Cor. 9:10; Ro. 4:18; 5:2; Tit. 1:2, and FG have καθ᾽ ἐλπίδα in Tit. 3:7. Hort[2] thinks this is due to digamma dropped as well as in the case of ἀφίδω (Ph. 2:23), but analogy to acpopav may be the explanation.[3] **Ἔφοδε** is read by a few MSS. in Ac. 4:29 as ἐφῖδεν in Lu. 1:25. Gregory[4] gives many examples of **ἀφ--, ἐφ--, καθ--** with ἐλπίζω and εἶδον in the LXX. W. H. offer **οὐχ ἰδού** as an alternative reading in Ac. 2:7, while B reads **οὐχ ἰδόντες** in 1 Pet. 1:8 and **οὐχ εἶδον** in Gal. 1:19. A has **οὐχ ὄψεσθε** in Lu. 17:22. W. H.[5] put **οὐχ ῾Ιουδαϊκῶς** in the margin in Gal. 2:14. **Καθ᾽ ἰδίαν** appears in **א** once, in B eight times, in D three times, in **Δ** once (Mt. 14:23; 17: 1, 19; 20:17; 24:3; Mk. 4:34; 6:31; 9:28; 13:3). But W. H. nowhere accept it, not even when B combines with **א** or D. **א**B have it in Mt. 24:3. The form καθ᾽ ἰδίαν is common in the κοινή inscriptions and the papyri. **Καθείδωλον** is read by M in Ac. 17:16. On the other hand καθ᾽ ἔτος, so common in the κοινή (cf. Latin *vetus*), is not found in the N. T., all MSS. in Lu. 2:41 reading κατ᾽ ἔτος. Hort[6] considers **οὐκ ἔστηκεν** (Jo. 8:44) to be merely the imperfect indicative of στήκω. So also as to ἔστηκεν in Rev. 12:4. **א** has ἐφιορκήσεις in Mt. 5:33, a form common in the Doric inscriptions.[7] DP have ἐφίορκος in 1 Tim. 1:10. In Rev. 12:11 A reads **οὐχ ἠγάπησεν**, while **οὐχ ὀλίγος** is read in the LXX and papyri as well as a number of times in Ac. (12:18 by **א**A, 14:28 by **א**, 17:4 by B, 19:23 by **א**AD, 19:24 by **א**, 27:20 by A). In Ac. 5:28 D has ἐφαγαγεῖν. W. H. print on the other hand ἀποκατιστάνει in Mk. 9:12 rather than ἀποκαταστάνει though with hesitation.[8] So likewise W. H. give ἐπίσταται instead of ἐφίσταται

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 16. Cf. Thumb, Unters. d. Spir. Asper, p. 65.

[2] Notes on Orth., p. 143.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 44; Thumb, Spir. Asper, p. 71. Moulton (Cl. Rev., Mar., 1910, p. 53) now says: "I am quite willing to be convinced that the long-lost digamma was an accessory here if no better explanation turns up." Thumb (Spir. Asper, pp. 11, 71) admits the possibility of the digamma explanation in some cases.

[4] Prol., p. 91.

[5] Cf. Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 313 f., where Hort really favours **οὐχ ῾Ιουδ.** and the rough breathing for all the forms of **᾽Ιούδας, ᾽Ιουδαῖος**, etc. For the variations in the LXX MSS. see Thack., p. 125.

[6] Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 312.

[7] Rutherford, New Phryn., p. 363. For this transfer of aspiration cf. Curtius, Gk. Verb, II, 109. Nestle (Am. Jour. of Theol., July, 1909, p. 44S) urges that, since the Gk. of the Bible is an "east-west language," attention must be paid to oriental tongues. He notes that the Coptic has aspiration in *helpis, hisos*, for **ἐλπίς, ἴσος**.

[8] Notes on Orth., p. 168.

in 1 Th. 5:3 (like B in Sap. 6:8), a wholly unusual' absence of aspiration in compounds of ἵστημι. For the LXX phenomena see Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 127 f. It is wholly doubtful whether **ὀμείρομαι** or **ὁμείρομαι** is right (1 Th. 2:8). **Οὐκ εὗρον** in some MSS. in Lu. 24:3, and **οὐκ ἕνεκεν** in 2 Cor. 7:12, Blass[2] considers as clerical errors, though they are common in the LXX and in the inscriptions.[3] N. T. MSS. (late cursives) even have **αἰτέω, ὀστεών**, **ὄχλος**, etc. For **μηθείς, οὐθείς** see this chapter p. 219, the Interchange of Consonants and chapter on Pronouns, pp. 750 f.

(d) TRANSLITERATED SEMITIC WORDS. The aspirate in the case of transliterated Semitic words (chiefly proper names) causes some difficulty. Blass[4] calls it "insoluble," though he accepts Hort's practice as rational,[5] expressing **א** and **ע** by the smooth breathing and **ה** and **ח** by the rough breathing. The MSS. disagree and are not consistent, but Blass calls the result of this procedure "strange." Hence Hort argues for **Ἄβελ** (ה) , **Ἀβραάμ** (**א**), **Ἄγαβος** (**ע**), **Ἄγαρ** (ה), **Ἀκελδαμάχ** (ח), **ἀλληλούϊα** (ה), **Ἀλφαῖος** (ח), **Ἀνανίας** (ה), **Ἄννα** (ח), **Ἀρέτας** (ח), **Ἀριμαθαία** (ה), **Ἄρ Μαγεδών** (ה), **Ἐβέρ** (**ע**), **Ἑβραῖος** (**ע**), **Ἑβραΐς** (**ע**), **Ἑβραϊστί** (**ע**),[6] **Ἐλισαῖος** (**ע**), **Ἐλμαδάμ** (**א**), **ἐλωΐ** (**א**), **Ἐμμώρ** (ח), **Ἐνώχ** (ח, but **Ἐνώς**, **א**), **Ἐρρώμ** (ה, but **Ἐσλεί**, **א**), **Εὔα** (ח), **ἠλεί** (**א**), but **Ἠλεί** (ה), **Ἠλείας** (**א**), **Ἤρ** (**ע**), **ὕσσωπος** (**א**),[7] **ὡσαννά** (ה), **Ὡσηέ** (ה). Hort[8] gives, moreover, the smooth breathing to all names beginning with as י as **Ἡσαίας**. Besides he considers it a "false association"[9] to connect **Ἱερεμίας**, **Ἰεριειχώ, Ἱεροσόλυμα (--μείτης), Ἰερουσαλήμ** with **ἱερός**, though Blass retains **Ἱεροσόλυμα** rather inconsistently.[10]

(e) THE USE OF BREATHINGS WITH ρ AND ρρ. W. H. follow Tischendorf and Lachmann in dropping the breathings in ρρ as in **ἄρρητα** (2 Cor. 12:4), though retaining the rough breathing with initial ρ as in **ῥήματα** (Ib.). Winer[11] argued that the Romans heard an aspiration with ρρ, since they used *Pyrrhus, Tyrrhenus*, etc. W. H. seem justified in using the smooth breathing with the first ρ in the word **ῥεραντισμένοι**. (Heb. 10:22) by old Greek cus-

[1] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 144.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 16.
[3] W.-Sch., p. 39.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 16. Hort, Intr. to N. T. Gk., p. 313. Cf. also Gregory, Prol., p. 106 f., for list of these words.
[5] Strange as it may seem, "Hebrew" rather than "Ebrew" is modern (Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 313).
[6] Hort (Notes, etc., p. 144), however, merely follows custom and prints **ὕσσ.**
[7] Intr. to N. T. Gk., p. 313.
[8] Ib.
[9] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 16. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 30 f.
[10] W.-M., p. 53.

tom.[1] The MSS., of course, give no help in the matter. The breathing with ρ is not written in the modern Greek vernacular text as in Pallis or Thumb.

(f) THE QUESTION OF **Αὐτοῦ**. This is somewhat knotty. It seems clear that as a rule **αὐτοῦ** and not **αὐτοῦ** is to be printed in the N. T. A number of reasons converge[2] on this point. The older Greek often used **αὐτοῦ** rather than **ἑαυτοῦ** as shown by the aspiration of the prepositions like **ἀφ' αὐτοῦ**, etc. In the N. T. there is not a single case of such aspiration after elision save in a few single MSS. Add to this the fact that the N. T. uses the reflexive pronoun much less than the earlier Greek, "with unusual parsimony" (Hort). Besides the personal pronouns of the first and second persons are frequently employed (Buttmann) where the reflexive might have been used. Buttmann urges also the point that in the N. T. we always have **σεαυτοῦ**, not **σαυτοῦ**. The earliest uncial MSS. of the N. T. and the LXX that use the diacritical marks belong to the eighth century, but they all have **αὐτοῦ**, not **αὐτοῦ**. Even in the early times it was largely a matter of individual taste as to whether the personal or the reflexive pronoun was used. Blass (p. 35) indeed decides absolutely against **αὐτοῦ.** But the matter is not quite so easy, for the Kotin' inscriptions give examples of **ὑφ αὐτοῦ** in first century B.C. and A.D.[3] Mayser[4] also gives a number of papyri examples like **καθ' αὐτοῦ μεθ' αὐτοῦ, ὑφ' αὐτῶν**, where the matter is beyond dispute. Hort agrees with Winer in thinking that sometimes **αὐτοῦ** must be read unless one insists on undue harshness in the Greek idiom. He instances Jo. 2:24, **αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευσεν ἀυτὸν αὐτοῖς,** and Lu. 23:12, **προϋπῆρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς αὐτούς**. There are other examples where a different meaning will result from the smooth and the rough breathing as in 1 Jo. 5:10 (**αὐτῷ**), 18 (**αὐτόν αὐτοῦ**, Eph. 1:5 (**αὐτόν**), 10 (**αὐτῷ**), Col. 1:20 (**αὐτόν**), 2:15 (**αὐτῷ**). W. H. print **αὐτοῦ** about twenty times. Winer leaves the matter "to the cautious judgment of the editors."

V. **Accent.**

(a) THE AGE OF GREEK ACCENT. The MSS. are worth as little for accent as for breathings. The systematic application of accent in the MSS., like the regular use of the *spiritus lenis*, dates

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 40 f.

[2] On the whole matter see Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 144 f.; W.-M., p. 188 f.; Buttmann, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 111; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 35.

[3] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., pp. 84, 144; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 161.

[4] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 306.

from the seventh century A.D.[1] Hort[2] caustically remarks that most modern grammarians have merely worked out "a consistent system of accentuation on paper " and have not recovered the Greek intonations of voice, though he has little to offer on the subject. Chandler[3] indeed laments that modern scholars scatter their Greek accents about rather recklessly, but he adds: "In England, at all events, every man will accent his Greek properly who wishes to stand well with the world." It is a comfort to find one's accents irreproachable, and Chandler rightly urges that the only way to use the accents properly is to pronounce according to the accent. The ancients were interested in Greek accent. Herodian in his **Καθολικὴ προσῳδία** investigated the accent of 60,000 words, but the bulk of his twenty books is lost. Chandler[4] found most help from Gottling, though others have written at length on the subject.[5] There are no accent-marks in the early inscriptions and papyri; in fact tradition ascribes the invention of these signs as a system to Aristophanes of Byzantium in the third century B.C., though the beginnings appear in the preceding century.[6] He and his disciple, Aristarchus, made the rules at any rate.[7] The Alexandrian grammarians developed these rules, which have shown a marvellous tenacity even to the present day in the modern Greek, though, of course, some words would naturally vary in accent with the centuries.[8] There is the Harris papyrus of Homer in the first century A.D. which has accents, and clearly the word had the accent in pronunciation like English long before it was written out. After the fourth century A.D. the use of accentual rhythm in Greek in place of quantitative rhythm had a tendency

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 66. Cf. also pp. 507 ff. on the Origin and History of Accent.

[2] Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 314.

[3] Gk. Accentuation (1881), p. xxiii. [4] Ib., p. xvii.

[5] Cf. Meister, Bemerk. zur dorischen Accentuation (1883); Hadley, On the Nat. and Theory of the Gk. Accent. (Ess. Phil. and Crit., pp. 110 ff.); Wheeler, Die griech. Nominalaccente (1885); Bloomfield, Study of Gk. Accent (Am. Jour. of Philol., 1883); Wack., Beitr. zur Lehre vom griech. Akzent; Brugmann, Griech. Gr. (1900), pp. 150 ff.; K.-B1., I, pp. 317 ff.; for further lit. see Brugmann above. On accent changes in mod. Gk. see Hatz., Einl., pp. 418-440; Thumb, Handb., p. 28 f. For the accent in the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 24. Here the same MSS. present the same problems that we have in the N. T.

[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 62. [7] Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 77.

[8] Krumb., Beitr. zu einer Gesch. der griech. Spr., Kuhn's Zeitschr. fur Sprachl., 1885, p. 521. Cf. also Hats., Einl. etc., p. 418; Chandler, Gk. Accentuation, p. v; Brugmann, Griech, Gr., p. 150.

to make the accent rather more stable.[1] "Of all the phonetic peculiarities of a language accent is the most important."[2] The earlier use of accents and breathings was probably "for the text of poetry written in dialect"[3] (cf. our reading-books for children). They were not written out "in ordinary prose till the times of minuscule writing," though Euthalius (A.D. 396) made use of them in his edition of the N. T.[4] The Christian hymns early show signs of changing from tone (pitch) to stress as is the rule in modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 6.

(b) SIGNIFICANCE OF ACCENT IN THE **Κοινή**. In Greek it is pitch, not stress, that is expressed by the accent, though in modern Greek the accents indicate stress. "In the ancient Sanskrit and the ancient Greek the rise and fall in musical tone was very marked."[5] In English we are familiar with stress-accent. "Hadley has ably argued that the compass of tone used by the Greeks was a musical fifth, i.e. from C= do to G= sol, involving also the intermediate third or E= me."[6] It was not a stronger current of breath,[7] but a higher musical note that we have. It was in a word "das musikalische Moment."[8] Hadley ("Nature and Theory of Gk. Accent," Essays Philol. and Crit., p. 111 f.) points out that προσῳδία comes from a root meaning 'to sing' (like the Latin *accentus*) and so ὀξύς and βαρύς answer to our high and low pitch. Giles[9] thinks that in the original Indo-Germanic language pitch and stress-accent were more evenly balanced. The accent singles out one syllable sharply and raises it higher than the rest, though as a matter of fact each syllable in a word has an accent or pitch lower down in the scale: Cf. the secondary accent in the English "incompatibility." The Harris papyrus of Homer even accents every syllable in each word.[10] Then again "the accent of a sentence is as much under the influence of a law of some kind as the accent of the word."[11] Language without accent or musical va-

[1] Sophocles, Lex. of Rom. and Byz. Period, p. 48.

[2] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 91. [3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 14.

[4] Ib. Cf. Gregory, Prol., p. 114, for specimen from Euthalius.

[5] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 92.

[6] Harris, MS. Notes on Gk. Gr. Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 77 f., for a discussion of the musical aspect of the matter.

[7] Arnold and Conway, The Restored Pronun. of Gk. and Lat., 1895, p. 18.

[8] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 129. 9 Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 94.

[10] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 65.

[11] Bloomfield, Study of Gk. Accent, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1883, p. 22. Cf. Plato, Crat., 399 A–B. Hirt (Der Indoger. Akzent, 1895, p. 17) contends for the two-tone principle.

riety in tone would be hopelessly monotonous and ineffective. An instance of the importance of accent and breathings is seen in **οὗ οὐ,** Ac. 19:40.

(c) SIGNS OF ACCENT. In practical usage (in our school grammars) there is only one distinction, the accented syllable and the unaccented syllables. The Greeks themselves distinguished the pronunciation of the acute and the circumflex. The difference is well illustrated by **εἶμι** and **εἰμί**. The three signs (acute or ὀξεῖα, grave or βαρεῖα, circumflex or περισπωμένη) come to symbolize the higher pitch of the accented syllable.[1] Originally the accented syllable was marked by the acute and all the unaccented syllables by the grave (merely the absence of the acute), but by and by this use of the grave accent was felt to be useless and was dropped.[2] Then the grave accentual mark of falling inflection was used for the acute when an oxytone word comes before another word (not enclitic), though this "grave" accent has the pitch of the unaccented syllable. Similarly in contraction of two syllables with acute and grave (´ `) arose the circumflex, the grave and the acute making acute still. The actual use in pronunciation of both acute and grave in the contracted syllable disappeared, so that the circumflex in pitch differed little, if any, from the acute. The difference, for instance, between the acute in δηλώσαι, and the circumflex in δηλῶσαι at was not perceptible in sound.[3] The Greek and the Latin agree in having the accent only on one of the three last syllables and thus differ from English and French for instance. It is not necessary here to go into the rules (not wholly arbitrary) which the Greeks developed for the accent of words. In the use of unaccented words (proclitics or enclitics) Greek does not differ radically from English. If the Greek has **ἐν οἴκῳ**, the English has "at-home." If the Greek has **εἰπέ μοι**, the English has "tell-me."[4]

(d) LATER DEVELOPMENTS IN ACCENT. There was not indeed uniformity among the dialects in the use of accent. They agreed only in the one point of not accenting further back than the third syllable from the end. "In other respects the Greek dialects show the widest divergencies in their accentuation. The two antipodes are AEolic and Doric, which are so closely allied phonetically: AEolic throws the accent as far back as possible in

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 66. [2] Ib., pp. 65, 68.

[3] Hadley, Uber Wesen and Theorie der griech. Beton., 1872, pp. 409, 415.

[4] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 96. Giles thinks that words like **ἐφερόμεθα** originally had the accent further back. Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 80, for Plato's word of 17 syllables and Aristophanes' word of 78.

all words, e.g. βασίλευς=βασιλεύς, . . .; Doric, on the contrary, faithfully preserves the original oxytone accent. Between these two dialects lie Ionic and Attic, which, however, are much nearer to Doric than to AEolic. But all the dialects, including Doric, observe the rule that, in those forms of the verb which are capable of being conjugated, the accent goes back as far as possible."[1] AEolic, for instance, has ἦ σθα where the Attic has ἦ σθά. But all the dialects[2] have ἐγώ, ἔγωγε. On this point in general see Kuhner-Blass, I, pp. 323 ff. The Dorians even had ἀνθρώποι, ἐλύσαν, etc. Perfect uniformity was no more possible in Greek than in English. The modern Greek preserves the three-syllable accent rule. Examples like ἔπιασε, ἐβράδυασε are not exceptions, since the ι and υ count as consonants. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 28. French follows tone like the ancient Greek. *Pecheur* is 'fisher,' while *pecheur* is 'sinner,' for example, a difference only in quality, not in accent.

(e) N. T. PECULIARITIES. Where so much is in doubt, excessive refinement is certainly not desirable. But the following points call for remark, and Gregory[3] can be consulted for the actual evidence (very slight) from the N. T. MSS. on the subject of accent. D alone among the older uncials has the accent (and that the occasional circumflex) save by the hand of a corrector.

1. *Shortening Stem-Vowels*. There is quite a tendency in the κοινή towards shortening some of the stem-vowels, especially in words in --μα. Hence W. H. do not follow the Attic accent here, but that of the κοινή, and give us κλίμα, κρίμα, μίγμα (cf. ἔλιγμα), πόμα, χρίσμα, though as to χρίσμα Blass[4] suggests that χρῖσμα is correct because of χριστός and because B (1 Jo. 2:20, 27) has χρεῖσμα. Analogy plays havoc with rules. Herodian[5] says that ι and υ were usually shortened before So W. H. give us κῆρυξ, κηρύξαι, στηρίξαι (Ro. 16:25), probably φοῖνιξ, χοῖνιξ. According to Winer-Schmiedel[6] this rule applies to ψ also, but W. H. and Blass[7] do not agree. So W. H. have θλίψις, ῥίψαν (Lu.

[1] Henry, Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., Elliott's transl., 1890, p. 93 f. Cf. Meister, Bemerk. zur dorischen Accentuation, p. 1.

[2] Cf. Wheeler, Griech. Nom. etc., p. 11, and Wack., Beitr., p. 19.

[3] Prol., p. 99 f.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 67, for further parallels. Also W.-M., p. 57. [5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15. [6] P. 68.

[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15. Blass urges that B has θλεῖψις, but W. H. refuse to follow B in matters of orthography. But the Herculaneum rolls here reinforce B with ει before ψ. On the whole subject see Lipsius, Gr. Unters., pp. 31 ff.; Lobeck, Parall., pp. 400 ff.; Cobet, N. T. Vatic., pp. xlix ff.

4:35). By parity of reasoning W. H. reject the circumflex accent in ἑλκύσαι, λίνον, μύρον, σπίλος, στύλος, συντετρίφθαι (Mk. 5:4), though συντρῖβον (Lu. 9:39) and σκῦλα (Lu. 11:22). Cf. μῦθος, μαργαρῖται, νῖκος, σῖτος, σῦκον etc. W. H. read ψύχος also. The length of υ in κύπτω is uncertain; ἀνακύψαι and παρακύψαι usually appear in the N. T. W. H. have, however, κρᾶζον in Gal. 4:6 and λαῖλαψ in Mk. 4:37. But ἑστάναι (Ac. 12:14) is right, though ἆραι (Mt. 24:17), θυμιᾶσαι (Lu. 1:9) because of long a. Cf. also ἐπᾶραι (Lu. 18:13), ἐπιφᾶναι (Lu. 1:79), πρᾶξαι. (Ac. 26:9), but πιάσαι (Jo. 7:30). So καταλῦσαι (Mt. 5:17), κατευθῦναι (Lu. 1:79) and κωλῦσαι (Ac. 10:47).

2. *Separate Words*. These are not so easily classified. W. H. read ἀγοραῖοι, not ἀγόραιοι; ἄντικρυ, not ἀντικρύ; ἀντίπερα, not ἀντιπέρα(ν); ἀπόδεκτος, not ἀποδεκτός but ἐκλεκτός, εὐλογητός, μισθωτός; ἀρεσκία (from ἀρεσκεύω) with which compare ἐριθία (from ἐριθεύω); ἀρεσκία (Attic ἄχρειος), as also ἔρημος (Attic ἐρῆμος), ἕτοιμος (Attic ἑτοῖμος), μωρός (Attic μῶρος), ὅμοιος (Attic ὁμοῖος), χλωρός (Attic χλῶρος); βραδυτής (3d decl.), but ἀδρότης (3d decl.); γαζοφυλάκοιν, not --εῖον and εἰδώλιον, with which compare τελώνιον, γλωσσόκομον being for the earlier γλωσσοκόμιον; δέσμη, not δεσμή; διετής (Mt. 2:16), not διέτης (Attic), and so with other compounds of -ετης, like ἑκατονταετής, etc., but ἑκατονταρχῶν (Ac. 23:17) is from –άρχης, not --αρχος; εἰπόν is the imperative (Mt. 18:17), for εἶπον is only Attic, and Charax calls εἰπόν Syracusan,[1] with which one may compare ἴδε (ἰδέ only Attic according to the Alexandrian grammarians, though Bornemann urged ἰδέ when verb and ἴδε when exclamation) and λάβε (λαβέ only Attic); θρησκός (Jas. 1:26), not θρῆσκος; ἱδρώς (Lu. 22:44), not ἱδρῶς; ἱμάντα (Mk. 1:7), not the Attic ἱμᾶντα; ἴσος, not the ἶσος[2]; ἰχθύς (Mt. 7:10), not ἰχθῦς; ὀσφύς (Mt. 3:4), not ὀσφῦς; ἰσχύς, not ἰσχῦς; κλείς in nominative singular (Rev. 9:1), though κλεῖς (1:18) and κλεῖδας (Mt. 16:19) in accusative plural, etc., with which compare πούς (Mk. 9:45), not ποῦς, and σής (Mt. 6:19), not σῆς; κτίστης (1 Pet. 4:19), not κτιστής, as γνώστης, etc.; κρύπτη, not κρυπτή (Lu. 11:33); μογιλάλος (Mk. 7:32), not –λᾶλος; μυλών (Mt. 24:41) is read only by DHM and most of the cursives, μύλος being correct; μυριάδων (--άς) as in Lu. 12:1; Rev. 5:11, not the Attic μυριαδῶν, and so as to χιλιάδων; ὀργυιά (Ac. 27:28), not ὄργυια; οὐά (Mk. 15:29), not οὐᾶ; ποίμνιον (Lu. 12:32), not ποιμνίον, and τρύβλιον in Mk. 14:20

[1] Cf. W.-M., p. 58.

[2] As shown in W.-M. (p. 60), the N. T. MSS. have ἔσω, not εἴσω, though εἰς, not ἐς.

(called no diminutive by some),[1] but **τεκνίον** always; **πλήμμυρα** (Lu. 6:48) is preferred by Winer-Schmiedel[2] as nominative to **πλημμύρης** rather than **–μύρα; πονηρός** always, not **πόνηρος** in the physical sense (Rev. 16:2) and **πονηρός** in the moral (Gal. 1:4)[3]; **πρῷρα** (Ac. 27:41), not **πρώρα; σπεῖρα** (Mk. 15:16), not **σπείρα; φλύαρος** (1 Tim. 5:13), not **φλυαρός**. The compound adverbs **ἐπέκεινα, ὑπερέκεινα** have thrown back the accent.

3. *Difference in Sense*. With some words the accent makes a difference in the sense and is quite important. We have, for instance, **Ἅγια**, not **ἁγιὰ**, in Heb. 9:2. W. H. read **ἀλλά**, not **ἄλλα**, in Jo. 6:23. In Jas. 1:15 W. H. have **ἀποκυεῖ** (from **–έω**), not **ἀποκύει** (from **–κύω**). So W. H. print **ἆρα** (interrog.) in Gal. 2:17, not **ἄρα** (illative). **Αὐτή** and **αὕτη** are easily confused, but W. H. prefer **αὕτη** to **αὐτή** in Mt. 22:39 (**αὐτῇ** in margin); Ro. 7:10; 1 Cor. 7:12; and **αὐτή** to **αὕτη** in Lu. 2:37; 7:12; 8:42; Ro. 16:2. In Rev. 2:24 the adjective **βαθέα** is correct, not the substantive **βάθεα** (uncontracted from **βάθος**). **Δεξιολάβος** or **δεξιόλαβος** is possible in Ac. 23:23 (cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 69). So W. H. give us **ἐγχρῖσαι** (infinitive) in Rev. 3:18, not **ἔγχρισαι** (imperative). Cf. also **ἐπιτιμήσαι** (Jude 9), optative, not infinitive **--ῆσαι**. Note the difference between **φοβηθῆτε** (subjunctive) and **φοβήθητε** (imperative) in Lu. 12:5. In Jo. 7:34, 36, W. H. prefer **εἰμί** rather than **εἶμι** (not elsewhere used in the N. T. save in composition with prepositions **ἀπό, εἰς, ἐξ, ἐπί, σύν**). In Mk. 13:28 and Mt. 24:32 W. H. have **ἐκφύῃ** (present active subjunctive), not **ἐκφυῇ** (second aorist passive subjunctive). In Lu. 19:29; 21:37 W. H. prefer **Ἐλαιῶν**, not **Ἐλαιών** (the correct text in Ac. 1:12, and possibly in Luke also according to the papyri, though **Ἐλαιῶνα** would be the form expected).[4] In Mk. 4:8, 20, W. H. put **ἐν** in the text and **ἕν** in the margin. **Ἕνι**, not **ἐνί**, occurs with **οὐκ** several times, once (1 Cor. 6:5) **οὐκ ἔνι ἐν.** In Lu. 9:38, W. H. read **ἐπιβλέψαι** (infinitive), not **ἐπίβλεψαι** (imperative). In 1 Cor. 5:11 W. H. read **ᾖ** (subjunctive), not **ἤ** (conjunction as Rec.). In Ro. 1:30 W. H. follow most editors in giving **θεοστυγεῖς** (passive), not **θεοστύγεις** (active sense of the adjective). In Mk. 5:29 all editors have the perfect **ἴαται**, not the present **ἰᾶται**. In Lu. 22:30 W. H. read **καθῆσθε** (subjunctive), not **κάθησθε** (indicative) nor **καθήσεσθε** (future, margin). In 1 Cor. 9:21 W. H. prefer **κερδανῶ** (future indicative) to **κερδάνω** (aorist subjunctive), and in

[1] Cf. W.-S., p. 73. [2] Ib., p. 72. [3] Ib., p 69.

[4] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 69. On accent of the vernac. see Apostolides, **Γλκωσσικαὶ Μελέται** (1906).

1 Cor. 6:2 **κρινοῦσιν** (future) to **κρίνουσιν** (present indicative in marg.). In Mk. 12:40 we have **μακρά**, not **μακρᾷ**. In 1 Cor. 3:14 W. H. prefer **μενεῖ** (future) to **μένει** (present), and in Jo. 14:17 they have **μένει**. In 1 Cor. 4:15 (14:19) and Mt. 18:24 no distinction can be made in the accent of **μυρίοι** ('innumerable') and **μύριοι** ('ten thousand') because of the cases. Dr. E. J. Goodspeed, of Chicago University (*Expository Times*, July, 1909, p. 471 f.), suggests **ὠφελήθης** in Mk. 7:11 instead of **ὠφεληθῇς**. It is entirely possible. In 1 Cor. 14:7 **ὅμως** is correct, not **ὡμῶς-ὁμοίως**. In Jo. 18:37 W. H. give **οὐκοῦν**, not **οὔκουν**, in Pilate's question. In Ac. 28:6 W. H. print **πίμπρασθαι** (**μι** verb), not **πεμπρᾶσθαι** (**ω** verb). In Rev. 17:5 **πορνῶν** (feminine) is probably right, not **πόρνων** (masculine). **Πρωτότοκος** (Col. 1 : 15), not **πρωτοτόκος**, is manifestly right. The difference between the interrogative **τίς** and the indefinite **τὶς** calls for frequent attention. In Heb. 5:12 W. H. have **τινά**, not **τίνα**, but in Heb. 3:16 **τίνες**, not **τινές**, and in 3:17 **τίσιν**, not **τισίν**. While in Mt. 24:41, 1 Th. 4:6, 1 Cor. 15:8 and 16:16 the article **τῷ** is to be read, not the indefinite **τῳ**, which form does not occur in the N. T. In 1 Cor. 10:19 **τί ἐστιν** (twice) is not interrogative, but the enclitic indefinite with the accent of **ἐστιν**. In Jas. 3:6 **τροχός** ('wheel') is properly read, not **τρόχος** ('course'). In Mk. 4:12 W. H. read **συνίωσιν**, not **συνιῶσιν**, as **συνίουσιν** in Mt. 13:13. Winer[1] considers the suggestion of **φωτῶν** for **φώτων** in Jas. 1:17 "altogether absurd."

4. *Enclitics (and Proclitics)*. Proclitics are regular in the N. T. The accent of enclitics calls for comment. As a rule W. H. do not accent them. So we have **αὐτόν τινας** (Mk. 12:13), **εἶναί τινα** (Ac. 5:36), **ἰδού τινες** (Mt. 28:11), **ὁδόν εἰσιν** (Lu. 8 : 12), **ἀσύνετοί ἐστε** (Mk. 7:18), **γάρ ἐστε** (Mk. 13:11), **καί φησι** (Ac. 10:31; 25:24). However, plenty of cases call for accent on the enclitic, as, for example, in **εὑρεῖν τινάς** (Ac. 19:1) for emphasis, **γάρ, φησίν** (Heb. 8:5 and cf. Mt. 14:8; Ac. 25:5, 22; 26:25; 1 Cor. 6:16; 2 Cor. 10:10) for clearness in punctuation, **καὶ εἰσίν** (Mt. 19:12 and cf. Ac. 5:25) for emphasis, **θεοῦ ἐσμέν** (1 Jo. 3:2), **ὑπὸ τινῶν** (Lu. 9:8) likewise, **οὐκ εἰμί** (Jo. 1:21). In **ὅπου εἰμί** (Jo. 7:34, 36) the accent is regular, though some critics wrongly prefer **εἶμι**.

The use of **ἐστίν** and **ἔστιν** demands special comment. When unemphatic, not at the beginning of a sentence, not preceded by **ἀλλ', εἰ, καί, οὐκ, ὅτι, τοῦτ',** or a paroxytone syllable, as, for example, in **Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν** (Jo. 4:22), we have unaccented **ἐστιν** as in **ἀγρός ἐστιν** (Mt. 13:38, 39), **καθώς ἐστιν** (1 Jo. 3:2), etc. In some ex-

[1] W.-M., p. 62.

amples of mild emphasis W. H. have ἐστίν, as in νῦν ἐστίν (Jo. 4:23; 5:25), ποῦ ἐστίν (Mt. 2:2; Mk. 14:14). But the cases are numerous where ἔστιν is correct, as when it is emphatic, and expresses existence or possibility, as in εἶδες ἔστιν (Rev. 17:18), αὐτοῦ ἔστιν (Ac. 2:29), ἅγιον ἔστιν (Ac. 19:2), ὁ εἷς ἔστιν (Rev. 17:10), οὐδεὶς ἔστιν (Lu. 1:61; 7:28; 18:29). Ἔστιν is also the accent at the beginning of sentences, as in Jo. 21:25; 1 Cor. 15:41; 1 Jo. 5:16 f.; Heb. 11:1. Cf. ἐστίν in Col. 1:15 and ἔστιν in 1:17. Then again we have, according to the usual rule, ἔστιν after ἀλλ᾽ (Jo. 13:10), εἰ (1 Cor. 15:44), καὶ (Mk. 12:11; 2 Cor. 4:3), ὅτι (2 Th. 2:4; Mk. 6:55; Heb. 11:6), but ὅτι ἐστίν (Ac. 23:5) when the idea of existence is not stressed, οὐκ (1 Cor. 11:20; Ro. 8:9, etc.), τοῦτ᾽ (Mk. 7:2; Ro. 7:18). W. H. give only ἐστίν after ποῦ (Jo. 9:12; 11:57; Mk. 14:14).

Sometimes two enclitics come together. Here the critics differ and W. H.[1] do not make clear the reasons for their practice. In Ac. 13:15 W. H. have εἴ τις ἔστιν and in Gal. 6:15 περιτομή τι ἔστιν, because they take go ἔστιν to be emphatic in both instances. In Jo. 6:51 W. H. have σάρξ μου ἐστίν. But in many examples the first enclitic is accented and the second unaccented as in Lu. 8:46 ἥψατό μού τις, 10:29 τίς ἐστίν μου, Jo. 5:14 χεῖρόν σοί τι, 8:31 μαθηταί μού ἐστε, 12:47 ἐάν τίς μου, 14:28 μείζων μού ἐστιν Ac. 2:25 δεξιῶν μού ἐστιν, 25:5 εἴ τί ἐστιν, 25:14 ἀνήρ τίς ἐστιν, 1 Cor. 10:19 εἰδωλόθυτόν τί ἐστιν and εἴδωλόν τί ἐστιν, 11:24 τοῦτό μού ἐστιν, 2 Cor. 11:16 μή τίς με, Ro. 3:8 καθώς φασίν τινες Heb. 1:10 χειρῶν σού εἰσιν, 2:6 δέ πού τις, Tit. 1:6 εἴ τίς ἐστιν. Modern Greek only has a second accent when the accent is in the third syllable as in τ᾽ ἅρματά μας (Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 29).

The personal pronouns now have the accent in W. H. and now are without it, as ὀφθαλμῷ σοῦ and ὀφθαλμοῦ σου (both in Mt. 7:4). Cf. also ἐγώ σε (Jo. 17:4), σύ με (17:8), but τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί (Lu. 8:28). With prepositions generally the enclitics are accented, as ἐν σοί (Jo. 17:21), though ἔμπροσθέν μου and ὀπίσω μου (Jo. 1:30 both, and so continually with these two prepositions). Ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ (Lu. 4:7) and ἐνώπιόν μου (Ac. 2:25) both appear. With the prepositions usually ἐμοῦ, not μου, occurs as ἕνεκα ἐμοῦ (Mt. 5:11). It is only with πρός that we have much trouble. The N. T. editors have generally printed πρός σε, but W. H. have that only in Mt. 25:39, elsewhere πρός σέ as in Mt. 26:18. Usually we have, according to W. H., πρός με as in Mt. 25:36; Jo. 6:65; 7:37, etc., and where the "me" is emphatic in sense,

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 77.

as Mt. 3:14; 11:28, in the first of which Tisch. and Griesbach have πρὸς μέ, a usage not followed by W. H., though kept in the LXX text of B, as in Is. 48:16; etc.[1] W. H. a few times prefer πρὸς ἐμέ (not enclitic) as in Lu. 1:43; Jo. 6:35, 37 (both ways here), 44 (marg.), 45; Ac. 22:8, 13; 23:22; 24:19. Occasionally the enclitic τινὲς is found at the beginning of a sentence, as in Mt. 27:47; Lu. 6:2; Jo. 13:29; Ph. 1:15; 1 Tim. 5:24.

5. *Proper Names* cannot always be brought under rules, for in Greek, as in English, men claim the right to accent their own names as they will. On the accent of the abbreviated proper names see chapter V, v. It is difficult to make a clear line of distinction as to why **Ἀντίπας** (Rev. 2:13) is proper, but **Ἀρτεμᾶς** (Tit. 3:12), save that in **Ἀρτεμίδωρος** the accent was already after **μ**. But cf. **Κλεόπας** (Lu.. 24:18) and **Κλωπᾶς** (Jo. 19:25).[2] In general one may say that proper names (geographical and personal) throw the accent back, if the original adjectives or substantives were oxytone. This is for the sake of distinction. **Ἀλεξανδρινός** (Ac. 27:6; 28:11) is the adjective. **Ἄσσος** (Ac. 20:13 f.) is doubtless correct, though Pape gives **Ἀσσός** also.[3] In **Ἀχαϊκός** (1 Cor. 16:17) the accent is not thrown back nor is it in **Ἀπολλώς** (1 Cor. 16:12). **Ἀσύνκριτος** (Ro. 16:14) retains the accent of the adjective, like **Τρόφιμος** (Ac 20:4) and **Ὑμέναιος** (1 Tim. 1: 20). But we have **Βλάστος** (Ac. 12:20), **Διοτρέφης** (3 Jo. 9), **Ἐπαίνετος** (Ro. 16:5), **Ἔραστος** (16:23), **Ἑρμογένης**. (2 Tim. 1:15), **Εὔτυχος** (Ac. 20:9), **Κάρπος** (2 Tim. 4:13), probably **Ὀνησίφορος** (2 Tim. 1:16; 4:19), **Πάταρα** (Ac. 21:1), **Πύρρος** (Ac. 20:4), **Συντύχη** (Ph. 4:2), **Σωσθένης** (1 Cor. 1:2), **Τίμων** (Ac. 6:5), **Τύχικος** (Ac. 20:4) **Φίλητος** (2 Tim. 2:17). But **Χριστός** always retains the oxytone accent whether proper name (1 Tim. 1:1) or verbal adjective (Mt. 16:16). In 2 Tim. 4:21 **Λίνος**, not **Λῖνος**, is read. So **Τίτος** (2 Cor. 2:13, etc.). In Ac. 27:17 **Σύρτις** is read by W. H. But **φῆλιξ** in Ac. 24:22, etc.

6. *Foreign Words*. These always give occasion for diversity of usage in transliterating them into another tongue. Blass[4] lets the quantity of the vowel in Latin determine the accent in the Greek equivalent for Latin words. So *Marcus*, **Μᾶρκος**, etc., but W. H. do not accept this easy principle and give us **Μάρκος** in Ac. 12:25, etc., **Κρίσπος** (1 Cor. 1:14), etc. W. H. likewise

[1] Cf. Lipsius, Gr. Unters., p. 61. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 78.

[2] In W.-Sch., p. 74 f., see remarks on the subject.

[3] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 73. This word is, of course, not to be confounded with **ἆσσον** (Ac. 27:13) as Text. Rec. did.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 15.

throw the accent back on Latin names like **Κούαρτος** (Ro. 16:23), **Πρίσκιλλα** (Ac. 18:2), **Σέκουνδος** (Ac. 20:4), **Τέρτυλλος** (24:2), but we have on the other hand **Γαΐος** (Ro. 16:23), not **Γάϊος, Οὐρ=** βανός (Ro. 16:9), **Σιλουανός** (2 Cor. 1:19), **Σκευᾶς** (Ac. 19:14).[1]

But not even Blass attempts to bring the Semitic words under regular rules. Still, it is true, as Winer[2] shows, that indeclinable Semitic words (especially proper names) have the accent, as a rule, on the last syllable, though the usage of Josephus is the contrary, because he generally inflects the words that in the LXX and the N. T. are indeclinable. So **᾽Ααρών, ᾽Αβαδδών, ᾽Αβιά, ᾽Αβιούδ, ᾽Αβραάμ**, to take only the first two pages of Thayer's Lexicon, though even here we find on the other side **῎Αβελ** and **᾽Αβιάθαρ**. If you turn over you meet **῎Αγαρ, ᾽Αδάμ, ᾽Αδδεί, ᾽Αδμείν, ᾽Αζώρ**, etc. It is not necessary here to give a full list of these proper names, but reference can be made to Lu. 3:23-38 for a good sample. In this list some indeclinable words have the accent on the penult, as **᾽Ελιέζερ** (29), **Ζοροβάβελ** (27), **Λάμεχ** (36), **Φάλεκ** (35).[3] The inflected Semitic words often throw the accent back, as **῎Αζωτος, ᾽Ιάκωβος, Λάζαρος**. Many of the Aramaic words accent the ultima, as **᾽Αββά, Γολγοθά, Κορβάν, ᾽Ελωί, σαβαχθανεί**, etc. For further remarks on the subject see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept:, pp. 26-31. The difficulties of the LXX translators are well illustrated here by Helbing.

VI. Pronunciation in the Κοινή. This is indeed a knotty problem and has been the occasion of fierce controversy. When the Byzantine scholars revived the study of Greek in Italy, they introduced, of course, their own pronunciation as well as their own spelling. But English-speaking people know that spelling is not a safe guide in pronunciation, for the pronunciation may change very much when the spelling remains the same. Writing is originally an effort to represent the sound and is more or less successful, but the comparison of Homer with modern Greek is a fruitful subject.[4] Roger Bacon, as Reuchlin two centuries later, adopted the Byzantine pronunciation.[5] Reuchlin, who introduced Greek to the further West, studied in Italy and passed on the Byzantine pronunciation. Erasmus is indirectly responsible for the current pronunciation of ancient Greek, for the Byzan-

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 75. [2] W.-M., p. 59.

[3] Cf. also Gregory, Prol., p. 102 f.; W.-Sch., p. 75; Westcott, Notes on Orth., pp. 155, 159; Thackeray, pp. 150 ff.

[4] Blass, Ausspr. des Griech., 1888, p. 7.

[5] Nolan, The Gk. Gr. of Roger Bacon, p. xx.

tine scholars pronounced ancient and modern alike. Jannaris[1] quotes the story of Voss, a Dutch scholar (1577-1649), as to how Erasmus heard some learned Greeks pronounce Greek in a very different way from the Byzantine custom. Erasmus published a discussion between a lion and a bear entitled *De Recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione*, which made such an impression that those who accepted the ideas advanced in this book were called Erasmians and the rest Reuchlinians. As a matter of fact, however, Engel has shown that Erasmus merely wrote a literary squib to "take off" the new non-Byzantine pronunciation, though he was taken seriously by many. Dr. Caspar Rene Gregory writes me (May 6, 1912) : "The philologians were of course down on Engel and sided gladly with Blass. It was much easier to go on with the totally impossible pronunciation that they used than to change it." Cf. Engel, *Die Aussprachen des Griechischen*, 1887. In 1542 Stephen Gardiner, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, "issued an edict for his university, in which, e.g. it was categorically forbidden to distinguish at from ε, ει and οι from ι in pronunciation, under penalty of expulsion from the Senate, exclusion from the attainment of a degree, rustication for students, and domestic chastisement for boys!"[2] Hence though the continental pronunciation of Greek and Latin was "Erasmian," at Cambridge and Oxford the Reuchlinian influence prevailed, though with local modifications. Geldart,[3] however, complains that at Eton, Rugby and Harrow so little attention is paid to pronouncing according to accent that most Greek scholars handle the accents loosely. The *Classical Review* (April, 1906, p. 146 f.) has the scheme approved by the Philological Societies of Cambridge and Oxford for "The Restored Pronunciation of Latin," which is the virtual adoption of the Continental principle. The modern Greeks themselves rather vehemently insist that ancient Greek should be pronounced as modern Greek is. Muller,[4] for instance, calls the "Erasmian" pronunciation "false" because it treats Greek "as dead." Geldart (*Modern Gk. Language in Its Relation to Ancient Gr.*, p. vii) says: "Modern Greek is nothing but ancient Greek made easy." It is not

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 31 f. Cf. Mayser, Gr., pp. 138-151.

[2] Blass, Pronun. of Anc. Gk., Purton's transl., p. 3.

[3] Guide to Mod. Gk., p. X.

[4] Hist. Gr. der hell. Spr. (pp. 26, 36). In pp. 35-40 he states the case against the squib of Erasmus. Cf. Engel (Die Ausspr. des Griech., 1887) who defends the mod. Gk. method, as already stated.

quite as simple as that. Foy[1] properly distinguishes between the old Greek vocal sounds and the modern Greek and refers to the development of Latin into the several Romance languages. There is this difference in the Greek, however, that it has only one modern representative (with dialectical variations) of the ancient tongue. One must not make the mistake of comparing the pronunciation of the modern Greek vernacular with the probable pronunciation of the literary Attic of the fifth century B.C. Then, as now, there was the literary and the vernacular pronunciation. The changes in pronunciation that have come in the modern Greek have come through the Byzantine Greek from the **κοινή** and thus represent a common stream with many rills. The various dialects have made contributions to the pronunciation of the **κοινή** and so of the modern Greek. In cultivated Athens at its best there was a closer approximation between the people and the educated classes. "Demosthenes, in his oration **περὶ στεφάνου** called AEschines a **μισθωτόν**, but had accented the word erroneously, namely, **μίσθωτον**, whereupon the audience corrected him by crying **μισθωτόν**."[2] Like the modern Italian, the ancient Greek had a musical cadence that set it above all other European tongues.[3] We can indeed appeal to the old Greek inscriptions for the popular pronunciation on many points.[4] According to this evidence in the first century B.C. in Attica **αι**=ae, **ει=ι, η=ι, υ=ι, υι=υ, οι=ι**, **β=υ** (English v).[5] Clearly then in the **κοινή** the process of *itacism* was already at work before the N. T. was written. What was true of the **κοινή** vernacular then does not of course argue conclusively for the pronunciation of cultivated Athenians in the time of Socrates. In versatile Athens "a stranger, if introduced on the stage, is always represented as talking the language or dialect of the people to which he belongs."[6] Blass indeed thinks that in Tarsus the school-teacher taught Paul Atticistic Greek! "**Ἴσμεν**,

[1] Lautsystem der griech. Vulgarspr., 1879, p. 83 f.

[2] Achilles Rose, Chris. Greece and Living Gk., 1898, p. 61.

[3] Cf. Mure, A Crit. Hist. of the Lang. and Lit. of Anc. Greece, I, p. 99; Bolland, Die althell. Wortbet. im Lichte der Gesch., 1897, p. 6. Cf. Pronun. of Gk. as deduced from Graeco-Latin Biling. Coins. By Cecil Bendall in Jour. of Philol., vol. XXIX, No. 58, 1904. Here the rough breathing is represented by h, **θ**=th, **φ** = ph.

[4] Thumb, Unters. etc., 1888, p. 1. Cf. Sophocles, Hist. of Gk. Alph. and Pronun., 1854.

[5] Telly, Chron. and Topog. der griech. Ausspr. nach d. Zeugnisse der Inschr., 1893, p. 39.

[6] Rutherford, The New Phryn., p. 32. [7] Philol. of the Gosp., p. 9,

ἴστε, ἴσασιν, he must have said, are the true forms which you must employ if you care to be considered a cultivated speaker or writer." Yet in Paul's Epistles he constantly has οἴδαμεν, --ατε, --ασιν. The Atticistic pronunciation was no more successful than the Atticistic spelling, forms and syntax. We maybe sure of one thing, the pronunciation of the vernacular κοινή was not exactly like the ancient literary Attic nor precisely like the modern Greek vernacular, but veering more towards the latter. In Greek as in English the pronunciation has perhaps varied more than the spelling. Giles[1] observes that English pronunciation "is really a stumbling-block in tracing the history of the English language." Hadley[2] has a very able and sane discussion of this matter of changes in Greek pronunciation. He insists on change all through the centuries (p. 139), which is the only rational position. If we turn to the earliest N. T. MSS. we shall find undoubtedly traces of this process of change from the old Attic toward the Byzantine or modern Greek pronunciation. Indeed in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.,[3] the date of the earliest uncials, the process is pretty well complete. The N. T. scribes make no hesitation in writing αι or ε; ι, ει, η, ῃ; οι or υ according to convenience or individual taste.[4] Blass,[5] contrary to his former view about Tarsus, says that it is impossible to suppose that there was anybody in the schools at Tarsus who would have taught Paul the correct historical spelling or pronunciation. To the student of the κοινή, as to us, in a sense "the Greek γράμματα were dead symbols, from which must be recovered the living sounds."[6] Of one thing we may be sure, and it is that other dialects besides the Attic contributed to the κοινή pronunciation. The κοινή would be dialect-coloured here and there in its pronunciation. Alexander's conquest, like the railroad and the steamship of the present day, levelled the dialectical variations in many points, whereas before every valley in Greece had its own pronunciation of certain words.[7] One taught the κοινή in a Doric environment

[1] Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 103. Cf. also Ellis, Early Eng. Pronun.

[2] "Gk. Pronun." in Ess. Philol. and Crit., pp. 128-140. Hatzidakis, Einl. etc.

[4] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 34 f. [5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 6 f.

[6] Nicklin, Cl. Rev., Mar., 1906, p. 116. This is precisely the objection that Jannaris (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 33) brings against the ancient grammarians as "post-Christian scribes" and unable to "speak with authority of the pronunciation of classical Greek."

[7] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 75. Cf. Oppenheim and Lucas, Byz. Zeitschr., 1905, p. 13, for exx. of phonetic spelling.

would show it somewhat. As a matter of fact the Boeotian dialect contributed largely to the κοινή vernacular pronunciation (and so the modern Greek) in points where the Boeotian differed radically from the old Attic.[1] Boeotian Greek "modified its vowel-system more than any other Greek dialect."[2] Thus already in Boeotian we find both αι and αε in the earliest inscriptions and finally η. So in Boeotian η became[3] ει in sound, as ἐπιδεί=ἐπειδή. The early Greek generally, as already shown, made no distinction in sign between ο and ω, and η was a slow development from ε. The Ionic dialect never took kindly to the rough breathing and greatly influenced the κοινή and so the modern Greek. By the Christian era β is beginning to be pronounced as *ν*, as the transliteration of Latin words like **Β**εργίλιος shows. *Z* is no longer *ds*, but *z*, though δ seems still usually *d*, not *th*. Who is right, therefore, the "Erasmians" or the Reuchlinians? Jannaris[4] sums up in favour of the Reuchlinians, while according to Riemann and Goelzer[5] the "Erasmians" are wholly right. As a matter of fact neither side is wholly right. In speaking of ancient Greek one must recognise other dialects than the literary Attic of the fifth century B.C. If you ask for the pronunciation of the vernacular κοινή of the first century A.D., that will be found as a whole neither in the literary Attic alone nor in the N. T. MSS. of the fifth century A.D. The papyri and the inscriptions of the time throw light on a good many points, though not on all. But even here the illiterate papyri do not furnish a safe standard for the vernacular of a man like Paul or Luke. It is small wonder therefore that N. T. MSS. show much confusion between —σει (future indicative) and σῃ (aorist subjunctive), -ομεν (indicative) and —ωμεν (subjunctive), --σθαι (infinitive) and --σθε (indicative middle), etc. It is possibly as well to go on pronouncing the N. T. Greek according to the literary Attic, since we cannot reproduce a clear picture of the actual vernacular κοινή pronunciation, only we must understand frankly that this

[1] Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 41.

[2] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 540.

[3] Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., pp. 41, 46. Thumb (Hellen., p. 228) warns us against overemphasis of the Boeotian influence.

[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 31. "The pronunciation of ancient Gk. in the manner of the present Greeks had been traditionally accepted at all times, before and through the Middle Ages, as a matter of unquestioned fact."

[5] Phonet., p. 56. "En resume, la prononciation grecque ancienne etait, sur presque tous les points, differente de la prononciation moderne."

is *not* the way it was done. On the other hand the modern Greek method misses it by excess, as the literary Attic does by default. There was, of course, no Jewish pronunciation of the κοινή. The Coptic shows the current pronunciation in many ways and probably influenced the pronunciation of the κοινή in Egypt. Cf. a German's pronunciation of English.

VII. Punctuation. In the spoken language the division of words is made by the voice, pauses, emphasis, tone, gesture, but it is difficult to reproduce all this on the page for the eye. Many questions arise for the editor of the Greek N. T. that are not easy of solution. Caspar Rene Gregory insists that whenever N. T. MSS. have punctuation of any kind, it must be duly weighed, since it represents the reading given to the passage.

(a) THE PARAGRAPH. As early as Aristotle's time the paragraph (παράγραφος) was known. A dividing horizontal stroke was written between the lines marking the end of a paragraph. Some other marks like > (διπλῆ) or ⌐ (κορωνίς) were used, or a slight break in the line made by a blank space. Then again the first letter of the line was written larger than the others or even made to project out farther than the rest.[1] The paragraph was to the ancients the most important item in punctuation, and we owe a debt to the N. T. revisers for restoring it to the English N. T. Cf. Lightfoot, Trench, Ellicott, *The Revision of the N. T.*, 1873, p. xlvi. Euthalius (A.D. 458) prepared an edition of the Greek N. T. with chapters (κεφάλαια), but long before him Clement of Alexandria spoke of περικοπαί and Tertullian of *capitula*. These "chapters" were later called also τίτλοι.[2] The στίχος of Euthalius was a line of set length with no regard to the sense, like our printer's ems. W. H. have made careful use of the paragraph in their Greek N. T. The larger sections are marked off by spaces and the larger paragraphs are broken into smaller sub-paragraphs (after the French method) by smaller spaces.[3] Another division is made by W. H. in the use of the capital letter at the beginning of an important sentence, while the other sentences, though after a period, begin with a small letter. This is a wholly arbitrary method, but it helps one better to understand W. H.'s interpretation of the text.

[1] On the paragraph see Thompson, Handb. of Gk. and Lat. Palaeog., pp. 67 ff. Occasionally the double point (:) was used to close a paragraph.

[2] Cf. Warfield, Text. Crit. of N. T., pp. 40 ff.

[3] Hort. Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 319. For the στίχος see further Gregory, Prol., p. 112 f.

W. H.[1] have also printed in metrical form passages metrical in rhythm like the Magnificat of Mary (Lu. 1:46-55), the fragment of a hymn in 1 Tim. 3:16, etc., while Lu. 2:14 and the non-metrical hymns in Revelation are merely printed in narrower columns. The Hebrew parallelism of 0. T. quotations is indicated also.

(b) SENTENCES. The oldest inscriptions and papyri show few signs of punctuation between sentences or clauses in a sentence,[2] though punctuation by points does appear on some of the ancient inscriptions. In the Artemisia, papyrus the double point (:) occasionally ends the sentence.[3] It was Aristophanes of Byzantium (260 B.C.) who is credited with inventing a more regular system of sentence punctuation which was further developed by the Alexandrian grammarians.[4] As a rule all the sentences, like the words, ran into one another in an unbroken line (*scriptura continua*), but finally three stops were provided for the sentence by the use of the full point. The point at the top of the line (·) (στιγμὴ τελεία, 'high point') was a full stop; that on the line (.) (ὑποστιγμή) was equal to our semicolon, while a middle point (στιγμὴ μέση) was equivalent to our comma.[5] But gradually changes came over these stops till the top point was equal to our colon, the bottom point became the full stop, the middle point vanished, and about the ninth century A.D. the comma (,) took its place. About this time also the question-mark (;) or ἐρωτηματικόν appeared. These marks differed from the στίχοι in that they concerned the sense of the sentence. Some of the oldest N. T. MSS. show these marks to some extent. B has the higher point as a period, the lower point for a shorter pause.[6] But still we cannot tell how much, if any, use the N. T. writers themselves made of punctuation points. We may be sure that they did not use the exclamation point, the dash, quotation-marks, the parenthesis, etc.[7] Parenthetical clauses were certainly used, which will be discussed elsewhere, though no signs were used for this structure by the ancient Greeks. W. H. represent the parenthesis either by the comma (Ro. 1:13) or the dash with comma (1 Tim. 2:7). Instead of

[1] Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 319 f.

[2] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 62.

[3] Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 69.

[4] Ib., p. 70; Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 67.

[5] I follow Thompson (Handb., etc., p. 70) on this point instead of Jannaris (pp. 63 and 67), who makes the ὑποστιγμή = our comma.

[6] Cf. Gregory, Prol., pp. 345, 348; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 17. D has the στίχοι, in the way of sense-lines (Blass, ib.).

[7] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 67.

quotation-marks W. H. begin the quotation with a capital letter with no punctuation before it, as in Jo. 12:19, 21. One way of expressing a quotation was by τό, as in Ro. 13:9. In the case of 0. T. quotations the Scripture is put in uncial type (Jo. 12:13). The period (περίοδος) gives very little trouble to the modern editor, for it is obviously necessary for modern needs. Here the editor has to make his interpretation sometimes when it is doubtful, as W. H. give ἔν. ὃ γέγονεν ἐν, not ἓν ὃ γέγονεν. ἐν (Jo. 1:4). So W. H. read θαυμάζετε. διὰ τοῦτο Μωυσῆς in Jo. 7:22, not θαυμάζετε διὰ τοῦτο. Μωυσῆς, etc. The colon (κῶλον),[1] 'limb of the sentence' formed a complete clause. See Jo. 3:31 for example of use of colon made by W. H. The comma (κόμμα) is the most common division of the sentence and is often necessary, as with the vocative. So Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσωμεν; (Lu. 3:12) and many common examples. In general W. H. use the comma only where it is necessary to make clear an otherwise ambiguous clause, whether it be a participial (Col. 2:2) or conjunctional phrase (Col. 1:23), or appositive (Col. 1:18), or relative (Col. 2:3). The first chapter of Colossians has a rather unusual number of colons (2, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20, 27, 28) as Paul struggles with several long sentences, not to mention the clashes (21, 22, 26). The Germans use the comma too freely with the Greek for our English ideas, leaving out the Greek! Even Winer defended the comma after καρπόν in Jo. 15:2 and ὁ νικῶν in Rev. 3:12, not to mention Griesbach's "excessive" use of the comma, Winer himself being judge.[2] My friend, Rev. S. M. Provence, D.D. (Victoria, Tex.), suggests a full stop before μαθών in Ac. 23:27 f. That would help the character of Claudius Lysias on the point of veracity.

(c) WORDS. The continuous writing of words without any space between them was not quite universal, though nearly so.[3] The oldest Attic inscription (Dipylon vase, probably eighth century B.C.) is written from right to left. With the common method it was not always easy for the practised eye to distinguish between words. Hence there arose the διαστολή or ὑποδιαστολή a comma used to distinguish between ambiguous words, as ὅ, τι, not ὅτι. But W. H. make no use of this mark, not even in ὅ, τι to distinguish it from the conjunction ὅτι. They print uniformly ὅτι (Lu. 10:35; Jo. 2:5; 14:13; 1 Cor. 16:2, etc.), not to men-

[1] Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 81. So Suidas. The colon is the main semi-division of the sentence, but mod. Eng. makes less use of all marks save the period and comma.

[2] W.-M., pp. 63, 67.

[3] Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 67.

tion doubtful cases like those in Mk. 9:11, 28; Jo. 8:25; 2 Cor. 3:14.[1] As to the marks of diaeresis (¨) reference may be had to the discussion of diphthongs and diaeresis in this chapter under II (i). W. H., like other modern editors, use the apostrophe (᾽) (or smooth breathing) to represent elision, as ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς (Mt. 24:21).[2] The coronis is the smooth breathing used also to show when crasis has taken place, as in **κἀμοί** (Lu. 1:3).[3] The hyphen, a long straight line, was used in the Harris-Homer MS. to connect compound words, but it is not in the N. T.[4] The editors vary much in the way such words as ἀλλά γε, ἵνα τί, **τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι,** etc., are printed. The MSS. give no help at all, for **τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν** in Ro. 1:12 is not conclusive against **τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν** elsewhere.[5] W. H. prefer ἀλλά γε (Lu. 24:21; 1 Cor. 9:2), ἆρά γε (Ac. 8:30), διά γε (Lu. 11:8; 18:5), εἴ γε (2 Cor. 5:3, etc.), καί γε (Ac. 2:18; 17:27), ὅς γε (Ro. 8:32), διὰ παντός (Mk. 5:5, etc.), διὰ τί (Mt. 9 : 11, etc.), ἵνα τί (Mt. 9:4, etc.), εἴ πως (Ac. 27:12), μή ποτε (everywhere save in Mt. 25:9 where **μήποτε),** μή που (Ac. 27:29), μή πως (1 Cor. 9:27, etc.), μή τις (1 Cor. 16:11, etc.). So also δῆλον ὅτι in 1 Cor. 15:27, ὅστις οὖν (Mt. 18:4). But on the other hand W. H. print διότι as well as **εἴτε, οὔτε, μήτε, ὥστε, καίπερ, μήποτε** (once), **μηδέποτε, μηδέπω οὐδέποτε, μηκέτι, οὐκέτι, μήπω, οὔπω, μήτιγε,** even **μήγε** (Mt. 6:1), **καθά καθό, καθώς, καθάπερ, καθότι, καθόλου, ὥσπερ, ὡσεί, ὡσπερεί** (1 Cor. 15:8), etc. But W. H. give us καθ᾽ εἷς in Ro. 12:5, ἀνὰ μέσον in Mt. 13:25, etc.; **Κατὰ μόνας** in Mk. 4:10, καθ᾽ ὅσον in Heb. 3:3. Adverbs like ἐπέκεινα (Ac. 7:43), ὑπερέκεινα (2 Cor. 10:16), παρεκτός (2 Cor. 11:28) are, of course, printed as one word. W. H. properly have ὕπερ ἐγώ (2 Cor. 11:23), not ὑπερεγώ. In Ac. 27:33 τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος is one word, but W. H. have **῾Ιερὰ Πόλις** in Col. 4:13 and **Νέα πόλις** in Ac. 16:11. It must be confessed that no very clear principles in this matter can be set forth, and the effort of Winer-Schmiedel[6] at minute analysis does not throw much light on the subject.

(d) THE EDITOR'S PREROGATIVE. Where there is so much confusion, what is the editor's prerogative? Blass[7] boldly advances

[1] W.-Sch., p. 35.

[2] See this ch. ii (k) for discussion of elision. For origin and early use of the apostrophe see Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 73.

[3] See this ch. II (1) for discussion of crasis. Cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 88.

[4] Thompson, Handb., etc., p. 72.

[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 14. For the usage of Tisch. in the union and the separation of particles see Gregory, Prol., pp. 109-111. In most cases Tisch. ran the particles together as one word.

[6] P. 35.

[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 17. Left out by Debrunner.

the German idea: "The most correct principle appears to be to punctuate wherever a pause is necessary for reading correctly." But Winer[1] shrinks from this profusion of punctuation-marks by the editors, which "often intruded on the text *their own* interpretation of it." The editor indeed has to interpret the text with his punctuation, but certainly good taste demands that the minimum, not the maximum, of punctuation-marks be the rule. They must of necessity decide "a multitude of subtle and difficult points of interpretation."[2] Hort indeed aimed at "the greatest simplicity compatible with clearness," and this obviously should be the goal in the Greek N. T. But the editor's punctuation may be a hindrance to the student instead of a help. It is the privilege of each N. T. student to make his own punctuation.

[1] W.-M., p. 63. [2] Hort, Intr. to Gk. N. T., p. 318.

CHAPTER VII

THE DECLENSIONS (**ΚΛΙΣΕΙΣ**)

Space will not be taken for the inflection of the nouns and pronouns, for the student of this grammar may be assumed to know the normal Attic inflections. Aristotle[1] used the term "inflection" (πρῶσις) of noun and verb and even adverb, but practically inflection is applied to nouns and conjugation (κλίσις ῥημάτων=συζυγία) to verbs. Noun (ὄνομα) does, of course, include both substantive and adjective without entering the psychological realm and affirming the connection between name and thing (cf. Plato's *Cratylus*).

I. THE SUBSTANTIVE (TO "ONOMA)

The Substantive (τὸ ὄνομα) is either concrete (σῶμα) or abstract (πρᾶγμα), ordinary appellative (ὄνομα προσηγορικόν) or proper (ὄνομα κύριον).

1. History of the Declensions. It is only since the seventeenth century A.D. that modern grammarians distinguish for convenience three declensions in Greek. The older grammars had ten or more.[2] In the modern Greek vernacular the first and third declensions have been largely fused into one, using the singular of the first and the plural of the third.[3] Thumb (*Handbook*, pp. 43 ff.) divides the declension of substantives in modern Greek vernacular according to gender simply (masculine, feminine, neuter). This is the simplest way out of the confusion. In Sanskrit five declensions are usually given as in Latin, but Whitney[4] says: "There is nothing absolute in this arrangement; it is merely believed to be open to as few objections as any other." Evidently

[1] Donaldson, New Crat., p. 421. It is in the accidence that the practical identity of N. T. Gk. with the popular **κοινή** is best seen, here and in the lexical point of view (Deissmann, Exp., Nov., 1907, p. 434).

[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 102; Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 264.

[3] Ib., pp. 105, 111. Cf. Hatzidakis, Einl. etc., pp. 376 ff.

[4] Sans. Gr., p. 111.

therefore the ancient Greeks did not have the benefit of our modem theories and rules, but inflected the substantives according to principles not now known to us. The various dialects exercised great freedom also and exhibited independent development at many points, not to mention the changes in time in each dialect. The threefold division is purely a convenience, but with this justification: the first has α stems, the second o stems, the third consonant and close vowel (ι, υ) stems. There are some differences in the suffixes also, the third declension having always the genitive ending in –ος. In the third declension especially it is not possible to give a type to which all the words in all the cases and numbers conform. Besides, the same word may experience variations. Much freedom is to be recognized in the whole matter of the declensions within certain wide limits. See metaplasm or the fluctuation between the several declensions.

2. **The Number of the Cases** (πτώσεις). The meaning and use of the cases will have a special chapter in Syntax (ch. XI).

(a) THE HISTORY OF THE FORMS OF THE CASES. This is called for before the declensions are discussed. The term "case" (πτῶσις, cases) is considered a "falling," because the nominative is regarded as the upright case (πτῶσις ὀρθή, εὐθεῖα), though as a matter of fact the accusative is probably older than the nominative (πτῶσις ὀνομαστική or ὀρθή). The other cases are called oblique (πλάγιαι) as deviations from the nominative. In simple truth the vocative (κλητική or προσαγορεύτικη) has no inflection and is not properly a case in its logical relations. It is usually the noun-stem or like the nominative in form. There are only three other case-endings preserved in the Greek, and the grammars usually term them accusative (πτῶσις αἰτιατική), genitive (πτῶσις γενική) and dative (πτῶσις δοτική).[1] There is no dispute as to the integrity of the accusative case, the earliest, most common of all the oblique cases and the most persistent. In the breakdown of the other cases the accusative and the prepositions reap the benefit. In truth the other oblique cases are variations from the normal accusative. But this subject is complicated with the genitive and the dative. It is now a commonplace in comparative philology that the Greek genitive has taken over the function of the ablative (ἀφαιρετική) also. In the singular the Sanskrit had already the same

[1] Mod. Gk. vernac. has only three cases (nom., gen. and acc.) and these are not always formally differentiated from each other. The mod. Gk. has thus carried the blending of case-forms almost as far as mod. Eng. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 31.

ending (–ας) for genitive and ablative, while in the plural the Sanskrit ablative had the same form as the dative (*bhyas*; cf. Latin *ibus*). Thus in the Sanskrit the ablative has no distinctive endings save in the singular of *a* stems like *kamat* ('love') where the ablative ending *–t (d)* is preserved. In Latin, as we know, the ablative, dative, locative and instrumental have the same endings in the plural. The Latin ablative singular is partly ablative, partly locative, partly instrumental. Some old Latin inscriptions show the *d*, as *bened, in altod marid*, etc. In Greek the ablative forms merged with the genitive as in the Sanskrit singular, but not because of any inherent "internal connection between them, as from accidents affecting the outward forms of inflection."[1] The Greek did not allow τ or δ to stand at the end of a word. So the Greek has πρός (not πρότ for προτί). **K**αλῶς may be (but see Brugmann[2]) the ablative καλῶτ and so all adverbs in —ως. The meaning of the two cases remained distinct in the Greek as in the Sanskrit. It is not possible to derive the ablative (source or separation) idea from the genitive (or γένος) idea nor vice versa. The Greek dative (δοτική) is even more complicated. "The Greek dative, it is well known, both in singular and plural, has the form of a locative case, denoting the place where or in which; but, as actually used, it combines, with the meaning of a locative, those of the dative and instrumental."[3] This is only true of some datives. There are true datives like **ὁδῷ,** χώρᾳ. The Indo-Germanic stock, as shown by the Sanskrit, had originally three separate sets of endings for these cases.

[1] Hadley, Ess. Philol. and Crit., Gk. Gen. or Abl., p. 52. Cf. also Miles, Comp. Synt. of Gk. and Lat., 1893, p. xvii. This blending of the cases in Gk. is the result of "partial confusion" "between the genitive and the ablative between the dative and the locative, between the locative and the instrumental" (Audoin, La Decl. dans les Lang. Indo-Europ., 1898, p. 248). In general on the subject of the history of the eight cases in Gk. see Brugmann, Griech. Gr., pp. 217-250, 375 f.; Comp. Gr. of the Indo-Ger. Lang., vol. III, pp. 52-280; Furze vergl. Gram., II, pp. 418 ff.; K.-B1., I, pp. 365-370, II, pp. 299-307; Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 268-301; Bopp, Uber das Dem. und den Urspr. der Casuszeichen etc., 1826; Hartung, Uber die Casus etc., 1831; Hilbschmann, Zur Casuslehre, 1875; Rumpel, Casusl., 1845; Meillet, Intr. a l'Etude Comp., pp. 257 ff.; Penka, Die Entst. der Synkr. Casus im Lat., Griech. und Deutsch., 1874. See also p. 33 f. of Hubner, Grundr. zu Vorles. uber die gricch. Synt.; Schleicher, Vergl. Griech.; Schmidt, Griech. Gr., etc.

[2] Brugmann (Griech. Gr., 1900, p. 225), who considers the ς in **οὕτως, κτλ.**, due to analogy merely, like the ς in **ἐγγύ-ς, κτλ**. But he sees an abl. idea in **ἐκ-τός**. Cf. also **οὐρανό-θε** like *coeli-tus*.

[3] Hadley, Ess. Phil. and Crit., p. 52.

The Greek plural uses for all three cases either "the locative in –**σι** or the instrumental forms in —**οις**."[1] "The forms in —**αις**, Latin —*is*, from –*a* stems, are a new formation on the analogy of forms from —*o* stems."[2] **᾽Αθήνησι** is locative plural. In the singular of consonant, **ι** and **υ** stems, the locative ending —**ι** is used for all three cases in Greek, as **νυκτί**. In the a declension the dative ending –**αι** is the same as locative **α**+**ι**. The form –**αι** contracts with the stem-vowel **α** into **ᾳ** or **η**. A few examples of the locative here survive, as in **πάλαι, ᾽Ολυμπίαι, θηβαι-γενής**.[3] **Χαμαί** may be either dative or locative. In the *o* declension also the dative ending –**αι** is the usual form, contracting with the *o* into **ῳ**. But a few distinct locative endings survive, like **᾽Ισθμοῖ, οἴκοι** (cf. **οἴκῳ**), **ποῖ**, etc. The Homeric infinitive **δόμεν** and the infinitive like **φέρειν** are probably locatives also without the **ι**, while the infinitives in –**αι** (**δόμεναι, δοῦναι, λελυκέναι, λύεσθαι, λῦσαι,** etc.) are datives.[4] The instrumental has left little of its original form on the Greek singular. The usual Sanskrit is *a*. Cf. in Greek such words as **ἅμα, ἕνεκα, ἵνα, μετά, παρά, πεδά**, possibly the Doric **κρυφᾶ**, Lesbian **ἄλλα**. Brugmann[5] thinks the Laconic **πή-ποκα**= Attic **πώ-ποτε** is instrumental like the Gothic *he* (English *why*). Cf. *the* in "the more the better," etc. Another Greek suffix —**φι** (Indo-Germanic, *bhi*) is found in Homer, as **βίηφι, θεόφιν** (plural). But this –**φι** was used also for ablative or locative, and even genitive or dative. It is clear therefore that in Greek the usual seven (eight with the vocative) Indo-Germanic cases are present, though in a badly mutilated condition as to form. The ideas, of course, expressed by the cases continued to be expressed by the blended forms. In actual intelligent treatment it is simpler to preserve the seven case-names as will be seen later.

(b) THE BLENDING OF CASE—ENDINGS. This is a marked peculiarity of the Indo-Germanic tongues. Neuter nouns illustrate

[1] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 287.

[2] Ib., p. 290. For survivals of the dat. —at see the Rhodian **ταῖ**, (Bjorkegren, De Sonis dial. Rhod., p. 41).

[3] Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 228. Cf. the Lat. *domi, Romoe*(i). For numerous exx. of loc. and dat. distinct in form in the various dialects see Meister, Griech. Dial., Bd. II, pp. 61 ff.; Hoffmann, Griech. Dial., Bd. I, p. 233 (dat. —**αι**, loc. --**ι**; dat. —**ωι**, loc. —**οι**). Cf. Collitz and Bechtel, Samml. d. griech. dial. Inschr., p. 308. [4] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 278 f.

[5] Griech. Gr., 3. Aufl., p. 229. Cf. K.-B1., II., pp. 301-307, for examples of the survival of abl., loc. and instr. forms in Gk. adverbs. Cf. also Meister, Griech. Dial., II., p. 295, for survivals of instr. forms in Cypriotic dial. (**ἀρᾶ, εὐχωλᾶ**). See Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I. Tl., p. 194.

the same tendency, not to mention the dual. The analytic process has largely triumphed over the synthetic case-endings. Originally no prepositions were used and all the word-relations were expressed by cases. In modern French, for instance, there are no case-endings at all, but prepositions and the order of the words have to do all that was originally done by the case-forms. In English, outside of the old dative form in pronouns like *him, them*, etc., the genitive form alone remains. Finnish indeed has fifteen cases and several other of the ruder tongues have many.[1] On the other hand the Coptic had no case-endings, but used particles and prepositions like NTE for genitive, etc. It is indeed possible that all inflectional languages passed once through the isolating and agglutinative stages. English may some day like the Chinese depend entirely on position and tone for the relation of words to each other.

(C) ORIGIN OF CASE, SUFFIXES. Giles[2] frankly confesses that comparative philology has nothing to say as to the origin of the case-suffixes. They do not exist apart from the noun-stems. Some of them may be pronominal, others may be positional (postpositions), but it adds nothing to our knowledge to call some of the cases local and others grammatical. They are all grammatical. The ablative and the locative clearly had a local origin. Some cases were used less often than others. Some of the case-forms became identical. Analogy carried on the process. The desire to be more specific than the case-endings led to the use of prepositional adverbs. As these adverbs were used more and more there was "an ever-increasing tendency to find the important part of the meaning in the preposition and not in the case-ending."[3] In the modern Greek vernacular, as already stated, only three case-forms survive (nominative, genitive, accusative), the dative vanishing like the ablative.[4]

[1] Farrar, Gr. Synt., p. 23.

[2] Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 271. Bergaigne (Du Role de la Deriv. dans la Decl. Indo-Europ., Mem. de la Soc. de Ling. de Paris, to. ii, fasc. 5) and G. Meyer (Zur Gesch. der indo-germ. Stammb. and Decl.) both argue that case-endings had no distinctive meaning in themselves nor separate existence. But see also Hirt, Handb. etc., pp. 231-288, for careful treatment of the cases. On the general subject of syncretism in the Gk. cases see Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 1. Tl., pp. 189 ff., 195 f. See also Sterrett, Horn. II., N. 15, for traces of abl., loc. and instr. forms in Hom. (loc. –ι, --θι; instr., –φι, –φιν; abl., –θεν).

[3] Giles, *op. cit*., p. 273.

[4] Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 149. Cf. also Keck, Uber d. Dual bei d. griech. Rednern etc., 1882.

3. Number (ἀριθμός) in Substantives. The N. T. Greek has lost the dual (δυικός) and uses only the singular (ἑνικός) and the plural (πληθυντικός). The Sanskrit and the Hebrew had the dual, but the Latin had only *duo* and *ambo* (and possibly *octo* and *viginti*) which had a plural inflection in the oblique cases. Coptic[1] had no plural nor dual save as the plural article distinguished words. English has only the dual twain, but we now say twins. The scholars do not agree as to the origin of the dual. Moulton[2] inclines to the idea that it arose "in prehistoric days when men could not count beyond two." It is more likely that it is due to the desire to emphasize pairs, as hands, eyes, etc., not to accept "Du Ponceau's jest that it must have been invented for lovers and married people."[3] In the oldest Indo-Germanic languages the luxury of the dual is vanishing, but Moulton considers its use in the Attic as a revival.[4] It never won a foothold in the AEolic and the New Ionic, and its use in the Attic was limited and not consistent.[5] The dual is nearly gone in the late. Attic inscriptions,[6] while in the κοινή it is only sporadic and constantly vanishing in the inscriptions and papyri.[7] In Pergamum[8] and Pisidia[9] no dual appears in the inscriptions. The only dual form that occurs in the LXX and the N. T. is δύο (not δύω) for all the cases (as genitive in 1 Tim. 5:19), save δυσί(ν) for the dative-locative-instrumental, a plural form found in Aristotle, Polybius, etc., and called a barbarism by Phrynichus.[10] Only in 4 Macc. 1:28 A δυοῖν is found, but δυεῖν in אV, as in Polybius and the Atticists (Thackeray, p. 187). For examples of δυσί(ν) see Mt. 6:24 = Lu. 16:13; Ac. 21:33; Heb. 10:28, etc. In the papyri, however, δύω, δυῶ, δυεῖν occasionally appear[11] along with δυσί(ν). In the modern Greek the dual is no longer used. Ἄμφω has vanished in the N. T. while ἀμφότεροι occurs fourteen times (Mt. 9:17, etc.),

[1] Tattam's Egyp. Gr., p. 16. [2] Prol., p. 57.

[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 23. Cf. Geiger, Ursp. d. Spr., § ix. Cf. Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 264. [4] Prol., p. 57.

[5] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 101. [5] Meisterhans, Att. Inschr., p. 201.

[7] Moulton, Cl. Rey,, 1901, p. 436. [8] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 138.

[9] Compernass, De Serm. Vulg. etc., p. 15. Tatian (p. 96 of his works) shows a dual.

[10] Rutherford, New Phryn., p. 289 f. But cf. K.-BI., I, p. 362, for further items about the dual.

[11] Deissmann, B. S., p. 187. For δυσί(ν) in the inscriptions see Dittenberger, 118. 22, etc. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 313. For similar situations in the LXX MSS. (τοῖς δύο, τοῖς δυσί, and A δυοῖν, א δυεῖν) see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 53. Cf. also C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 25.

once (Ac. 19:16) apparently in the sense of more than two, like the occasional use of the English "both" and the Byzantine use of ἀμφότεροι and "two clear examples of it in NP 67 and 69 (iv/A.D.)."[1] Once for all then it may be remarked that in the N. T. both for nouns and verbs the dual is ignored. The dual was rare in the later Ionic and the κοινή follows suit (Radermacher, *N. T. Gk.*, p. 184). The syntactical aspects of number are to be discussed later.

4. Gender (γένος) in Substantives. In the long history of the Greek language gender has been wonderfully persistent and has suffered little variation.[2] It is probably due to the natural difference of sex that grammatical gender[3] arose. The idea of sense gender continued, but was supplemented by the use of endings for the distinction of gender. This personification of inanimate objects was probably due to the poetic imagination of early peoples, but it persists in modern European tongues, though French has dropped the neuter (cf. the Hebrew) and modern English (like the Persian and Chinese) has no grammatical gender save in the third personal pronoun (*he, she, it*) and the relative.[4] Analogy has played a large part in gender.[5] The Sanskrit, Latin and Greek all gave close attention to gender and developed rules that are difficult to apply, with many inconsistencies and absurdities. In Greek ἥλιος is masculine and σελήνη feminine, while in German we have *die Sonne* and *der Mond*. Perhaps we had better be grateful that the Greek did not develop gender in the verb like the Hebrew verb. Moulton[6] thinks it "exceedingly strange" that English should be almost alone in shaking off "this outworn excrescence on language." The N. T., like Homer and the modern Greek, preserves the masculine (ἀρσενικόν), feminine (θηλυκόν) and neuter (οὐδέτερον). Some words indeed have common (κοινόν) sex, like ὁ ἡ παῖς, ὄνος, θεός, while others, applied to each sex, are called epicene (ἐπίκοινον), like ἡ ἀλώπηξ, ἄρκτος. In German we actually have das *Weib* ('wife')!

(a) VARIATIONS IN GENDER. They are not numerous. ἄβυσσος (χώρα) is a substantive in the LXX (Gen. 1:2, etc.) and the N. T. (Lu. 8:31, etc.), elsewhere so only in Diogenes Laertes.

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 80. [2] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 103.

[3] Paul, Prim of Hist. of Lang., pp. 289 ff. Brugmann thinks that gender came largely by formal assimilation of adj. to subst. as ἄνθρωπος κακός, χώρα ἱερά. Dan. Crawford, the Bantu missionary, claims 19 genders for Bantu.

[4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 26 f. [5] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 64, 259.

[6] Prol., p. 59. On the whole subject of gender see K.-B1., I, pp. 358 ff.

In Mk. 14:3 W. H. and Nestle properly read τὴν ἀλάβαστρον, though the Western and Syrian classes give τὸν ἀλ. after Herodotus, and a few of the late MSS. τὸ ἀλ. In Rev. 8:11 ὁ (not ἡ) ἄψινθος is read, though א and some cursives omit the article, because the word is a proper name. In Mk. 12:26 all editors have ὁ βάτος (the Attic form according to Moeris), elsewhere ἡ βάτος (Lu. 20:37; Acts 7:35). θεός may be either masculine as in Ac. 19:11 or feminine as in Ac. 19:37, but in Ac. 19:27 we have θέα (Text. Rec. also in 35, 37), an "apparently purposeless variation."[1] Thieme (*Die Inschr. von Magn*., p. 10) says that ἡ θεός is used in the inscriptions of Asia Minor in formal religious language. Burnet (*Review of Theology and Philosophy,* 1906, p. 96) says that in Athens ἡ θεός was used in every-day language, but ἡ θεά in the public prayers, thus taking the Ionic θεά. Cf. Mayser, *Gr. d. griech. Papyri* (*Laut- and Wortlehre*, 1906), p. 254 f., for papyri illustrations. Blass[2] considers ἡ **Ἰερουσαλήμ** (Ac. 5:28, etc., the common form in LXX, Luke and Paul) feminine because it is a place-name, and hence he explains πᾶσα **Ἰεροσόλυμα** (Mt. 2:3) rather than by πόλις understood. Ληνός in Rev. 14:19 strangely enough has both masculine and feminine, τὴν ληνόν . . . τὸν μέγαν but א fem. (*bis*). The feminine is the common construction, but the masculine is found in LXX in Is. 63:2 only. Λίθος is always ὁ in the N. T., even when it means a precious stone (Rev. 5 times), where Attic after 385 B.C.[3] had ἡ. Λιμός is masculine in Lu. 4:25 as in the Attic, but is chiefly feminine in Acts and Luke, like the Doric and late Attic, as in Lu. 15:14; Acts 11:28.[4] In Lu. 13:4, Jo. 9:7, 11 we have ὁ **Σιλωάμ**, while Josephus has both ἡ (*War*, V, 12. 2) and ὁ (*War*, II, 16. 2). Blass[5] explains the use of ὁ in the Gospels by the participle ἀπεσταλμένος in Jo. 9:7. Στάμνος in Heb. 9:4 is feminine after the Attic instead of the Doric ὁ στ., as in Ex. 16:33. In Rev. 21:18 (21) we read also ὁ ὕαλος rather than ἡ ὕαλος as is customary with

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 60, but he adds "is explained by inscriptions." Cf. Nachmanson, Magn. Inschr., p. 126, for many exx.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 32. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 160. Mk. and Jo. have only τὸ **Ἰεροσόλυμα** and Mt. usually.

[3] Meisterhans, Att. Inschr., p. 129.

[4] Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157. Moulton (Prol., p. 60) finds λιμός now masc. and now fern. in the pap. LXX MSS. show similar variations. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 45; Thack., p. 145 f., for same situation in LXX concerning βάτος, ἀλάβαστρος **(--ον),** ληνός, στάμνος. Cf. C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 27, for further exx.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 32.

precious stones.[1] Ὕσσωπος (Heb. 9:19; Jo. 19:29) reveals its gender only in the LXX (Lev. 14:6, 51 f.) where it is masc. in BA, fem. in E and 1 (3) Ki. 4 : 19 BA. The neuter τὸ ἄλας occurs in papyri as early as third century B.C. (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, 1908, p. 177).

(b) INTERPRETATION OF THE LXX. In Ro. 11:4 Paul uses τῇ βάαλ rather than the frequent LXX τῷ βάαλ. The feminine is due, according to Burkitt, to the Q'ri, בֹּשֶׁת. (αἰσχύνη). Moulton speaks of ἡ βάαλ as occurring "three times in LXX and in Ascensio Isaiae 12."[2] But ἡ βάαλ occurs "everywhere in the prophetic books, Jer., Zeph., Hos., etc." (Thayer), though not so common in the historical books, far more than the "three times" of Moulton. In Mk. 12:11 and Mt. 21:42 the LXX αὕτη is due to זֹאת, though the translators may have "interpreted their own Greek by recalling κεφαλὴν γωνίας."[3] In Gal. 4:25 Paul has not mistakenly used τό with Ἄγαρ, for he is treating the name as a word merely. Any word can be so regarded.

(c) VARIATIONS IN GENDER DUE TO HETEROCLISIS AND METAPLASM. These will be discussed a little later. Delbruck thinks that originally all the masculine substantives of the first or α declension were feminine and that all the feminine substantives of the second or o declension were masculine.

5. The First or α Declension. There was a general tendency towards uniformity[4] in this declension that made it more popular than ever. Here only the N. T. modifications in this general development can be mentioned.

(a) THE DORIC GENITIVE—ABLATIVE SINGULAR α. This form survives in βορρᾶ (Lu. 13:29; Rev. 21:13) and was common in the Attic after 400 B.C. Note also μαμωνᾶ (Lu. 16:9). It is frequent in the LXX, papyri, inscriptions, though mainly in proper names. These proper names in –ας, chiefly oriental, make the genitive-ablative in —ᾶ or, if unaccented —ας, in a. So **Ακύλα** and **Ἀκύλου** in papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 187), though, no gen. in N. T. (only -ας and -αν) **Ἀγρίππα**[5] (Ac. 25:23), **Ἀνανία**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26. Cf. Theophrast, De lapid. 49, fors ἡ ὕελος.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 59. He corrects this *erratum* in note to H. Scott.

[3] Ib.

[4] Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 106. Swete, 0. T. in Gk., p. 304 f., has some good illustrations and remarks about the declensions in the LXX.

5 Both **Ἀγρίππα** and **Ἀγρίππου** occur in the pap. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 34 and 434. This gen. in —α gradually became "a ruling principle" for all substantives in —ας (Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 108, 110). See Thumb,

(from –ας, so Thayer), **Ἄννα** (Lu. 3:2), **Ἀντίπας** (indeclinable here or mere slip for –α, Rev. 2:13), **Ἀρέτα** (2 Cor. 11:32), **Βαραββᾶ** (gen. does not appear, only nom. –ας as Mk. 15:7, and accus. –ᾶν as 15:11, etc.), **Βαρνάβα** (Gal. 2:1; Col. 4:10; see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 187), **Ἐπαφρᾶ** (Col. 1:7), **Ἑρμᾶν** (Ro. 16:14, Doric accusative), **Ζηνᾶν** likewise (Tit. 3:13); **Ἡλεία** (Lu. 1:17) according to **א**B (so W. H.) **Ἰούδα** (person, Lu. 3:33; Mk. 6:3; tribe, Mt. 2:6; Heb. 8:8; land, Lu. 1:39), **Ἰωνᾶ**, (Mt. 12:39), **Καιάφα** (Lu. 3:2; Jo. 18:13), **Κηφᾶ** (1 Cor. 1:12), **Κλωπᾶ** (Jo. 19:25), **Λουκᾶς** (only in nominative, as Col. 4:14, but genitive would be –ᾶ), **Σατανᾶ** (Mk. 1:13), **Σίλας** (dative **Σίλᾳ**. in Ac., and genitive **Σίλα** in Jos. Vit., 17), **Σκευᾶ** (Ac. 19:14), **Στεφανᾶ** (1 Cor. 1:16). Nachmanson finds the Doric genitive fairly common with such short proper names and mentions **Σηνᾶ** in his list.[1] Very common in modern Greek, cf. Hatzidakis, *Einl*., p. 76.

(b) THE ATTIC GENITIVE-ABLATIVE. The usual Attic form for the masculine gen. abl. (**ου**) is found also as in **Αἰνέας** (so Lobeck, *Prol. Pathol*., p. 487), **Ἀνδρέου** (Mk. 1:29), **Βαραχίου** (Mt. 23:35), **Ἐζεκίου** (so LXX), **Ἡλείου** (Lu. 4:25), **Ἡσαίου** (Mt. 3:3, etc.), **Ἱερεμίου** (Mt. 2:17), **Λυσανίου** (Lu. 3:1), **Οὐρίου** (Mt. 1:6), **Ζαχαρίου** (Lu. 1:40). These Hebrew proper names ended in but receive the regular inflection for masculine nouns of the first declension. There are likewise some proper names in –ης with genitive-ablative in –**ου**. **Ἰαννῆς** and **Ἰαμβρῆς** (2 Tim. 3:8) only appear in the N. T. in the nominative. **Κρήσκης** (2 Tim. 4:10) and **Πούδης** (2 Tim. 4:21) belong to the 3d declension. **Εὐφράτης** (Rev. 9:14; 16:12) has only accusative and dative (instrumental-locative) in the oblique cases in the N. T., though the genitive-ablative form is –**ου**. **Ἡρῴδου** (Mt. 2:1) and **Ἰορδάνου** (Mt. 3:5) follow the usual rule like **ᾨδου** (Mt. 16:18). **Ἀπελλῆς** (Ro. 16:10), **Ἑρμῆς** (Ro. 16:14), like **κοδράντης** (Mt. 5:26) and **φελόνης** (2 Tim. 4:13), have no oblique case in the N. T. save the accusative (-ῆν).[2] **Ἰωάνης** in W. H. always has genitive-ablative in –**ου** for the Apostle and in Jo. 1:42; 21:15, 16, 17, for the father of Simon Peter, though **Βαριωνᾶ** in Mt. 16:17.[3] So for John Mark (Acts 12:12).

Handb., p. 49. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., pp. 160-166. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 33, for LXX illustrations.

[1] Magn. Inschr., p. 120. Cf. also Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 139.

[2] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 94.

[3] Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 159. See Nachmanson (Magn. Inschr., p. 119) and Schweizer (Perg. Inschr., p. 138 f.) for illustrations of these points from the **κοινή** inscr. The gen. in –**ου** is more common in the pap. than that in

Σωσθένης has accusative in –ην (Ac. 18:17) for the first declension and is heteroclite.[1] We have only ξεστῶ in Mk. 7:4. Words like νεανίας have the genitive-ablative in –ου (Ac. 7:58).

(c) Voc. in —α of masc. nouns in -της in δέσποτα, ἐπιστάτα, καρδιογνῶστα, ὑποκριτά. Cf. ᾅδη.

(d) WORDS IN –ρα AND PARTICIPLES IN —υῖα. These come regularly[2] to have the genitive-ablative in --ης and the dative-locative-instrumental in –ῃ like the Ionic. Moulton[3] indeed thinks that "analogical assimilation," on the model of forms like δόξα, δόξης, had more to do with this tendency in the κοινή than the Ionic influence. Possibly so, but it seems gratuitous to deny all Ionic influence where it was so easy for it to make itself felt. The "best MSS."[4] support the testimony of the papyri and the inscriptions here.[5] So W. H. read μαχαίρης (Rev. 13:14), πλημμύρης (Lu. 6: 48), πρῴρης (Ac. 27:30), Σαπφείρῃ (Ac. 5:1), σπείρης (Ac. 21:31; 27:1). In Acts B is prone to have —ας, —ᾳ as with D in Ac. 5:1, but W. H. do not follow B here. In Ac. 5:2 συνειδυίης may be compared with ἐπιβεβηκκυίης (1 Sam. 25:20), and other examples in the LXX,[6] but the forms –υίας, --υίᾳ still survive in the Ptolemaic period.[7] The preference of the LXX MSS. and the early papyri for μαχαίρας (–ρᾳ) shows that it is a matter of growth with time. In the early Empire of Rome –ρης forms are well-nigh universal. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 142. On the other hand note the adjective στειρᾳ, (Lu. 1:36). Words like ἡμέρα (—ρα) and ἀλήθεια, μία (ια, εια) preserve the Attic inflection in —ας, ᾳ.[8]

(e) THE OPPOSITE TENDENCY TO (d). We see it in such examples as Λύδδας (Ac. 9:38, but Soden reads –δης with EHLP) and Μάρθας (Jo. 11:1). Moulton[9] finds the Egyptian papyri giving Ταμύσθας as genitive. θέρμα is given by Lobeck, though not in N. T. (genitive –ης, Ac. 28:3), and note πρύμνα in Ac. 27:41.

—α. See Mayser, Gr. griech. Pap., 1906, p. 250 f. (Laut- u. Wortlehre). For the contracted forms see p. 252. It is also more frequent in the LXX. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 161 f.

[1] W.-Sch., p. 94. [2] B. S., p. 186.

[3] Prol., p. 48; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34. where a number of exx. are given like ἀρούρης, καθηκυίης, etc. Cf. Thumb, Hellen., p. 69. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 31-33, and Thack., Gr., p. 140 f., for similar phenomena in the LXX.

[4] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 156. [5] Deissmann, B. S., p. 186.

[6] Gregory, Prol., p. 117. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 81.

[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 48.

[8] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25.

[9] Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 434. For examples in Attic inscriptions see Meisterhans, p. 119 f. Cf. Σουσάννας in LXX, C. and S., Sel. fr. the LXX, p. 26.

Moulton[1] suggests that **Νύμφαν** (Col. 4:15 according to the correct text) is not clue to a Doric **Νύμφαν**, but by a "reverse analogy process" the genitive **Νύμφης** produced the short nominative **Νύμφα** like δόξα, δόξης. Blass[2] calls χρυσᾶν (Rev. 1:13) "a gross blunder, wrongly formed on the model of χρυσᾶς 1:12," but Moulton[3] holds that we have "abundant parallels."

(f) DOUBLE DECLENSION. This phenomenon appears in the case of **Νέαν Πόλιν** (Ac. 16:11) and **Ἱερᾷ Πόλει** (Col. 4:13), the adjective as well as the substantive being treated separately in the first and third declensions.

(g) HETEROCLISIS (ἑτερόκλισις) AND METAPLASM (μεταπλασμός). Blass[4] makes no distinction in his treatment of heteroclisis and metaplasm, though the distinction is observed in Winer-Schmiedel.[5] For practical use one may ignore the distinction and call all the examples metaplasm with Blass or heteroclisis with Moulton.[6] The fluctuation is rare for the first declension in the N. T. In Ac. 28:8 editors properly read δυσεντέριον rather than δυσεντερία (supported only by a few cursives). The form θεά (Ac. 19:27) and the usual Attic ἡ θεός (Ac. 19:37) are both found. This variation between the first and the second declensions is well illustrated by **Γομόρρας** (2 Pet. 2:6) and **Γομόρρων** (Mt. 10:15; —**οις**, Mk. 6:11 Rec.), **Λύστραν** (Ac. 14:6) and **Λύστροις** (Ac. 14:8). Moulton[7] finds abundant parallel in the Egyptian papyri use of place-names. In Rev. 1:11 ABC and some cursives read θυάτειραν instead of the usual θυάτειρα. So in Ac. 27:5 some of the MSS. read **Μύρραν** instead of **Μύρρα** as accus., a reading confirmed by Ramsay,[8] who found the accus. in —**αν** and the gen. in —**ων**. Moulton[9] cites ἡ **Ἱεροσόλυμα** from two MSS. of xi/A.D. (Usener, *Pelagia*, p. 50).

The chief variation between the first and second declensions appears in the compounds in –αρχης and (Attic) –αρχος. Moulton[10] finds examples of it *passim* in the papyri and calls the minute work of Winer-Schmiedel "conscientious labour wasted thereon." But Hort[11] does not think these variations in good MSS. "wholly

[1] Prol., p. 48. Cf. also his paper in Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc., Oct., 1893, p. 12.
[2] Gr., p. 25, but 4th ed., p. 28, cites P. Lond. I, 124, 26, χρυσᾶν ἢ ἀργυρᾶν.
[3] Prol., p. 48. "Falsche Analogie" acc. to W.-Sch., p. 81.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 28 f.
[5] Pp. 83 ff. Thack. (Gr., p. 153) includes heteroclisis under metaplasm.
[6] Prol., p. 48. [7] Ib., p. 244.
[8] St. Paul the Traveller, p. 129. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 48. [9] Ib.
[10] Ib. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.
[11] Notes on Orth., p. 156.

irregular." In the N. T. forms in -αρχης, like most of the dialects and the κοινή are greatly in the majority.[1] Thus in the N. T. we have Ἀσιάρχης (Ac. 19:31; not in nom. in N. T.), ἐθνάρχης (2 Cor. 11:32), πατριάρχης (Heb. 7:4), πολιτάρχης (Ac. 17:6, 8), τετραάρχης (Lu. 3:19), but always χιλίαρχος. In the addition of the β text to Ac. 28:16 the MSS. divide between στρατοπέδαρχος (HLP) and –άρχης (cursives). Ἑκατόνταρχος is the nominative in Mt. (8:5, 8; 27:54), and the accusative in —χον is found once in Acts (22:25). Elsewhere in all cases in Matthew, Luke and Acts the form in —χης is read by the best MSS. (as Ac. 10:1).

The first and the third declensions show variation in δίψος (old form δίψα) in 2 Cor. 11:27, where indeed B has δίψῃ instead of δίψει. Νίκη (the old form) survives in 1 Jo. 5:4, but elsewhere the late form νῖκος prevails (as 1 Cor. 15:54 f.). The LXX likewise shows τό δίψος, τὸ νῖκος interchangeably with the ἡ forms. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept*., p. 49; Thackeray, Gr., p. 157. The dative Ἰωάνει (third declension) instead of Ἰωάνῃ (first declension) is accepted a few times by W. H. (Mt. 11:4; Lu. 7:18; Rev. 1:1). Σαλαμίνῃ (first declension) for Σαλαμῖνι (third declension) in Ac. 13:5, Hort[2] considers only Alexandrian.

The third declension nouns often in various N. T. MSS. have the accusative singular of consonant stems in —ν in addition to —α, as χεῖραν in Jo. 20:25 (ℵAB), 1 Pet. 5:6 (ℵA). This is after the analogy of the first declension. Other examples are ἄρσεναν Rev. 12:13 (A), ασεβῆν in Ro. 4:5 (ℵDFG), ἀστέραν in Mt. 2:10 (ℵC), ἀσφαλῆν in Heb. 6:19 (ACD), Δίαν in Ac. 14:12 (DEH), εἰκόναν in Rev. 13:14 (A), μῆναν in Rev. 22:2 (A), ποδήρην in Rev. 1:13 (A), συγγενῆν in Ro. 16:11 (ABD), ὑγιῆν in Jo. 5:11 (ℵ). Blass[3] rejects them all in the N. T., some as "incredible," though properly recalling the Attic τριήρην, Δημοσθένην. Moulton[4] finds this conformation to the "analogy of first declension nouns" very common in "uneducated papyri, which adequately foreshadows

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 28; K.-B1., I, 3, 502. Cf. also W.-M., p. 70 f; W.-Sch., p. 82; Soden, p. 1387 f. For illustrations from the LXX see W.-M. Cf. also Nachmanson, Magn. Inschr., p. 121. For numerous pap. examples of compounds from ἄρχω see Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap. (Laut- u. Wortl.), p. 256 f. For the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 37 f. Thack., Gr., p. 156, finds —αρχης ousting —αρχος.

[2] Notes on Orth., p. 156. [3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26. Not in ed. 4.

[4] Prol., p. 49. Cf. Gregory, Prol., p. 118; W.-M., p. 76; Jann., pp. 119, 542; Psichari, Grec de la Sept., pp. 165 ff. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, 34 f., for this "very common" ace, in the pap. See Mayser, Gr. d. griech, Pap., p. 286 f.

its victory in modern Greek." The inscriptions[1] as well as the papyri have forms like γυναῖκαν, ἄνδραν, etc. It is these accusative forms on which the modern Greek nominative in ἄρχονται is made (of. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 47) and thus blended the first and the third declensions.[2] Hort[3] will accept none of these readings in the N. T. because of the "irregularity and apparent capriciousness" of the MS. evidence, though he confesses the strength of the testimony for ἀσφαλῆν in Heb. 6:19, συγγενῆν in Ro. 16:11, and χεῖραν in Jo. 20:25. These nouns are treated here rather than under the third declension because in this point they invade the precincts of the first. The LXX MSS. exhibit the same phenomena (ἐλπίδαν, μονογενῆν, etc.). See Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, p. 50; Thackeray, Gr., p. 147. The opposite tendency, the dropping of ν in the first declension .accusative, so common in modern Greek, is appearing in the papyri, as δεξιὰ χεῖρα (Volker, *Papyrorum Graecorum Syntaxis* etc., p. 30 f.).

(h) INDECLINABLE SUBSTANTIVES. These are sometimes inflected in some of the cases in the first declension. **Βηθανιά** is accusative in Lu. 19:29, and so indeclinable, like **Βηθφαγή**, but elsewhere it is inflected regularly in the first declension (so –ίαν Mk. 11:1, etc.) save once or twice in B. **Βηθσαιδά** has accusative **Βηθσαιδάν** in Mk. 6:45; 8:22, but it may be only another alternate indeclinable form (Thayer) like **Μ**αγαδάν. So likewise **Γ**ολγοθά has accusative in in Mk. 15:22. Hort[4] finds "the variations between **Μ**αρία and the indeclinable **Μαριάμ**" "singularly intricate and perplexing, except as regards the genitive, which is always –ίας, virtually without variation, and without difference of the persons intended." It is not necessary to go through all the details save to observe that as a rule the mother of Jesus and the sister of Martha are **Μαριάμ**, while Mary of Clopas is always **Μ**αρία. Mary Magdalene is now **Μαριάμ**, now **Μ**αρία. In the Aramaic as in the Hebrew probably all were called **Μαριάμ**. **Μ**αρία is merely the Hellenized form of **Μαριάμ**. It is probably splitting too fine a hair to see with Hort[5] a special appropriateness in **Μαριάμ** in Jo. 20:16, 18.

6. The Second or o Declension. There is no distinctively feminine inflection in the o declension, though feminine words oc-

[1] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 133.

[2] Cf. Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 156 f.; Schmid, Atticismus, IV, 586.

[3] Notes on Orth., p. 158. Kretschmer (Entst. der **κοινή**, p. 28) finds this ace. in —αν in various dialect inscriptions. Cf. also Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 24, for χάριταν, etc. [4] Notes on Orth., p. 156. [5] Ib.

cur, like ἡ ὁδός. But the neuter has a separate inflection. Modern Greek preserves very few feminines in –ος.[1] Thumb (*Handb*., p. 53 f). gives none. The main peculiarities in the N. T. are here noted.

(a) THE SO-CALLED ATTIC SECOND DECLENSION. It is nearly gone. Indeed the Attic inscriptions began to show variations fairly early.[2] The κοινή inscriptions[3] show only remains here and there and the papyri tell the same story.[4] Already λαός (as Lu. 1:21) has displaced λεώς and ναός (as Lu. 1:21) νεώς, though νεκόρος survives in Ac. 19:35. **Ἀνάγαιον** likewise is the true text in Mk. 14:15 and Lu. 22:12, not ἀνώγεων nor any of the various modifications in the MSS. In Mt. 3:12 and Lu. 3:17 ἡ ἅλων may be used in the sense of ἡ ἅλως (see Thayer) by metonymy. The papyri show ἅλως (Attic second declension) still frequently (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, Feb., 1908, p. 180). Cf. same thing in LXX. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept*., p. 49 f.; Con. and Stock, *Sel. fr.* LXX, p. 26; Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 144. **Ἀπολλώς** has accusative in –ών in 1 Cor. 4:6 and Tit. 3:13, though the Western and Syrian classes have –ώ in both instances. In Ac. 19:1 **Ἀπολλώ** is clearly right as only A^2L 40 have –ών. The genitive is **Ἀπολλώ** without variant (1 Cor. ter). So the adjective ἵλεως is read in Mt. 16:22 and Heb. 8:12, though a few MSS. have ἵλεος in both places. The best MSS. have **τὴν Κῶ** in Ac. 21:1, not **Κῶν** as Text. Rec. Cf. 1 Macc. 15:23. Blass[5] compares albc:os of the third declension.

(b) CONTRACTION. There is little to say here. The adjectives will be treated later. **Ὀστοῦν** (Jo. 19:36) has ὀστέα, accus. pl., in the best MSS. in Lu. 24:39 and ὀστέων in Mt. 23:27 and Heb. 11:22. So also ὀστέων in the Western and Syrian addition to Eph. 5:30. **Ὀρνέου** (Rev. 18:2) and ὄρνεα (Rev. 19:21) are without variant. The papyri show this Ionic influence on uncontracted vowels in this very word as well as in various adjectives (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 435). For examples in the LXX (as ὀστέων, 2 Ki. 13:21) see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 82, and Helbing, Gr. d. *Sept*., p. 36; Thackeray, p. 144; Con. and Stock, *Sel. fr. LXX,* p. 27. Moulton[6] considers it remarkable that the N. T. shows

[1] Jam., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 111 f. [2] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 127 f.

[3] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 123 f.; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 142.

[4] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34. See also Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., 1906, p. 259 f. For the LXX see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 38 f., where a few exx. occur.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25. **Νεώς** appears in 2 Macc. 6:2, etc.

[6] Prol., p. 48 f. He thinks it proof that the N. T. writers were not illiterate, since the pap. examples are in writers "with other indications of illiteracy." Cf. also Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.

no traces of the contraction of **κύριος** into **κύρις** and **παιδίον** into **παιδίν**, for instance, since the papyri have so many illustrations of this tendency. The inscriptions[1] show the same frequency of the **–ις**, **–ιν** forms which finally won the day in modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 61.

(c) THE VOCATIVE. In the o declension it does not always end in **ε** in the masculine singular. **θεός** in ancient Greek is practically always retained in the vocative singular. The N. T. has the same form as in Mk. 15:34 (cf. also Jo. 20:28), but also once (Mt. 27:46). This usage is found occasionally in the LXX and in the late papyri.[2] So also Paul uses **Τιμόθεε** twice (1 Tim. 1:18; 6:20). Aristophanes had **᾽Αμφίθεε**, Lucian **Τιμόθεε**, and the inscriptions **φιλόθεε**.[3] Note also the vocative **υἱὸς Δαυείδ** (Mt. 1:20) and even in apposition with **κύριε** (Mt. 15:22). The common use of the article with the nominative form as vocative, chiefly in the third declension, belongs more to syntax. Take as an instance of the second declension **μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον** (Lu. 12:32).

(d) HETEROCLISIS AND METAPLASM. Variations between the first and second declensions have been treated on p. 257. The number of such variations between the second and third declensions is considerable. **Νοῦς** is no longer in the second declension, but is inflected like **βοῦς**, viz. **νοός** (2 Th. 2:2), **νοΐ** (1 Cor. 14:15, 19). So **πλοός** in Ac. 27:9, not **πλοῦ**.[4] The most frequent interchange is between forms in **–ος**, masculine in second declension and neuter in the third. In these examples the N. T. MSS. show frequent fluctuations. **Τὸ ἔλεος** wholly supplants **τὸν ἔλεον** (Attic) in the N. T. (as in the LXX), as, for instance, Mt. 9:13; 12:7; 23:23; Tit. 3:5; Heb. 4:16, except in a few MSS. which read **ἔλεον**. Without variant we have **ἐλέους** and **ἐλέει**. On the other hand **ὁ ζῆλος** is the usual N. T. form as in the ancient Greek (so **ζήλω**, Ro. 13:13; 2 Cor. 11:2) , but **τὸ ζῆλος** is the true text in 2 Cor. 9:2 and Ph. 3:6. In Ac. 5:17 only B has **ζήλους**, and all read **ζήλου** in Acts 13:45. **῾Ηχος** is usually masculine and in the second declension, as in Heb. 12:19 (cf. Lu. 4:37; Ac. 2:2), and for the

[1] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 125; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 143. On the origin of these forms see Hatz., Einl., p. 318; Brug., Grundr., § 62 n.; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34.

[2] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 34, 434.

[3] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 81. In the LXX both **θεός** and **θεέ** occur. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 34; C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 26; Thack., p. 145.

[4] Cf. Arrian, Peripl., p. 176. See W.-Sch., p. 84, for similar exx. in the inscr., as **ῥοῦς**, **ῥοός** in late Gk. For pap. exx. of **βοῦν, πλοῦν** and **χοῦν** see Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 257 f., 268 f.

earlier according to Moeris and Blass.[1] In Lu. 21:25 W. H. read ἠχοῦς from ἠχώ but Hort[2] admits ἤχους from τὸ ἦχος to be possible, and Nestle reads ἤχους in his sixth edition. In Ac. 3:10 C reads θάμβου instead of θάμβους. In eight instances in Paul (2 Cor. 8:2; Ph. 4:19; Col. 1:27; 2:2; Eph. 1:7, 2:7; 3:8, 16) in the nominative and accusative we have τὸ πλοῦτος, but ὁ πλοῦτος in Gospels, Jas., Heb., Rev. The genitive is always --του. Τὸ σκότος instead of ὁ σκότος is read everywhere in the N. T. save in the late addition to Heb. 12:18 where σκότῳ appears, though ζόφῳ is the true text. The form δάκρυσιν (Lu. 7:38, 44) is from δάκρυ, an old word that is found now and then in Attic, but τὸ δάκρυον appears also in Rev. 7:17; 21:4; δακρύων may belong to either decl. Σάββατον (–του, --τῳ) is the form used in the N. T. always, as Mk. 6:2, but σάββασιν as Mk. 1:21, etc. B has σαββάτοις, like the LXX sometimes, in Mt. 12:1, 12. Κατήγωρ is accepted by W. H. and Nestle in Rev. 12:10 on the authority of A against אBCP, which have the usual κατήγορος. According to Winer-Schmiedel[3] this is not Greek, but a transliteration of the Aramaic קעיגור. Blass,[4] however, thinks it is formed on the model of ῥήτωρ.

Several words fluctuate between the masculine and the neuter in the second declension. In Lu. 14:16; Rev. 19:9, 17, several MSS. read δεῖπνος instead of the usual δεῖπνον. Like the old Greek, δεσμός has the plural δεσμά in Lu. 8:29; Ac. 16:26; 20:23, but οἱ δεσμοί in Ph. 1:13. Before Polybius –ζυγόν was more common. (Thayer), but in the N. T. it is ζυγός (Mt. 11:30). Ὁ θεμέλιος is the only form of the nom. sing. in the N. T., as 2 Tim. 2:10 (supply λίθος); Rev. 21:19, but τὰ θεμέλια (acc) in Ac. 16:24 like the LXX and the Attic. The plural θεμελίους we have in Help 11:10; Rev. 21:14, 19. θεμέλιον (acc.) may be either masculine, or neuter. In Ro. 11:10 ὁ νῶτος is used in the quotation from the 0. T. instead of the older τὸ νῶτον. In the early Greek ὁ σῖτος (never τὸ σῖτον) had a plural in σῖτα as well as σῖτοι. The same, thing is true of the N. T. MSS. for Ac. 7:12 except that they divide between τὰ σῖτα and τὰ σιτία, and σιτία is the correct text.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 28. Cf. LXX MSS., for like variations in 7-6 and ὁ ζ., ὁ ἔλεος and τὸ ἔλ., ὁ ἦχος and τὸ ἦ., ὁ πλοῦτος and τὸ πλ.. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 47 f. See p. 49 for σάββασι and σαββάτοις, δάκρυον, δάκρυσι and Cf. also Thack., Gr., pp. 153 ff.

[2] Notes on Orth., p. 158. See W.-Sch., p. 84, for exx. of ἤχους in the LXX. For similar variations in the inscr. see Nachrn., Magn. Inschr., p. 135.

[3] P. 85. So also Thayer, the Rabbins' name for the devil.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 29; Deiss., Light, p. 90; Raderm., Gr., p. 15.

Blass[1] indeed objects that σιτία does not suit the sense. Στάδιον has σταδίους rather than the Attic στάδια in Lu. 24:13; Jo. 6:19 (W. H. and Nestle, but Tisch. στάδια ℵD), and is a marginal reading in Rev. 21:16 instead of σταδίων.

(e) THE MIXED DECLENSION. Some substantives with special inflection have this. It is particularly in foreign names in the α and o declensions that this inflection became popular. "The stem ends in a long vowel or diphthong, which receives —ς for nom inative and --ν for accusative, remaining unchanged in vocative, genitive, and dative singular. **Ἰησοῦς** is the most conspicuous of many N. T. examples. It plays a large part in modern Greek."[2] Hence we have **Ἰησοῦς** nominative, **Ἰησοῦ** genitive-ablative, as Mt. 26:6; dative, etc., as Mt. 27:57; vocative Mk. 1:24. Some MSS. of the LXX have dative **Ἰησοῖ** in Deut. 3:21, etc. The accusative is **Ἰησοῦν**, as Mt. 26:4. **Ἰωσῆ** is the genitive of **Ἰωσῆς** according to the reading of Mt. 27:56 in W. H. Mg. instead of **Ἰσωήφ**, but in Mk. 6:3 **Ἰωσῆτος** is the reading. So runs **Λευείς** (nominative, Lu. 5: 29), **Λευεί** (genitive, Lu. 3 : 24), **Λευείν** (accusative, Lu. 5:27). Dative appears only in the LXX as Gen. 34:30 **Λευεί**. **Μανασσῆς** has accusative **Μανασσῆ** in Mt. 1:10 and the genitive in –ῆ (Rev. 7:6), but Hort[3] calls attention to the fact that ℵ[b]B have **Μανασσῆ** instead of the nominative in Mt. 1:10, making the word indeclinable.

(f) PROPER NAMES. **Ἰακώβ** is indeclinable in Mt. 1:2, but we have **Ἰάκωβον** in Mt. 4:21. Several proper names have only the plural, as **θυάτειρα** (Rev. 2:18, but B -ρη and ABC -ραν, 1:11), **Ἱεροσόλυμα** (Mt. 2:1, but πᾶσα 'I., 2:3), **Φίλιπποι** (Ac. 16:12), **Καῦδα** (Ac. 27:16), **Μύρρα** (Ac. 27:5), **Πάταρα** (Ac. 21:1), **Σάρεπτα** (Lu. 4:26), **Σόδομα** (Jude 7). The Latin words **μόδιος** (Mt. 5:15) and **μάκελλον** (1 Cor. 10:25) are inflected. So Latin proper names like **Ἰοῦστος** (Ac. 18:7) and **Παῦλος** (Ro. 1:1). For **Γομόρρας** and **Λύστραν** see 5 (g).

7. The Third Declension (consonants and close vowels **ι** and **υ**). The third declension could easily be divided into several and thus we should have the five declensions of the Sanskrit and the Latin. But the usual seven divisions of the third declension have the genitive-ablative singular in **--ος** (**--ως**). The consonantal

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 28. In the LXX MSS. we find **δεσμοί** and —ά, **ζυγοί,** and –ά**, θεμέλιοι** and —α**, νῶτοι** and —α**, στάδιον** and **στάδιοι, σῖτος** and **σῖτα**. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 46 f.; Thack., p. 154f. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 49.

[3] In the LXX proper names have great liberty in inflection. This is quite natural in a transl. Cf. Thack., Gr., pp. 160-171.

stems show more sweeping changes than the vocalic (sonantic) stems in this declension.[1] Only those changes that are related to the N. T. Greek can be here discussed.

(a) THE NOMINATIVE AS VOCATIVE. There is an increasing use of nominative forms as vocatives. This usage had long existed for nouns that were oxytone or had labial or guttural stems. Elsewhere in general the stem had served as vocative. No notice is here taken of the common use of the article with the nominative form as vocative, like ἡ παῖς (Lu. 8:54), a construction coming under syntactical treatment. According to Winer-Schmieder[2] the use of the singular without the article belongs also to syntax and the solution of W. H. is called "certainly false." Hort[3] had suggested that in the case of θυγάτηρ as vocative (Mk. 5:34; Lu. 8:48; Jo. 12:15) and πατήρ (Jo. 17:21, 24, 25) the long vowel (η) was pronounced short. Why not the rather suppose that the vocative is like the nominative as in the case of labial and guttural stems? The usage is thus extended sometimes to these liquids. Indeed, in Jo. 17:25 we have πατὴρ ἁγαθέ the adjective having the vocative form. In Mk. 9:19 (Lu. 9:41) we have ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος and ἄφρων in Lu. 12:20; 1 Cor. 15:36). See also ὦ πλήρης (Ac. 13:10) for —ες, which might be an indeclinable form like the accusative (II, 2 (f)). But these adjectives show that the usage is possible with substantives. There are indeed variant readings in the MSS. above, which have θύγατερ and πάτερ, but in Mt. 9:22 DGL have θυγάτηρ. Note also ἄνερ (1 Cor. 7:16) and γύναι (Lu. 13:12). For peculiarities in nom. see (d).

(b) THE ACCUSATIVE SINGULAR. The theoretical distinction that consonant-stems had the accusative singular in –α and vocalic stems in –ν began to break down very early. From the third century B.C. Jannaris[4] suspects that popular speech began to have all accusative singulars with ν, an overstatement, but still the tendency was that way. The use of ν with words like πόλιν, ναῦν (Ac. 27:41, only time in N. T., elsewhere vernacular πλοῖον), etc., together with the analogy of the first and second declensions, had a positive influence. See p. 258 for discussion of the double accusative ending –α plus ν, like ἄνδραν in the papyri.[5] These forms belong in reality to the third declension, though formed after the analogy of the first, and so were presented when first reached in the Lis-

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 121. [2] P. 90.

[3] Notes on Orth., p. 158. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35, gives μήτηρ as voc. three times in a iii/A.D. pap. (B.U.).

[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 119. [5] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 435.

cussion. However, there are other consonant-stems which form the accusative in –**ν** instead of –α. In Tit.3:9 and Ph. 1:15 we have ἔριν instead of ἔριδα.[1] So in Rev. 3:7 and 20:1 the Attic κλεῖν is read, for this is not a new tendency by any means, but Lu. 11:52 the MSS. have κλεῖδα, though here also D has κλεῖν. **K**λεῖδα is found in the LXX as in Judg. 3:25. **X**άριτα appears in Ac. 24:27 and Ju. 4, and A has it in Ac. 25:9, but the Attic χάριν holds the field (forty times).[2] In the LXX the Ionic and poetical χάριτα occurs only twice (Zech. 4:7; 6:14) and is absent from the papyri before the Roman period. Cf Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 150. For the irrational **ν** with **μείζω** in Jo. 5:36 see Adjectives. In Ac. 27:40 the correct text is ἀρτέμωνα, not **--ονα**, from nom. ἀρτέμων.

(c) THE ACCUSATIVE PLURAL. In Winer-Schmiedel (p. 88) ἔρεις is given as nominative and accusative except in 1 Cor. 1:11 (ἔριδες, nom.), but as a matter of fact the accusative plural does not appear in the N. T. except as an alternative reading ἔρεις in **א**^{c}ACKLP, in Tit. 3:9 (correct text ἔριν). In Gal. 5:20 W. H. put ἔρεις in the margin rather than ἔρις, probably "an itacistic error."[3] W. H. read τὰς κλεῖς in Rev. 1:18, but κλεῖδας in Mt. 16:19. In Ac. 24:27 χάριτας is supported by HP and most of the cursives against χάριτα (correct text) and χάριν (**א**^{c}EL, etc.). The accusative in **-νς** has changed into **-ας** with **--υ** and **--ου** stems, as βόας from βοῦς (Jo. 2:14 f., cf. LXX), βότρυας from βότρυς (Rev. 14:18), ἰχθύας from ἰχθύς (Mt. 14:17).[4] This simplification of the accusative plural was carried still further. Just as πόλεας had long ago been dropped for πόλεις, so βασιλέας has become –εῖς like the nominative, "and this accusative plural is regular in N. T. for all words in **--ευς**."[5] In the LXX **--εας** appears a few times, but since 307 B.C. the Attic inscriptions show **--εις** as accusative.[6] It is found indeed sometimes in Xenophon and

[1] Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157. For the LXX see Thack., p. 140; Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 40 f., where the N. T. situation is duplicated.

[2] See Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 151, for illustr. of these accs. in the inscr. For the pap. see Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35, both χάριτα and χάριν, etc. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 271 f.

[3] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157.

[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26, and W.-Sch., p. 86. Arrian has ἰχθύας. LXX MSS. (Thack., Gr., p. 147) show **νηός** and **νεώς, νῆας** and **ναῦς, βόας**. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 43. Usually ἰχθύας, p. 44.

[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26.

[6] Meisterh., p. 141. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 86. So the LXX. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 147 f.; Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p, 43. Wackern. (Indoger. Forsch., 1903,

Thucydides, though the strict Atticists disown it. Cf. γραμματεῖς in Mt. 23:34, etc. A few forms in —εας survive in the inscriptions.[1] Νήστεις (from νῆστις) is the correct accusative in Mk. 8:3 and Mt. 15:32. א here reads νήστις, but is unreliable on this itacism (Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157). The Achaean, Elean, Delphian and Phocian inscriptions[2] (Northwest Greek) have ithe accusative plural in –ες just like the nominative (cf. Latin).[3] It is very common in the modern Greek vernacular and in the papyri.[4] Moulton[5] finds many examples like γυναῖκες, μῆνες, ὄντες, πάντες, τέκτονες, τέσσαρες, etc. In the LXX τέσσαρες as accusative is very common as a variant in the text of Swete.[6] In Herodotus τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα is indeclinable and τρεισκαίδεκα in Attic since 300 B.C.[7] So in the N. T. some MSS. read τέσσαρες (though the most still have τέσσαρας) as אA in Jo. 11:17, א in Ac. 27:29, AP in Rev. 4 :4; 7: 1, א in Rev. 9:14.[8] In Rev. 4:4 the best authority (א, AP, etc.) is really on the side of τέσσαρες (second example).[9] Indeed "in the N. T. τέσσαρας never occurs without some excellent authority for τέσσαρες."[10] In the first 900 of Wilcken's ostraca, Moulton (*Prol*., p. 243) finds forty-two examples of accusative τέσσαρες and twenty-nine of τέσσαρας. Moulton[11] considers it probable that other nominative forms in Revelation, like ἀστέρες in A (Rev. 1:16), may be illustrations of this same tendency.

p. 371) thinks the acc. in —εις is due not to the nom. but to compensative lengthening.

[1] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 150.

[2] Also early in Phthiotis (J. Wackernagel, Zur Nominalinfl., indoger. Forsch., 1903, p. 368). Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 119; Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., 1906, p. 270 f.

[3] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 546.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 36. Cf. Volker, Pap. Grace. Synt., p. 28.

[5] Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 34, 435. Cf. also Buresch, Rhein. Mus., XLVI, 218.

[6] W.-Sch., p. 87.

[7] Ib. Cf. Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 163 f.

[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26. Cf. Jann., p. 120.

[9] Cf. Hort, Notes on Sel. Read., p. 138.

[10] Moulton, Prol., p. 36. "In Rev. CB have —ρας, א 3/5, AP 3/6." H. Scott.

[11] Ib. This use of —ες as acc. may be compared with the common acc. pl. in —ες in the mod. Gk. vernac. Cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 47 ff. Cf. nom. like ὁ πατέρας (Psichari, Ess. de Gr. Hist. Neo-grecque, 1886, l[e] partie, p. Even ἡμέρες, πολίτες, etc. In the Eleatic dial. the loc.-dat. pl. is —οις as in χρημάτοις. Cf. Meister, Bd. II, p. 61. The LXX MSS. show τέσσαρες as acc. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 54. The acc. in —ες rare in LXX MSS. outside of τέσσαρες. Thack., Gr., p. 148 f. Moulton (Prol., p. 243, ed. 2) suggests that this tendency started with τέσαρες because it is the only early cardinal that had a separate form for the acc. plural.

(d) PECULIARITIES IN THE NOMINATIVE. In general one may say that the various ways of forming the nominative singular in Greek are blending gradually into unity, the masculine in ς and the feminine in α or η. Many of the new substantives went over to the first declension.[1] Luke has gen. Ἐλαιῶνος, in Ac. 1:12 from nom. Ἐλαιών, and the papyri give nearly thirty examples of this noun.[2] Jos. also (*Ant*. vii, 9, 2) has Ἐλαιῶνος. On the other hand the use of Ἐλαία is frequent (in Jos. also), as εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, (Mt. 21:1). But in Lu. 19:29 we have πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν, (W. H.),and in Lu. 21:37 εἰς τὸ ὄρος κτλ. In both these examples it would be possible to have Ἐλαιών, not as an indeclinable substantive, but as a lax use of the nominative with ὁ καλούμενος (cf. Revelation and papyri). So Deissmann.[3] But even so it is still possible for Ἐλαιῶν to be proper (on the whole probably correct) in these two disputed passages.[4] It is even probable that the new nominative Ἐλαιών, is made from the genitive Ἐλαιῶν.[5] Ἔρεις is a variant with ἔρις in Gal. 5:20 (marg. W. H.), 1 Cor. 3:3; 2 Cor. 12:20; 1 Tim. 6:4, but in 1 Cor. 1:11 all MSS. have ἔριδες. W. H. once (Ac. 1:10) accept the rare form ἔσθησις (2, 3 Macc.) rather than the usual ἐσθής, though the Alexandrian and Syrian classes have it also in Lu. 24:4. In Lu. 13:34 אD read nominative not found in ancient Greek (Thayer), though the Doric used the oblique cases ὄρνιχος, etc.[6] Elsewhere in all MSS. the usual ὄρνις occurs, as Mt. 23:37, and in the N. T. only the nominative singular is found.[7] Another contrary tendency to the usual ς in the nominative singular is seen in ὠδίν (1 Th. 5:3; cf. also Is. 37:3) for the usual ὠδίς. The papyri show forms like ὀξύρριν.

One or two points about neuter substantives call for remark. The inflection in —ας, —αος = —ως, has nearly vanished.[8] A few examples still survive in the inscriptions.[9] In Lu. 1:36 the Ionic form γήρει from γῆρας is found, as often in the LXX and Test.

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 121.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 49; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. Deiss., B. S., pp. 208 ff.

[3] B. S., p. 210.

[4] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 93. Moulton (Prol., pp. 69, 235) has a full presentation of the facts.

[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 235.

[6] The form ὄρνιξι appears several times in the pap. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 149.

[7] W.-Sch., p. 89. LXX ὀρνίθων.

[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 26.

[9] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 156.

XII Pat.[1] **Κέρας** always in the N. T. (as in LXX) has the Attic plural **κέρατα** (Rev. 8 times) and **τέρας** regularly **τέρατα** (11 times). The plural **κρέα** (from **κρέας**) is the only form in the N. T. (1 Cor. 8:13; Rom. 14:21) as in the LXX, though a MSS. or so in each case has **κρέας** (singular).

(e) THE GENITIVE-ABLATIVE FORMS. These call for little remark save in the adjective, for which see later. **Σινάπεως** (from **σίναπι**) is uniform in the N. T., as Mt. 17:20. **Πήχυς** has no genitive singular in the N. T. though **πήχεος** is common in the LXX,[2] but has **πηχῶν** (from Ionic **πηχέων** or through assimilation to neuters in **–ος**), not the Attic **πήχεων**. In Jo. 21:8 only A Cyr. have **πήχεων** and in Rev. 21:17 only **א**.[3] For the genitive singular of **Ἰωσῆς** and **Μανασσῆς** see 6 (e).

(f) CONTRACTION. It is not observed in **ὀρέων** (Rev. 6:15) and **χειλέων** (Heb. 13:15). In both instances the Ionic absence of contraction is always found in the LXX (Prov. 12:14). This open form is not in the Attic inscriptions, though found in MSS. of Attic writers and the poets especially.[4] In the **κοινή** it is a "widespread tendency" to leave these forms in —os uncontracted, though **ἐτῶν** is correct in Ac. 4:22, etc.[5] So the LXX, Thackeray, Gr., p: 151.

(g) PROPER NAMES. **Μωυσῆς** has always the genitive-ablative **Μωυσέως** (Jo. 9:28), though no nominative **Μωυσεύς** is known. The genitive **Μωσῆ** appears usually in the LXX, as Num. 4:41, and the vocative **Μωσῆ** as in Ex. 3:4. Cf. Thackeray, Gr., p. 163 f. W. H. have **Μωυσεῖ** (always with v. r. **–σῇ**) as in Mk. 9:4, except in Ac. 7:44 where the form in **--ῇ** is due to the LXX (usual form there).[6] The accusative is **Μωυσέα** once only (Lu. 16:29), elsewhere **–ῆν,** as in Ac. 7:35 (so LXX). **Σολομών** (so in the nominative, not **–ῶν**) is indeclinable in **א** in Mt. 1:6 as usually in the LXX. But the best MSS. in Mt. 1:6 have the accasative **Σολομῶνα**, a few **–ῶντα**. So the genitive **Σολομῶνος** in Mt. 12:42,

[1] W.-Sch., p. 86. So Sir. 25:3, etc. The LXX also has the Ionic gen. **γήρους**. See Thack., Gr., p. 149; Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 42. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. Griech. Pap., p. 276. [2] As Ex. 25:9. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 87.

[3] Hort, Notes on Orth. But Xen. and Plut. (often) have **πηχῶν**. See W.-M., p. 75. In LXX note **πήχεος** and **πήχεως, πήχεων** and **πηχῶν**. Helbing, Gr., p. 45; Thack., p. 151.

[4] W.-Sch., p. 88. [5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 27.

[6] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 581-60, for discussion of the decl. of proper names in the LXX. The phenomena correspond to those in N. T. MSS. **Προμηθεύς** had an Attic nom. **–ής**, gen. **—έως**, Thumb, Handb., § 330. 1,

though a few MSS. have –ῶντος. The Gospels have uniformly the genitive in —ῶνος. But in Ac. 3:11 W. H. accept Σολομῶντος (so also 5:12), though BD etc. have ῶνος in 5:12. Cf. Ξενοφῶντος (from nominative –ῶν). Διοτρέφης (3 Jo. 9) and Ἑρμογένης (2 Tim. 1:15) occur in nom. There are other proper names (Roman and Semitic) which are inflected regularly like Βαβυλών (Mt. 1:11), Γαλλίων (Ac. 18: 12), Ἐλαιών (Ac. 1:12) Καῖσαρ (Mt. 22: 17), Σαρών (Ac. 9:35), Σιδών (Mt. 11:21), Σίμων (Mt. 4:18). There should be mentioned also Σαλαμίς (dative —῝ινι, Ac. 13:5). Cf. proper names in the LXX, Thackeray, Gr., pp. 163 ff.

(h) HETEROCLISIS AND METAPLASM. Most of the examples have already been treated under the first declension 5 (g) or the second declension 6 (d). The accusative ἅλα (Mk. 9:50) is like the old Greek ὁ ἅλς. Some MSS. (Western and Syrian classes) in Mk. 9:49 have ἁλί also. In Mk. 9:50 ℵLA have τὸ ἅλα as nominative (cf. Lev. 2:13) like γάλα. But the best MSS. (ℵBDLΔ) give τὸ ἅλας in the first two examples in 9:50 and ἅλα (accusative) in the third (so W. H.). So also Mt. 5:13 and Lu. 14:34. Cf. dative ἅλατι in Col. 4:6. In the LXX τὸ ἅλας is rare (Thackeray, Gr., p. 152). Papyri show τὸ ἅλας in third century B.C. (Moulton, and Milligan, *Expositor*, Feb., 1908, p. 177). Instead of ὄρνις in Rev. 18:2 we have the genitive ὀρνέου, from ὄρνεον (good old Greek word), ὀρνέοκις in Rev. 19:17, and ὄρνεα in 19:21. In Mk. 6:4 and Lu. 2:44 συγγενεῦσι. (cf. 1 Macc. 10:88) is probably[1] from συγγενεύς, not συγγενής. Cf. 1 Macc. 10:89. This is a good place for me to record the admiration which has possessed me as I have tested the work of Hort through the maze of details in the MS. evidence concerning the forms.

8. Indeclinable Words. These do not, of course, belong to any declension. Josephus Grecized most of the Hebrew proper names like Ἀμίναβος (Mt. 1:4, Ἀμιναδάβ).[2] Some he put in the first declension, many in the second and third declensions.[3] Blass[4] sums the matter up by observing that "the Hebrew personal names of the 0. T., when quoted as such," are indeclinable. This is an overstatement. But certainly many that in the LXX and the N. T. are not inflected, might have been, such, for instance, as Ἀαρών, Ἰακώβ, Κεδρών, Σαλμών, Συμεών, to go no further.[5] It is hardly worth while to give the entire list of these words.

[1] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158.
[2] Ib. for extensive list.
[3] W.-Sch., p. 91.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 29.
[5] Thack., Gr., p. 169, suggests that place-names in —ων are declined or indeclinable according to rank and distance.

They include such other words as the majority of those in the genealogy in Mt. 1 and that in Lu. 3, besides many other proper names,[1] including such geographical names as **Αἰνών, Βηθφαγή, Σιών, Σινᾶ**, etc.

There are other indeclinable Hebrew and Aramaic words such as **Κορβᾶν** (Mk. 7:11), **μάννα** (Rev. 2:17), **πάσχα** (Lu. 2:41), **σίκερα** (Lu. 1:15 as in LXX). The gender (fem.) of the indeclinable **οὐαί** (Rev. 9:12; 11:14) is probably due, as Blass[2] suggests, to **θλίψις**. In 1 Cor. 9:16 **οὐαί** is used as a substantive (so also LXX).

The use of **ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος** in the nominative after **ἀπό** in Rev. 1:4, etc., belongs more to syntax than to accidence. It is evidently on purpose (to express the unchangeableness of God), just as **ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος** is in apposition with **με** (Jo. 13:13) in lieu of quotation-marks.

II. THE ADJECTIVE (**ὄΟΝΟΜΑ ἐΠΙΘΕΤΟΝ**)

Donaldson[3] is probably right in saying that, in general, the explanation of the adjective belongs to syntax rather than to etymology. But there are some points concerning the adjective that demand treatment here.

1. The Origin of the Adjective. Adjectives are not indispensable in language, however convenient they may be.[4] In the Sanskrit, for instance, the adjective plays an unimportant part. Whitney[5] says: "The accordance in inflection of substantive and adjective stems is so complete that the two cannot be separated in treatment from one another." He adds[6] that this wavering line of distinction between substantive and adjective is even more uncertain in Sanskrit than in the other early Indo-Germanic tongues. Most of the Sanskrit adjectives have,three endings, the masculine and neuter being usually **α** stems while the feminine may have **α** or **ι**, this matter being "determined in great part only by actual usage, and not by grammatical rule." So likewise Giles in his *Comparative Philology* has no distinct treatment of adjectives. The adjective is an added descriptive appellative (**ὄνομα ἐπίθετον**) while the substantive is an essential appellative (**ὄνομα οὐσιαστικόν**). But substantives were doubtless

[1] See further list in W.-Sch., p. 91.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 32.
[3] New Crat., p. 502.
[4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p.' 29.
[5] Sans. Gr., p. 111.
[6] Ib. Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 117, for the adjectival use of the substantive.

used in this descriptive sense before adjectives arose, as they are still so used. So, for instance, we say brother man, Doctor A., Professor B., etc. Cf. in the N. T. ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ (Mt. 3:6), etc. This is, indeed, apposition, but it is descriptive apposition, and it is just at this point that the adjective emerges in the early period of the language.[1] Other Greek adjectives in form as in idea are variations from the genitive case, the genus case.[2] In itself the adjective is as truly a noun as the substantive. As to the form, while it is not necessary[3] that in every case the adjective express its gender by a different inflection, yet the adjectives with three genders become far commoner than those with two or one.[4] From the etymological point of view this inflection in different genders is the only distinction between substantive and adjective.[5] The Greek has a much more highly developed system of adjectives than the Sanskrit, which has survived fairly well in modern Greek, though a strong tendency is present to simplify adjectives to the one declension (--ος, —η, --ον). Participles, though adjectives in inflection, are also verbs in several respects and call for separative discussion. The process of treating the adjective as a substantive belongs to syntax.[6] The substantivizing of the adjective is as natural, though not so common in Greek as in Latin, as the adjectivizing of the substantive which we have been discussing.[7] The distinction between adjective and substantive is hard to draw in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 66). In modern Greek every adjective has a special feminine form. The development is complete. Cf. Thumb, pp. 66 ff.

2. Inflection of Adjectives. In Greek as in Sanskrit, the adjective has to follow the inflection of the substantive in the various declensions, the three genders being obtained by combining the first with the second or the third declensions.

(a) ADJECTIVES WITH ONE TERMINATION. Of course at first this may have been the way the earliest adjectives arose. Then the genders would be formed. But analogy soon led to the formation of most adjectives with three endings. Some of these

[1] Delbruck, Syntakt. Forsch., IV, pp. 65, 259. Cf. Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 239.

[2] Donaldson, New Crat., p. 474.

[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 30.

[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 139.

[5] Donaldson, New Crat., p. 502.

[6] Brug. (Griech. Gr., pp. 413-417) has no discussion of the adjective save from the syntactical point of view.

[7] See Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 414 f., for numerous exx. in the earlier Gk.

adjectives with one ending were used only with the masculine or the feminine, and few were ever used with the neuter.[1] Jannaris[2] considers them rather substantives than adjectives, but they illustrate well the transition from substantive to adjective, like ἄπαις, μάκαρ, φυγάς. In fact they are used of animated beings. In the N. T. we have ἅρπαξ (Mt. 7:15; 1 Cor. 5:10), πένης (2 Cor. 9: 9. Cf. πλάνητες, Jude 13 B), and συγγενίς (Lu. 1:36). Συγγενίς is a later feminine form like εὐγενίς for the usual συγγενής (both masculine and feminine) which Winer[3] treats as a substantive (so Thayer). Strictly this feminine adjective belongs[4] only to words in –τής and –εύς. Blass[5] quotes εὐγενίδων γυναικῶν by way of comparison. Modern Greek still has a few of these adjectives in use. The ancient adjectives in –ης (εὐγενής) have disappeared from the modern Greek vernacular (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 72).

(b) ADJECTIVES WITH TWO TERMINATIONS. Some adjectives never had more than two endings, the masculine and the feminine having the same form. In the so-called Attic second declension this is true of ἵλεως (Mt. 16:22). But a few simple adjectives of the second declension never developed a feminine ending, as, for instance, βάρβαρος (1 Cor. 14:11), ἐ(αἰ)φνίδιος (Lu. 21: 34), σωτήριος (Tit. 2:11).[6] In the N. T. ἥσυχος has changed to ἡσύχιος (1 Pet. 3:4). The adjectives in the third declension which end in –ης or –ων have no separate feminine form. So εὐγενής (Lu. 19:12), εὐσεβής (Ac. 10: 7) μείζων (Jo. 15:13), etc. Then again some simple adjectives varied[7] in usage in the earlier Greek, especially in the Attic, and some of these have only two endings in the N. T., like ἀΐδιος (Ro. 1:20), ἔρημος (Ac. 1:20, etc., and often as substantive with γῆ or χώρα not expressed), κόσμιος (1 Tim. 2:9), οὐράνιος (Lu. 2:13; Ac. 26:19), φλύαρος (1 Tim. 5:13), φρόνιμος (Mt. 25:2, 4, 9), ὠφέλιμος (1 Tim. 4:8; 2 Tim. 3:16). With still others N. T. usage itself varies as in the case of αἰώνιος (Mt. 25:46, etc.) and αἰωνία (Heb. 9:12; 2 Th. 2:16, and often as a variant reading); ἕτοιμος (Mt. 25:10) and ἑτοίμη (1 Pet. 1:5); μάταιος (Jas. 1:26) and ματαία (1 Pet. 1:18); ὅμοιος (Rev. 4: 3, second example correct text) and ὁμοία (Rev. 9:10,

[1] K.-B1., I, p. 547 f. [2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 143.
[3] W.-M., p. 80. But cf. W.-Sch., p. 97.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33. 5 Ib.
[6] Cf. K.-B1., I, p. 535 f., for fuller list. Some of the simple verbals in —τος also had no fem., as ὤνητος.
[7] In the LXX we see a very slight tendency towards giving a fem. form to all adjs. Thack., Gr., p. 172.

though W. H. put ὁμοίας in the margin instead of ὁμοίας, 19); ὅσιος (1 Tim. 2:8; so probably, though ὁσίους may be construed with ἐπαίροντας instead of χεῖρας). The early Attic inscriptions furnish examples of two endings with such adjectives as δόκιμος (no feminine example in the N. T.) and λοιπός with either two or three (N. T. only three).[1] The papyri furnish ἔρημος and οὐράνιος as feminine and others not so used in the N. T., as δίκαιος, μέτριος, σπόριμος.[2] It was the rule with compound adjectives to have only two endings, for the most of them never developed a feminine form, as ὁ (ἡ) ἄλογος.[3] This tendency survives in the inscriptions, especially with compounds of α– privative and prepositions, and in the papyri also we have abundant examples.[4] The N. T. usage is well illustrated by 1 Pet. 1:4, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον. Cf. Jas. 3: 17.

(c) ADJECTIVES WITH THREE TERMINATIONS. The great majority of Greek adjectives, like ἀγαθός, --ή, --όν, developed three endings and continue normal (cf. Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 68), as is universal in the modern Greek. Some of the compound adjectives also had three endings, especially compounds in —ικός and –ιος, as μοναρχική, ἀναξία (Plato).[5] The same thing is observed in the inscriptions[6] and the papyri.[7] In the N. T. we have several examples, as ἀργός, --ή (Attic always ἀργός, though Epimenides has --ή) in 1 Tim. 5:13;. Tit. 1:12; Jas. 2:20 according to BC. In Mk. 4:28 αὐτομάτη is not entirely new, for classic writers use it. In 2 Jo. 13 (and probably also 1) we have ἐκλεκτή. In Mt. 4:13 the MSS. give παραθαλασσία, but D has –ιον. However, in Lu. 6:17 παράλιος is the feminine form, though occasionally the LXX and older Greek had –ία, varying like the other compounds in –ιος. Other adjectives of three endings belong to the third and

[1] Cf. Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 148. Cf. also αιώνιος, κόσμιος, in Magnesia Magn. Inschr., p. 140). Aristophanes used βασίλειος, βέβαιος, μακάριος, οὐράνιος, πάτριος with two endings (G. Wirth, De Motione Adjectivorum, 1580, p. 51). This is true also of Euripides (ib., p. 49 f.). For further discussion of adjectives with two endings see Wilhelm, Zur Motion der Adjec. dreier End. in Griech. etc., p. 23; Wilhelm, Der Sprachgebr. der Lukianos etc., p. 23. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 57 f. On the whole the LXX shows the extension of the fem. so that adjs. which in Attic have two or three terminations have three in the LXX (ἄγριος, βέβαιος, δίκαιος, ἐλεύθερος, μάταιος). Thack., Gr., p. 172.

[2] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 289 f. [3] K.-B1., I, p. 538.

[4] Cf. Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 141; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 158; ayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 291.

[5] K.-B1., I, p. 538 f. [6] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 158.

[7] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 291.

the first declensions, like ὀξύς, ὀξεῖα, ὀξύ; πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν; ἑκών, ἑκοῦσα, ἑκον; μέλας, μέλαινα, μέλαν; μέγας, μεγάλη, μέγα; πλύς, πολλή, πολύ. Cf. the perfect active participle in –ώς, --υῖα, --ός. The LXX MSS. sometimes have πᾶν as indeclinable (πᾶν τὸν τόπον, etc.) like πλήρης. Cf. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, p. 51. Indeclinable πλήρης is retained by Swete in Sir. 19 : 26. Cf. Helbing, *ib*. See (f) below.

(d) THE ACCUSATIVE SINGULAR. Some adjectives of the third declension have ν after the analogy of the first declension. See this chapter, 1, 5, (g), for the discussion in detail. W. H. reject them all, though in a few cases the testimony is strong.[1] They are ἀσεβῆν (Ro. 4 :5), ἀσφαλῆν (Heb. 6:19), μείζων (Jo. 5:36), συγγενῆν (Ro. 16:11), ὑγιῆν (Jo. 5:11). The use of irrational ν with μείζω (Jo. 5:36 μείζων in ABEGMΔ) is likened by Moulton (Prol., p. 49) to irrational ν with subjunctive ᾖ (ᾖν). Cf. ch. VI, II (h), p. 220.

(e) CONTRACTION IN ADJECTIVES. Two points are involved, the fact of contraction (or the absence of it) and the use of α or η after ε, ι, ρ. The uncontracted forms of adjectives are not so common as is the case with substantives. Cf. this chapter, 1, 6, (b). The contracted forms are practically confined to forms in –ους, like ἁπλοῦς, διπλοῦς, ἀργυροῦς, πορφυροῦς, σιδηροῦς, χαλκοῦς, χρυσοῦς. Here again we have a still further limitation, for the uncontracted forms occur chiefly in the Apocalypse and in א and in the case of χρυσοῦς.[2] Cf. Rev. 4:4; 5:8, where א reads χρυσέους, –έας. But in Rev. 2:1 אPB read χρυσῶν, while AC have χρυσέων. Χρυσᾶν in Rev. 1:13, though accepted by W. H. and read by אAC, is rejected by Blass, but admitted by Debrunner (p. 28), as shown on p. 257. P. Lond. reads χρυσᾶν ἢ ἀργυρᾶν, and L. P.^{w} (ii/iii A.D.) also has χρυσῆν ἢ ἀργυρῆν.[3] In each instance probably analogy has been at work.[4] Thackeray (*Gr.*, p. 172 f.) gives a very few uncontracted forms in --εος in the LXX. W. H. accept the genitive βαθέως in Lu. 24:1 and πραέως in 1 Pet. 3:4 instead of the usual form in –ους. Hort[5] considers the variations in ἥμισυς as "curious," but they find abundant parallel in the

[1] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157 f. For pap. exx. of ὑγιῆν see Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 295. Thack. (Gr., p. 146) considers it a vulgarism, though it began as early as iv/B.C. (see Σωκράτην, τριήρην). It is common ii/A.D.

[2] Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 34 f., for LXX.

[3] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 35, 435.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 48. Cf. τὴν ἱερὴν κεφαλήν on Rom. tomb (Kaibel, Epigram. Graeca, 1878, p. 269).

[5] Notes on Orth., p. 158.

papyri as does χρυσέων above.[1] In Mk. 6:23 ἡμίσους, not --εος, is the genitive form, the usual (probably only) form in the papyri.[2] The neuter plural ἡμίσεα has practically no support in Lu. 19:8, though ἡμίση is the Text. Rec. on the authority of late uncials and cursives. **Τ**ὰ ἡμίσυ has slight support. W. H. read τὰ ἡμίσια (ℵBQ 382, L having itacistic —ια) and derive it from a possible ἡμίσιος.[3] But it is possible, if not probable, that ἡμίσεια was the earlier form changed by itacism to ἡμίσια.[4] The plural of νῆστις is νήστεις (Mk. 8:3; Mt. 15:32), and not νήστις as already shown.[5] For participles in –υία, –υίης see this chapter, p. 256. As a rule the forms in –υίης and –ρης predominate, but note στείρᾳ, in Lu. 1:36.[6] In the case of ὑγιής, whereas the Attic had accusative ὑγιᾶ (ὑγιῆ in Plato, *Phadr*. 89 d), the N. T., like the inscriptions, papyri and the LXX, has only ὑγιῆ (Jo. 5:11, 15; 7:23).[7] In Jo. 18: 1 χειμάρρου is almost certainly from χείμαρρος instead of the classical χειμάρροος.[8] In 2 Pet. 2:5 ὄγδοον is not contracted, though sometimes the papyri have ὄγδους, ὄγδουν.[9]

(f) INDECLINABLE ADJECTIVES. The papyri have cleared up two points of much interest here. One is the use of πλήρης in N. T. MSS. in an oblique case. In Mk. 4:28 Hort (*Appendix*, p. 24) suggests πλήρης σῖτον (C* two lectionaries) as probably the original. In Ac. 6:5 W. H. put ἄνδρα πλήρης in the margin, though πλήρη is read only by B among the MSS. of importance. In Jo. 1:14 all the MSS. (save D 5 followed by Chrys. and Theoph.) have πλήρης. Moulton[10] indeed suggests that πλήρη was the original text, which was changed to the vulgar πλήρης. But the argument can be turned round just as easily. In almost every N. T. instance of an oblique case of πλήρης good uncials have the indeclinable form (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 50). The LXX also has examples of indeclinable πλήρης (cf. Hort, *Appendix*, p.

[1] **Χ**ρυσέῳ is exceedingly common in the pap. (Moulton, Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 435).

[2] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 294 f. Cf. also Deiss., B. S., p. 186; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 34. So also the LXX, Thack., Gr., p. 179.

[3] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 15S. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 87. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 52.

[4] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 87. **Ἡ**μίσεια occurs in Antoninus Liberalis (ab. 150 A.D.) and οἰκεῖος is analogous.

[5] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 157. [6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25.

[7] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. For adjs. with acc. in —η (and sometimes ν added, —ην) see Dieterich, Unters., p. 175. Cf. this ch., II, 2, (d).

[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 25. [9] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 294.

[10] Prol., p. 50. See Cronert, Mem., p. 179; Turner, Jour. Theol. St., I, pp. 100 ff. Milligan (N. T. Doc. s, p. 65) finds one ex. of indecl. πλήρης B.C.

24). So Job 21: 24, ℵABC. The examples of πλήρης so used are "fairly common" in the papyri[1] and come as early as the second century B.C.[2] There seems therefore no reason to refuse to consider πλήρης in Jo. 1:14 as accusative and to accept it as the text in Mk. 4:28 and Ac. 6:5. The other example of indeclinable adjectives is found in comparative forms in –ω, like πλείω. Moulton[3] points out that in Mt. 26:53 ℵBD read πλείω δώδεκα λεγιῶνας, while the later MSS. have mended the grammar with πλείους. He quotes also Cronert[4] who has furnished abundant evidence from the papyri and literature of such a use of these forms just like πλήρης. Cf. Mayser, *Gr. d. griech. Papyri,* p. 63 f.

3. Comparison of Adjectives. The comparative is a natural development in the adjective, as the adjective itself is a growth on the substantive.

(a) THE POSITIVE (θετικὸν ὄνομα OR ὄνομα ἁπλοῦν). This is the oldest form of the adjective, the most common and the most persistent. It is not always true that the comparative and superlative forms represent an actually higher grade than the positive. The good is sometimes more absolute than better or even best. See ἀγαθός in Mk. 10:18, for instance. Sometimes indeed the positive itself is used to suggest comparison as in Mt. 18:8, **καλόν σοί ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν . . . ἢ δύο χεῖρας, κτλ.** This construction is common in the LXX, suggested perhaps by the absence of comparison in Hebrew.[5] The tendency of the later Greek is also constantly to make one of the degrees do duty for two. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 181. But this matter belongs rather to the syntax of comparison. Participles are, of course, used only in the positive save in a few cases where the adjective-idea has triumphed wholly over the verb-conception.[6] Verbals in —τος sometimes have comparison, though μᾶλλον, may be freely used with participles.

(b) THE COMPARATIVE (συγκριτικὸν ὄνομα). The stem may be (besides adjective) either a substantive (βασιλεύ-τερος) or an adverb (πρό-τερος). Cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 82. The primary comparative-ending –ιων, (Sanskrit *iyans*) is probably kin to the adjective-ending —ιος.[7] This form along with the superlative –ιστος is

[1] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. For the indecl. πλήρης in Acta Thomae see Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 24. Cf. Sir. 19 : 26. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 52. It is not till i/A.D. that it is common in the pap. Thack. (Gr., p. 176) thinks it not genuine in the LXX.

[2] lb., p. 435. But see Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 297.

[3] Prol., p. 50. [4] Philologus, LXI., pp. 161 ff. [5] W.-M., p. 302.

[6] K.-BI., I, p. 553; Schwab, Die Hist. Synt. d. griech. Comparative, 3. Heft, 1895, pp. 152 ff. [7] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 290; Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 30,

probably originally qualitative in idea and does not necessarily imply excess. In the modern Greek these forms are not used at all.[1] They have disappeared before the secondary comparative form —τερος, which even in the earlier Greek is far more common. The ending —τερος does imply excess and appears in various words that are not usually looked upon as comparatives, as ἕ-τερος (‘one of two), ἑκά-τερος (‘ each of two'), ἡμέ-τερος (nos-ter), ὑμέ-τερος (*vos-ter*), ὅσ-τερος.[2] So also δεύ-τερος like πρό-τερος (cf. Latin *al-ter*, English other) is a comparative form.[3] "The comparison-suffixes ιων, ιστος, τερος belong to the Indo-Germanic ground speech."[4] In the N. T. the forms in —ιων), as in the papyri,[5] hold their own only in the most common words. Schwab (*op. cit*., p. 5) makes —ατος older than --τατος. **Ἀμείνων** is not used in the N. T. and **Βέλτιον** only as an adverb once (2 Tim. 1:18). **Ἐλάσσων** appears four times, once about age as opposed to **μείζων** (Ro. 9:12), once about rank as opposed to **κρείσσων** (Heb. 7:7), once about excellence (Jo. 2:10) as again opposed **κρείσων**, and once as an adverb (**ἔλασσον**, 1 Tim. 5:9) in the sense of less, not **μικρότερος** (‘smaller’). **Ἧσσον** (neuter only) is found in 1 Cor. 11: 17 as opposed to **κρεῖσσον**, and as an adverb in 2 Cor. 12:15. **Κάλλιον** (Ac. 25:10) is an adverb. **Κρείσσων**, is confined to Peter, Paul's Epistles and Hebrews (some eighteen examples, ten of them in Heb.). **Μείζων** is common (some fifty times), though some of them displace the superlative as we shall see directly. The neuter plural (**μεῖζονα**) appears once as **μείζω** (Jo. 1:50).[6] Once also (3 Jo. 4) the double comparative form **μειζότερος** occurs, several similar examples appearing in the papyri, as **μειζότερος, μελαντώτερον, πρεσβυτερωτ́ρα**.[7] A few other examples in poetry and late Greek are cited by Winer-Moulton,[8] like **κρειττότερος, μειζονότερος, μειζό-**

[1] Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 73.

[2] Cf. Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 292; Brug., Indoger. Forsch., 1903, pp. 7 ff.

[3] Cf. Ascoli in Curtius' Stud. zur griech. and lat. Gr., 1876, p. 351.

[4] Schwab, Hist. Synt. d. griech. Comp., Heft I, 1893, p. 3.

[5] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 298. He mentions **βελτίων, ἐλάσσων, ἥσσων, πλείων (πλέων)**. For the inscr., Nachm. (Magn. Inschr., p. 143) adds **ἀμείνων** and **μείζων**.

[6] The pap. have many exx: of the form without **ν** as in **πλείω (ους)**, etc. See Mayser,. Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 298 ff. But the usage varies greatly. The LXX MSS. show similar variations. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 54 f. As LXX exx. of uniformity in form of comp. note **ἀγαθώτερος** and **αἰσχρότερος**, but only **ἐγγίων**(—στος), not **ἐγγύτερος** (-τατος), C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 29. Thack. (Gr., pp. 184 ff.) gives a careful summary of the exx. of –**ιων, --ιστος** in the LXX.

[7] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 35, 435.

[8] P. 81. Cf. also Dieterich, Unters. etc., p. 180, for **ὀλιζότερος**.

τερος itself, μειότερος, πλειότερος. Cf. English vernacular " lesser." Τάχιον (W. H. ειον), not θᾶσσον, is the N. T. form as we read in the papyri also.[1] Cf. Jo. 20:4, etc. Χείρων is found eleven times (cf. Mt. 9:16). The ending --τερος more and more the usual one. Cf. τομώτερος (Heb. 4:12). Some comparative adjectives are derived from positive adverbs like ἐξώτερος (Mt. 8:12), ἐσώτερος (Ac. 16:24), κατώτερος (Eph. 4: 9). These latter adjectives are common in the LXX and the later Greek, not to say Attic sometimes.[2] Διπλότερος (Mt. 23:15) is for the old Attic διπλούστερος. So Appian also. Cf. ἁπλότερον, Anthol. Pal., III, 158 (Dieterich, *Unters*., p. 181). The Ionic already had ὀλιγώτερος and ταχύτερος (Radermacher, Gr., p. 56). Cf. ἀγαθώτερος (Hermas, Mand. VIII, 9, 11) and ἀγαθώτατος (Diod., 16, 85). The rules for the use of —ώτερος and —ότερος apply in the N. T. As μᾶλλον is often used with the positive in lieu of the comparative ending, so it is sometimes with the comparative, a double comparative (μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον, Ph. 1:23; μᾶλλον πεισσότερν, Mk. 7:36), a construction not unknown to the classic orators of Athens where emphasis was desired.[3] Paul did not perpetrate a barbarism when he used ἐλαχιστότερος (Eph. 3:8), a comparative on a superlative. It "is correctly formed according to the rule of the common language."[4] Cf. also such a late form as ἐσχατώτερος.[5]

(C) THE SUPERLATIVE (ὑπερθετικὸν ὄνομα). As with the comparative, so with the superlative there are primary and secondary forms. The primary superlative ending –ιστος (old Indian *isthas*, Zend. and Goth. *ista*)[8] did not perhaps represent the true superlative so much as the dative (intensive like English "very") superlative.[7] It was never very widely used and has become extinct in modern Greek.[8] The κοινή inscriptions show only a few examples like ἄγχιστα, ἔγγιστα, κάλιστος, κράτιστος, μέγιστος, πλεῖστος.[9] In the papyri Mayser[10] notes βέλτιστον, ἐλάχιστον (--ίστη also), καλλίστη, κάρτιστος, πλεῖστοι, ταχίστην (—ιστα), χειρίστην. In the N. T., however, the superlative in –ιστος is more common than that in –τατος, though none too frequent in itself. They are besides usually elative (intensive) and not true superlatives.[11] D reads ἔγ-

[1] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. Cf. also ἀμεινότερος in the older language (Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 34).
[2] W.-M., p. 81; Thack., Gr., p. 183.
[3] Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft III, p. 65.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 34.
[5] W.-M., p. 81, Jann., p. 147.
[6] K.-B1., I, p. 554; Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 291.
[7] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 30.
[8] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 144.
[9] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 160; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 143.
[10] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 298.
[11] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33.

γιστα in Mk. 6:36. **Ὁ** ἐλάχιστος (1 Cor. 15:9) is a true superlative, a thing so rare in the N. T. that Blass[1] attributes this example either to the literary language or to corruption in the text.[1] But Moulton[2] is able to find a parallel in the Tb.P. 24, ii/B.C. But more about true and elative superlatives in Syntax (ch. XI;V, xiv). In 2 Cor. 12:9, 15 (D in Ac. 13:8), we have ἥδιστα. **Κ**ράτιστε (Lu. 1:3, etc.) is "only a title" (Moulton, p. 78). **Μ**άλιστα appears a dozen times only, though μᾶλλον is exceedingly common. Blass[3] indeed suggests that a popular substitute for μάλιστα as for πλεῖστα was found in the use of περισσός. This is much more true of the use of περισσός as the equivalent of μᾶλλον or πλείων (cf. Mt. 5:37; 27:23). Paul uses the comparative adverb περισσοτέρως (Ph. 1:14. Cf. double comparative in Mk. 7:36). In Heb. 7:15 (cf. 2:1; 13:19 —ως) περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλον we have more than **μ**ᾶλλον. Cf. μέγιστος (2 Pet. 1:4) and πλεῖστος in Mt. 11:20; 21:8; 1 Cor. 14:27. **Τ**άχιστα (Ac. 17:15) Blass[4] credits again to the literary element in Luke. In ὕψιστος we have a superlative that occurs thirteen times and always about God or heaven (as Mk. 5:7; 11:10).

When we take up the form in —τατος in the N. T. the story is soon told. Brugmann[5] finds the origin of this ending in forms like δέκατος (cf. Latin *decimus*), πρῶτος (cf. Latin *primus*), ὕπατος, ὕστατος. It has no direct parallel in the other languages.[6] Hirt[7] suggests —ταμος and —ατος as two forms which finally resulted in —τατος. It is true that the forms in —ατος faded away as superlatives and ἔσχατον became ἐσχατώτατον in the κοινή inscriptions,[8] but this is true also of the forms in —τατος.[9] The papyri have "scores" of examples of superlatives in —τατος (chiefly elative).[10] The rarity of the —τατος forms in the N T. may be purely accidental (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 154). It is not quite true that

[1] Ib.
[2] Prol., 79.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33 f.
[4] Ib., p. 33.
[5] Indog. Forsch., 1903, pp. 7-9. Ascoli (Curtius' Stud., etc., 1876, p. 351) suggests τρίτος (cf. Hom. τρίτατος) also. Cf. also ἔσχατος.
[6] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 294.
[7] Ib.
[8] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 161.
[9] This double superl. does not appear in the N. T., but various instances are noted in the pap. and the later Gk. as ἐλαχιστότατος, μεγιστότατος, πρώτιστα. So Lat. *minissimus, pessimissimus*. Cf. W.-M., p. 81; Dieterich, Unters., p. 181.
[10] Moulton, Prol., p. 78; Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 297 f. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept. pp. 54-57, for corresponding infrequency of the superl. forms in the LXX. The compar. is driving it out. Cf. also ib., p. vii.

"only one example of the --τατος superlative" (Moulton, Prol., p. 78) survives in the N. T. There are three with –τατος, besides those with –ατος: ἁγιώτατος (Ju. 20), ἀκριβέστατος (Acts 26:5), τιμιώτατος (Rev. 18:12; 21:11). Thackeray (Gr., p. 182) finds —τατος much more common in the LXX, though chiefly in the elative sense and in the more literary books of the LXX (Wisd., 2-4 Mace.; Prov., Esd.). **Ἀκριβέστατος** (Ac. 26:5) Blass again credits to the literary language. **Ἔσχατος** and πρῶτος (ω from =ωρα, Doric α) are both very frequent in the N. T. See Mt. 19:30 for the contrasted πρῶτοι ἔσχατι κτλ. The very great number of times that πρῶτος (πρῶτον included) is used in the N. T. (some 200) in contrast to only ten instances of πρότερον and one of προτέρα (Eph. 4:22) deserves comment. This seems in conflict with the observed disuse of the superlative in favour of the comparative. But a counter-tendency is at work here. The disappearance of duality before plurality has worked against πρότερον. Luke does not use πρότερον at all and it appears only once in Grenfell and Hunt's four volumes of papyri.[1] The LXX shows πρῶτος displacing πρότερος (Thackeray, Gr., p. 183). So in English we say first story of a house with only two, first edition of a book which had only two, etc. It is almost an affectation in Greek and English, however good Latin it may be, to insist on πρότερος. So in Jo. 1:15 (πρῶτος μου), 15:18 (πρῶτον ὑμῶν), Ac. 1:1 (τὸν πρῶτον λόγον) we have merely first of two and in the two first instances the ablative construction as with the comparative. Winer properly saw this usage of πρῶτον to be true to the Greek genius.[2] In Mt. 27: 64 we have both ἔσχατος and πρῶτος used of two, ἔσται ἡ ἐσχάτη πλάνη χείρων τῆς πρώτης. **Πρότερος** is indeed used in the sense of the former in Eph. 4:22, whereas πρότερον in the sense of the first of two does appear in Heb. 7:27 (πρότερον—ἔπειτα).[3] It is probably a defect in both Latin and Greek that the same forms were used to express the elative and true superlative sense (so as to comparative also).[4] As the dual vanished, so it was inevitable that with the same principle at work either the comparative or the superlative would. Outside of ἔσχατος and πρῶτος where the principle crossed with a different application because πρότερος was disappearing, it is the superlative that goes down, especially the true superlative as opposed to the dative (intensive). Hermas, though in the vernacular, still uses the superlative in the elative (inten-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 79
[2] W.-M., p. 306.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 34.
[4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 30.

sive) sense very often.[1] In the N. T. then the comparative is beginning to take the place of the superlative, a usage occasionally found in classical Greek,[2] and found now and then in the papyri.[3] See 1 Cor. 13: 13 τὰ τρία ταῦτα μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη. See also ὁ μεῖζων (Mt. 18:4). But this matter will call for more comment under Syntax (ch. XIV, XIII, (i)).

III. NUMERALS (ʾΑΡΙΘΜΟΙ).

No great space is demanded for the discussion of the non-syntactical aspects of the numerals.

1. The Origin of Numerals. Donaldson[4] thinks that seven of the first ten numerals may be traced to primitive pronominal elements. Pronouns and numerals belong to the stable elements of lahguage, and the numerals are rather more stable than the pronouns in the Indo-Germanic tongues.[5] See the numerals in substantial integrity in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 80-84). The system of numeration is originally decimal (cf. fingers and toes) with occasional crossing of the duodecimal.[6] There possibly were savages who could not count beyond two, but one doubts if the immediate ancestors of the Indo-Germanic peoples were so primitive as that.[7] See previous discussion in this chapter, I, 3. Counting is one of the first and easiest things that the child learns. It is certain that the original Indo-Germanic stock had numerals up to 100 before it separated.[8] The roots are widespread and fairly uniform.

2. Variety among Numerals.

(a) DIFFERENT FUNCTIONS. The numerals may be either substantive, adjective or adverb. So ἡ χιλιάς (Lu. 14:31), χίλιοι (2 Pet. 3:8), ἑπτάκις (Mt. 18:21).[9] Number thus embraces separate ideas.

(b) THE CARDINALS (ὀνόματα ἀριθμητικά). They may be either declinable or indeclinable, and this according to no very well-defined principle. The first four are declinable, possibly from their frequent use." After 200 (δια-κόσιοι, --αι, --α) they have the regular

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33. He cites the mod. Italian also which makes no distinction between the comp. and superl.

[2] Schwab, Hist. Synt. d. griech. Comp., II, pp. 172 ff.

[3] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 439.

[4] New Crat., p. 294.

[5] Giles, Man., etc., p. 393.

[6] Ib.

[7] However, see Moulton, Prol., p. 58. Cf. Taylor, Prim. Cult., I, p. 242 f.

[8] Moulton, Prol., p. 58.

[9] Cf. K.-B1., I, p. 621 f.

[10] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35.

inflection of adjectives of the second and first declensions. The history of **εἷς, μία, ἕν** is very interesting, for which see the comparative grammars.[1] **Εἷς** is exceedingly common in the N. T. as a cardinal (Mt. 25:15) and as an indefinite pronoun (Mt. 8:19), approaching the indefinite article. For the use of **εἷς** in sense of ordinal see Syntax, ch. XIV, xv, (a), but it may be remarked here that the papyri have **τῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι** (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35). The indeclinable use of **εἷς** (or adverbial use of **κατά**) is common in later Greek. Cf. **καθ' εἷς** in Mk. 14:19; (Jo. 8:9); Ro. 12:5.[2] So modern Greek uses **ἕνα** as neuter with which Mayser[3] compares **ἕνα** as feminine on an early ostrakon. But the modern Greek declines **ἕνας, μία, ἕνα** in all genders (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 81). **Οὐδείς** and **μηδείς** are both very common in the N. T. with the inflection of **εἷς**. **Μηθείς** occurs only once (Ac. 27:33). W. H. admit **οὐθείς** only seven times (all in Luke and Paul, as Ac. 20:33), and once (Ac. 15:9) **οὐδέν** is in the margin. Jannaris (*Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 170) calls this form in **θ** chiefly Alexandrian, rare in Attic, but Mayser (Gr., p. 180) notes **οὐδείς** as "Neubildung" while **οὐθείς** is good Attic. For history of it see Orthography and Phonetics, p. 219. The frequent use of **δύο** as indeclinable save in the plural form **δυσί** in the later Greek has already been commented on in this chapter (1, 3), as well as the disappearance of **ἄμφω** before **ἀμφότεροι**. Indeclinable **δύο** is classical, and after Aristotle **δυσί** is the normal dative (Thackeray, Gr., p. 186). **Τρία** (possibly also **τρίς**) is occasionally indeclinable in the papyri.[4] The common use of **τέσσερα** in the **κοινή** and the occasional occurrence of **τέσσαρες** as accusative in N. T. MSS. (like Northwest Greek) have been noticed in chapters VI, 2, (a), and VII, 1, 7, (c).[5] **Πέντε, ἕξ** and **ἑπτά** need not detain us. The originally dual form **ὀκτώ** is found only ten times, and five of them with other numerals. **Ἐννέα** appears only five times, while **δέκα** is nothing like so common as **ἑπτά**, not to mention the first five cardinals. **Ἕνδεκα** is found six times, but **δώδεκα** is quite common, due chiefly to the frequent mention of the Apostles. From thirteen to nineteen in the N. T., like the papyri[6] and the modern Greek, **δέκα** comes first, usually without **καί**,

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 211; Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 311; Giles, Man., p. 394. On numerals in the LXX see Thack., Gr., pp. 186-190; C. and S., Sel. fr. the LXX, p. 30 f.

[2] Cf. W.-M., p. 312. So **ἀνὰ εἷς** (Rev. 21:21).

[3] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 312. Perhaps the earliest ex. of indeclinable **ἕνα**. For the LXX usage cf. W.-Sch., p. 90.

[4] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 315.

[5] Ib. Cf. also Dittenb., 674. 28.

[6] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 316.

as δέκα ὀκτώ (Lu. 13:4), though once with καί (Lu. 13:16). But unlike the papyri the N. T. never has δεκαδύο.[1] But δεκαπέντε (as Jo. 11:18) and δεκατέσσαρες (as Gal. 2:1) occur several times each. Εἴκοσι is a dual form, while τριάκοντα and so on are plural.[2] Ἑκατόν is one hundred like ἅ-παξ. W. H. accent ἑκατοναετής, not --έτης. Usually no conjunction is used with these numerals, as εἴκοσι τέσσαρες (Rev. 19:4), ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι (Ac. 1:15), but τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἕξ (Jo. 2:20). Cf. Rev. 13:18. In the LXX there is no fixed order for numbers above the "teens." Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 188. The N. T. uses χίλιοι often and δισχίλιοι once (Mk. 5:13) and τρισχίλιοι once (Ac. 2:41). The N. T. examples of μυρίος by reason of case do not distinguish between μύριοι, 'ten thousand' (Mt. 18:24) and μυρίοι, 'many thousands' (1 Cor. 4:15). The N. T. uses μυριάς several times for the latter idea ('myriads'), sometimes repeated, as μυριάδες μυριάδων (Rev. 5:11). So also χιλιάς is more common in the N. T. than χίλιοι, both appearing chiefly in Revelation (cf. 5:11). In Rev. 13:18 B and many cursives have χξ΄=ἑξακόσιοι ἑξήκοντα ἕξ, while the cursive 5 has χις΄ = ἑξακόσιοι δέκα ἕξ. As a rule in the N. T. MSS. the numbers are spelled out instead of mere signs being used.

(c) THE ORDINALS (ὀνόματα τακτικά). They describe rank and raise the question of order, πόστος.[3] They are all adjectives of three endings and all have the superlative form —τος save πρότερος and δεύ-τερος which are comparative.[4] In most cases the ordinals are made from the same stem as the cardinals.[5] But this is not true of πρῶτος nor indeed of δεύ-τερος (not from δύο, but from δεύομαι).[6] Cf. the English superlative 'first' (with suffix *-isto*). Πρῶτος has driven πρότερος out of use in the N. T. except as an adverb (or τὸ πρότερον) save in one instance, προτέραν ἀναστροφήν (Eph. 4:22). The disappearance of πρῶτος before the ordinal use of εἷς belongs to Syntax. In the N. T. as in the papyri[5] the ordinals up to twelve are regular. From 13 to 19 the N. T., like the vernacular papyri[7] (so Ionic and κοινή generally), puts the smaller

[1] Δέκα δύο is normal in the pap. of the Ptol. age. Cf. Rec., Ac. 19:7. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 188. So also δέκα τρεῖς, and even δέκα μιᾶς once. Always δέκα τέσσαρες, δέκα πέντε, δέκα ὀκτώ. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35.

[2] Giles, Man., p. 398.

[3] K.-Bl, I, p. 622. Cf. Brug., πόστος, Cl. Philol., 1907, p. 208.

[4] These both have a superl., as πρῶτος and δεύτατος (Horn.). Brug., Gk. Gr., p. 212.

[5] Giles, Man., p. 400. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 212; Moulton, Prol., p. 95 f.

[6] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 318.

[7] Ib. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35.

number first and as a compound with καί, only the second half of the word in the ordinal form. So τεσσαρεσκαιδέκατος (Ac. 27: 27), not τέταρτος καὶ δέκατος (Attic).[1] But the papyri show examples of the usual Attic method,[2] as ἕνατος καὶ εἰκοστός. The distinction between the decades (like τριακοστός) and the hundreds (like τριακοσιοστός) should be noted. In modern Greek all the ordinals have disappeared out of the vernacular save πρῶτος, δεύτερος, τρίτος, τέταρτος.[3] The article with the cardinal is used instead.

(d) DISTRIBUTIVES IN THE N. T. The multiplicative distributives (with ending –πλοῦς) occur in the N. T. also. **Ἁπλοῦς** as an adjective is found only twice (Mt. 6:22= Lu. 11:34), both times about the eye. **Διπλοῦς** appears four times (as 1 Tim. 5:17). Cf. the Latin *sim-plex, du-plex*, English *simple, diplomatic*. The proportional distributives end in –πλασίων. As examples one may note ἑκατονταπλασίονα (Lu. 8:8) and πολλαπλασίονα (Lu. 18: 30). Cf. English "two-fold," "three-fold," etc. One of the commonest ways of expressing distribution is by repetition of the numeral as in δύο δύο (Mk. 6:7). Cf. *συμπόσια συμπόσια* (Mk. 6: 39 f.). In Lu. 10:1 we have ἀνὰ δύο δύο in the text of W. H., a "mixed distributive" (Moulton, Prol., p. 97). The modern Greek has either ἀπὸ δυό or δυὸ δυό) (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 83). It is a vernacular idiom which was given fresh impetus (Brugmann, *Distributiva*, p. 9) from the Hebrew idiom. Deissmann cites τρία τρία from 0. P. 121 (iii/A.D.). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 21) follows Thumb (*Hellen*., p. 152) in denying that it is a Hebraism. See further ch. XIV, xv (d).

(e) NUMERAL ADVERBS. These are of two kinds, either like ἅμα (Ac. 24: 26), δίχα, 'in two' (not in the N. T., though see διχάζω Mt. 10:35), or like ἅπαξ, δίς, τρίς, etc. The one kind answers to multiplicatives and the other to proportionals.[4] The numeral adverbs continue in use in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 189 f.). The modern Greek instead of the numeral adverb uses φορά (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 83).

IV. PRONOUNS (ʼ**ΑΝΤΩΝΥΜΙΑΙ**)

1. Idea of Pronouns. It is not the idea of a subject or object that is set forth by the pronoun, but the relation of a subject or object to the speaker.[5] Sometimes, to be sure, as in conversation,

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 35. So the LXX also. Thack., Gr., p. 188.

[2] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 35. And even the use of forms like ἓν κιὰ εἰκοστὸν, Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 318.

[3] Thumb, Handb. d. neugr. Volksspr., p. 56. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 175. [4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 36. [5] K.-B1., I, p. 579.

the pronoun does not strictly stand in the place of a substantive. When one person addresses another, "I" and "thou" are plain enough from the nature of the circumstances. The pronoun indicates, but does not name the speaker, etc. In a sense then language is a sort of drama in which there are three characters, the speaker, the person addressed and the person spoken of.[1] Hence the first and second personal pronouns have no gender, while the third person, who may or may not be present, has gender. Giles[2] cites the case of Macaulay who repeated the substantive so often as almost to make the pronoun useless, though the reverse tendency is more common. The right use of pronouns is a good index of style.

2. Antiquity of Pronouns. The personal pronouns are probably the oldest part of the Indo-Germanic declension.[3] Pronouns (and numerals) are the most persistent parts of speech. They are essential to the very life of a language.[4] Strange enough, the Coptic and the Hebrew, for instance, are only alike in their pronouns and their numerals.[5] In Greek as in Sanskrit and English the pronouns maintain themselves with great tenacity. The pronouns are also closely akin in all the Indo-Germanic tongues. Cf. Sanskrit *aham*, Greek ἐγώ(ν), Latin *ego*, Gothic *ik*, Anglo-Saxon *ic*, German *ich*, English *I*, French *je*. They retain the case-forms better than any other parts of speech.

3. Pronominal Roots. Indeed pronouns present an independent set of roots parallel to the verbal and nominal roots. As verb, noun, adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunctions, intensive particles grow up around the old verbal (and nominal) roots, so pronouns represent a separate history. There are two great root-stocks then (verbal or nominal and pronominal).[6] The pronouns can be resolved into monosyllabic roots.[7] One may not follow Donaldson[8] (now obsolete), when he calls all the pronouns originally demonstrative, and yet something can be said for that idea. In the Sanskrit Whitney[9] calls this "very limited set of roots, the so-called pronominal or demonstrative roots." Monro[10] remarks that noun-stems name or describe while pronouns only

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 32. He accents πρόσωπον (*persona*) as illustrating this dramatic aspect.

[2] Giles, Man., p. 238.. [3] Ib., p. 297. [4] Ib., p. 13.

[5] Renan, Hist. des Lang. Semit., p. 84 f.

[6] Cf. Bopp, Uber den Einfl. der Pron. auf die Wortbild., 1832.

[7] Donaldson, New Crat., p. 241.

[8] Ib., p. 245. [9] Sans. Gr., p. 185.

[10] Hom. Gr., p. 57; Bopp, Vergl. Gr., § 105.

point out; the one is predicative, the other demonstrative. The difference then is fundamental. "Pronouns are found to contain the same elements as those which furnish the person-endings of verbs." (Monro, *ib*.)

4. Classification. Pronouns are either substantive in signification and inflection as ἐγώ, adjective as ἡμέτερος, or adverb as οὕτως. The other classification is into nine or ten great classes: personal, intensive, reflexive, possessive, demonstrative, relative, interrogative, indefinite, distributive.[1] The correlative pronouns can be regarded separately also. These classes will call for special comment in detail See also ch. XV, 1.

(a) THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS. In all the Indo-Germanic tongues the personal pronouns vary a good deal in inflection from the substantives and adjectives.[2] The various Greek dialects show great variety in the inflection of the personal pronouns.[3] The nominative singular has a different stem in the first personal pronoun from the other cases in all the Indo-Germanic languages. The N. T. follows current and ancient usage fairly well in the form of the first and second personal pronouns. The same thing is true as to the enclitic and the emphatic forms in the oblique cases. The MSS. vary between **μου** and **ἐμοῦ**, etc. Not only do MSS. give the regular **πρός με**, but the papyri[4] furnish **εἴς με**, **περί μου, ὑπό μου**. The question whether **σου** or **σοῦ** should be read is a very delicate one and rests almost wholly with the editor. W. H. have, for instance, **ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου** and **ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σοῦ** in the same sentence (Mt. 7:4. Cf. also the next verse). Nestle here has no such refinement, but **σου** all through these verses. The third personal pronoun gave trouble in Greek as in some other languages. In Attic the old **οὗ, οἷ, ἕ** (without nominative) was chiefly reflexive,[5] though not true of the Ionic. Possibly this pronoun was originally reflexive for all the persons, but came to be used also as the simple pronoun of the third person, whereas in Latin it remained reflexive and was restricted to the third person.[6] The N. T. is like the **κοινή**

[1] K.-B1., I, p. 579, have only five.

[2] Hirt, Handb., p. 296. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 84, for mod. Gk.

[3] Cf. K.-B1., I, pp. 580 ff. See briefer summary in Giles, Man., p. 298 f., and Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 244 f. On the multiplicity of roots in the pers. pron. see Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 336.

[4] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p.302 f. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 165.

[5] Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 33. He illustrates by the Eng.: "I will lay me down and sleep." Cf. **ὑμῖν** in Mt. 6:19 f.

[6] Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 341.

in the use of αὐτός (common also in Attic) instead of οὗ as the third personal pronoun. It is used in all three genders and in all cases save that in the nominative it usually has emphasis (cf. Mt. 1:21), a matter to be discussed under Syntax. Indeed αὐτός, whatever its etymology, is originally an intensive pronoun (like Latin *ipse*), not a personal pronoun.[1] The "frequent and almost inordinate use" (Thayer) of αὐτός in the LXX (cf. Jer. 18:3 f.) and the N. T. is noticeable. So modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 86)

(b) THE INTENSIVE PRONOUN. The N. T. has nothing new to say as to the form of the intensive αὐτός. It is usually in the nominative that it is intensive like αὐτὸς μόνος (Jo. 6:15), though not always (cf. Jo. 14:11). The modern Greek[2] uses also a shorter form τοῦ, etc. (also Pontic ἀτοῦ), as personal pronoun. The use of ὁ αὐτός may be compared with ὁ ἴδιος. See ch. XV, III, (g).

(c) REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS. The reflexive form is nothing but the personal pronoun plus the intensive αὐτός. The reflexive is one use of this intensive in combination with the personal pronoun. They were originally separate words.[3] So αὐτὸς ἐγώ (Ro. 7:25) which is, of course, not reflexive, but intensive. The Greek reflexives have no nominative and the English has almost lost "himself," "myself" as nominative.[4] In the N. T. the first and second persons have a distinct reflexive form only in the singular (ἐμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ). In 2 Th. 1:4 αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς is obviously intensive, not reflexive. In 1 Cor. 7:35 ἡμῶν αὐτῶν it is doubtful.[5] See ch. XV, iv, for further discussion. The contracted form σαυτοῦ is not found in the N. T. It is common in the Kingdom books in the LXX and occurs in the papyri. See even σατόν in σύ βλέπε σατὸν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, B.G.U. 1079 (A.D. 41). So as to αὐτοῦ. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 190. The modern Greek uses τοῦ ἐμαυτοῦ, μου for the reflexive (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 88). The reflexive for the third person[6] (usually ἑαυτοῦ in the singular, about twenty times αὑτοῦ, etc., in W. H., as αὐτὸν in Jo. 2:24), while the only reflexive form for all persons in the plural in the N. T. has no secure place in the N. T. for the first and second person singular. The possible reflexive (or demonstrative?) origin of a made this usage natural. It appears in the papyri[7] (τὰ αὐτοῦ, Pet. I. 15, 15) and the

[1] Flensberg (Uber Urspr. and Bild. des Pron. αὐτός, 1893, p. 69) denies that it is from αὗ, but rather from αυα. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 244.

[2] Thumb, Handb., p. 85.

[3] K.-Bl., I, p. 596.

[4] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 62.

[5] Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 144.

[6] Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 33.

[7] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 303 f.

late inscriptions[1] for the first and second person singular. In the modern Greek the same thing is true.[2] But in the N. T. only late MSS. read ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ against ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ (ℵBCL) in Jo. 18:34. In Gal. 5:14 and Ro. 13:9 only Syrian uncials have ἑαυτόν for σεαυτόν.[3] This use of ἑαυτῶν for all three persons is fairly common in classical Attic. Indeed the personal pronoun itself was sometimes so used (δοκῶ μοι, for instance).[4]

(d) POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS (κτητικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι). It is somewhat difficult in the discussion of the pronouns to keep off syntactical ground, and this is especially true of the possessive adjectives. For the etymology of these adjectives from the corresponding personal pronouns one may consult the comparative grammars.[5] But it is the rarity of these adjectives in the N. T. that one notices at once. The third person possessives (ὅς, σφέτερος) have entirely disappeared. Σός is found in only two of Paul's letters: 1 Cor. and Phil., and these only three times. Σός is found about twenty-six times and ὑμέτερος eleven (two doubtful, Lu. 16:12; 1 Cor. 16:17). Ὑμέτερος appears in Paul only in 1 and 2 Cor., Gal., Ro. Ὑμέτερος appears only nine times counting Lu. 16:12, where W. H. have ὑμέτερον in the margin, and Ac. 24:6 which W. H. reject. It is only ἐμός that makes any show at all in the N. T., occurring some seventy-five times, about half of them (41) in the Gospel of John. Thumb[6] and Moulton[7] have made a good deal of the fact that in Pontus and Cappadocia the use of ἐμός, σός, etc., is still common, while elsewhere the genitive personal pronoun prevails.[8] The point is that the Gospel of John thus shows Asiatic origin, while Revelation is by another writer. But one can easily go astray in such an argument. The Gospel of Luke has ἐμός three times, but Acts not at all. The large amount of dialogue in the Gospel of John perhaps explains the frequency of the pronoun there. The possessive ἐμός is naturally in the mouth of Jesus (or of John his reporter) more than σός, for Jesus is speaking so much about himself. The possessive is more formal and more emphatic in the solemn

[1] Schweizer, Gr. d. perg. Inschr., p. 161. [2] Thumb, Handb., p. 88.

[3] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 167. These last two quote Lev. 19:18. Cf. Simcox, ib.; Dyroff, Gesch. des Pron. Reflex., 2. Abt., pp. 23 (Hefte 9 and 10 in Schanz's Beitr. etc.).

[4] Cf. Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 63; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 167.

[5] Giles, Man., p. 301; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 250; Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 307.

[6] Theol. Literaturzeit., 1893, p. 421.

[7] Prol., p. 40 f. He admits that the other possessives do not tell the same story. [8] Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 89.

words of Jesus in this Gospel.[1] This is probably the explanation coupled with the fact that John was doubtless in Asia also when he wrote the Gospel and was open to whatever influence in that direction was there. The discussion of details will come later, as will the common use of the genitive of the personal pronouns rather than the possessive adjective, not to mention the article. The reflexive pronoun itself is really possessive when in he genitive case. But this as well as the common idiom ὁ ἴδιος need only be mentioned here. The Boeotian inscriptions show *F*ίδιος in this sense as early as 150 B.C. (Claflin, *Syntax of Boeotian* Inscriptions, p. 42). The line of distinction between the pronouns is thus not always distinct, as when ἑαυτῶν (αὑτῶν) is used in the reciprocal sense (Lu. 23:12), a usage known to the ancients. The necessity in the N. T. of using the genitive of personal pronouns in the third person after the disappearance of ὅς is like the Latin, which used *ejus, suus* being reflexive. Farrar (*Greek Syntax*, p. 34) recalls the fact that its is modern, his being originally neuter also.

(e) DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS (δεικτικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι). But deictic must have a special limitation, for all pronouns were possibly originally deictic (marking an object by its position). The anaphoric (ἀναφορικαί) pronouns develop out of the deictic by usage. They refer to or repeat. The true relative is a further development of the anaphoric, which includes demonstrative in the narrower sense. In a strict historical method one should begin the discussion of pronouns with the demonstratives in the larger sense and show how the others developed.[2] But here we must treat the demonstrative pronouns in the narrower sense as distinct from the original deictic or the later relative. The demonstrative thus applies both to position and relation. The declension of the demonstratives is more akin to that of substantives than any of the other pronouns.[3] **Ὅδε**[4] occurs only ten times in. the N. T., and eight of these in the form τάδε, seven of which come in the formula in Rev. τάδε λέγει (as Rev. 2:1, etc.). The others are τάδε (Ac. 21:11), τῇδε (Lu. 10:39), τήνδε (Jas. 4:13).[5]

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 54. Dr. Abbott (Joh. Gr., p. 295) thinks that John's love of contrast leads him to use ὑμεῖς as often as all the Synoptists.

[2] So Riem. and Goelzer in their Phonet., pp. 316 ff. [3] Ib.

[4] Gildersleeve (Am. Jour. of Phil., 1907, p. 235) considers SSE the pron. of the first person, οὗτος of the second, ἐκεῖνος of the third.

[5] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 35 f. For the etymology of the dem. pron. see Brug., Gk. Gr., p. 242 f.

The inscriptions and the papyri agree with the N. T. in the great rarity of ὅδε in the later κοινή.[1] But in the LXX it is commoner, and chiefly here also τάδε λέγει (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 191). There are also many examples of ὅς as a demonstrative, as Ro. 14:5 and also cf. **ὁ, ἡ, τό** with **δέ,** as **οἱ δέ** in Mt. 27:4. This latter demonstrative construction is very common. **Αὐτός** is beginning to have a semi-demonstrative sense (common in modern Greek) in the N. T., as in Lu. 13:1, ἐν αυτῷ καιρῷ. There is little to say on the non-syntactical side about and **ἐκεῖνος** and **οὗτος** save that both are very common in the N. T., **οὗτος** extremely so, perhaps four times as often as **ἐκεῖνος** which is relatively more frequent in John.[2] Blass[3] points out the fact that **οὐτοσ-ί**, does not appear in the N. T. (nor in the LXX), though the adverb **νυν-ί** is fairly common in Paul and twice each in Acts and Hebrews. **Οὐχί** is much more frequent especially in Luke and Paul. Smyth[4] compares **ἐ-κεῖνος** (**κεῖνος** in Homer) to Oscan *e-tanto*. Modern Greek uses both forms and also **ἐ-τοῦτος** and **τοῦτος** in the nominative.[5]

Of the correlative demonstratives of quality **τοῖος** is not found in the N. T. and **τοιόσδε** only once (2 Pet. 1: 17) . **Τοιοῦτος** (neuter **τοιοῦτο** and **-ον**) occurs fifty-seven times, chiefly in the Gospels and Paul's earlier Epistles (Gal. 5:21). We find neither **τόσος** nor **τόσοσδε** and **τοσοῦτος** (the only correlative demonstrative of quantity) is less frequent than **τοιοῦτος** (cf. Lu. 7:9). The neuter is also in **--ον** and **–ο.** Of the correlatives of age **τηλικοῦτος** alone is found four times (cf. Jas. 3:4). See also ch. XV,

(f) RELATIVE PRONOUNS (ἀναφορικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι). Homer shows the transition of the demonstrative to the relative, using five forms (**ὁ, ὅ τε, ὅς, ὅς τε, ὅς τις**). Attic dropped **ὁ** and **ὅ τε** as well as **ὅσ τε**. This use of **τε** with **ὁ** and **ὅς** may be compared with the common use of the Latin *qui* = *et is*. So the Hebrew זֶה (‘this’) is sometimes relative. Cf. German *der* and English *that*.[6] Relatives in the narrower sense grew naturally out of the anaphoric use of the demonstrative. The weakening of **ὁ** to the article and the introduction of the longer demonstratives (**ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος**) left **ὅς** more and more for the true relative use. **Ὁ** and **ὅς** have a

[1] See Nachm., Magn. p. 145; Dieterich, Unters., p. 197; Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 308.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171. [3] Ib., p. 35; Thackeray, p. 191.

[4] The Ionic Dial., p. 448.

[5] Cf. Thumb, Handb. d. neugr. Volkspr., p. 64. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 161.

[6] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 185 ff.; Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35.

different etymology. Relative ὅς= Sanskrit *yas*. There are thus Only two pure relatives that survive in the N. T., ὅς and ὅστις, for ὅσπερ and ὁσδήποτε are not found save that the Western and Syrian classes read ὅνπερ in Mk. 15:6. **Ὁ**σδήποτε in Jo. 5:4 disappears with the rejection of that verse. Already the papyri[1] and the inscriptions[2] show the rare occurrence of ὅστις, confined as a rule to the nominative and gradually disappearing in the modern Greek before ὁ ὁποῖος and even ποῦ.[3] Compare the vulgar "whar" in "the man whar said that." **Ὅ**στις is, of course, merely ὅς plus the indefinite τις in the sense of 'any one' or again of 'somebody in particular.' Both of these senses occur in the N. T. usage. The N. T. follows the papyri and inscriptions in using only the nominative of ὅστις save the neuter accusative ὅ τι (Lu. 10:35), and the genitive in set phrases like ἕως ὅτου (Jo. 9:18). It is used in both the singular and the plural, however, but is otherwise nearly indeclinable. **Ὅ**ς γε (Ro. 8:32) is, of course, simply ὅς plus the intensive particle γε. **Ὅ**ς itself is many times more common in the N. T. than ὅστις and raises no questions save many syntactical ones. **Ὁ**ῖος, ὁπoῖος, ὅσος, ἡλίκος are also relatives of quality, quantity and age. **Ὁ**ῖος is found only fourteen times in the N. T., ten of them in Paul's writings (cf. 2 Cor. 10:11). **Ὁ**ποῖος can count up only five examples, four in Paul if we credit to him Ac. 26:29. This is a little strange when one recalls how common it is in the modern Greek. But the correlatives generally are weak in the vernacular[4] κοινή. **Ὁ**πόσος is not in the N. T. nor modern Greek, but ὅσος (1 Cor. 7:39) holds its own. As to ἡλίκος, it drops to four instances, two of them in the same sentence (Jas. 3:5).

(g) INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS. **Τ**ίς, (τί) is fairly common in the N. T. both in direct (Mt. 21:31) and indirect questions (Mt. 26:22) like the papyri usage. **Τ**ίς, τί in the Thessalian Greek is κίς,[5] κί. So Sanskrit *kas*, Latin *quis*, Gothic *hwas*, English who, German *wer*. In Latin and English the relative is formed from the same root, but not so in the Greek. In modern Greek, however, τίς has vanished before ποῖος (cf. ὅστις before ὁ ποῖος),[6] accented ποιός, though τί (indeclinable) survives strangely enough in the sense of "what sort."[7] In the N. T. the qualitative cor-

[1] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 310. [2] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 145.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 167 f. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 93.
[4] Mayser, Cr. d. griech. Pap., p. 311; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 145.
[5] K.-B1., I, p. 613; Hoffmann, Die gr. Dial., Bd. II, p. 558.
[6] Thumb, Handb., p. 94. [7] Ib.

relative **ποῖος** is used fairly often as a direct interrogative (cf. Mk. 11:28) and sometimes as an indirect interrogative (Mt. 24:42). **Ποταπός** is used a few times in direct (Mt. 8:27) and indirect also (Lu. 7:39). **Πόσος** is still used as a direct interrogative (Mt. 12:12) in quantitative questions and a few times in indirect questions (Mk. 15:4). **Πηλίκος** occurs only twice (one of these doubtful, Gal. 6 : 11, W. H. **ἡλίκοις** margin) and both times in indirect question (Heb. 7:4). The disappearance of duality has taken **πότερος** entirely away, though **πότερον** occurs once as an adverb in an indirect question (Jo. 7:17). In the LXX we find **πότερον** only once in Job (Thackeray, Gr., p. 192). Modern Greek does not use **πηλίκος**, though **πόσος** survives.

(h) INDEFINITE PRONOUNS. Like the Latin *ali-quis* (interrogative *quis*) the Greek **τὶς** differs from the interrogative **τίς** only in accent. It is very common in the N. T. (as Lu. 1:5), but already it is giving way to **εἷς** (Mt. 8:19), a usage not unknown to the older Greek.[1] In the N. T. we have **εἷς τις** together (Mk. 14:47; Lu. 22:50). Modern Greek has supplanted **τὶς, τὶ** by **κανείς** (**κἄν**, **εἷς**) and **καθείς** (cf. **καθ' εἷς** in N. T.).[2] The negative forms **μήτις** and **οὔτις** do not appear in the N. T. save that **μήτι** occurs in questions (Mt. 12:23) and **μή τις** with **ἵνα**. But **μηδείς** and **οὐδείς** are very common. The old **δεῖνα** meets us only once (Mt. 26:18), but hangs on in the modern Greek.[3] **Οὐ πᾶς** and **μὴ πᾶς** belong wholly to Syntax.

(1) DISTRIBUTIVE AND RECIPROCAL PRONOUNS. These pronouns have an insecure place in the N. T. with the exception of **ἄλλος, ἀλλήλων, ἕκαστος** and **ἕτερος**. **Ἑκάτερος** like **πότερος** has vanished, as implying duality. It is rare in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 192). **Ἄμφω** is gone, but **ἀμφότεροι** lingers on in some fourteen instances (cf. Mt. 9:17). **Ἀλλήλων** (composed of **ἄλλος, ἄλλος**) is naturally only in the oblique cases of the plural, but is fairly common (cf. Jo. 4:33). It has vanished in the modern Greek. **Ἕκαστος** on the other hand appears only in the singular except in Ph. 2:4 (probably twice there). It too has disappeared in the modern Greek. **Ἕτερος** is beside **ἀμφότεροι** the only surviving dual pronoun, and it goes down in the modern Greek along with **ἀμφότεροι**.[4] It is less common (97 times) in the N. T.

[1] Dieterich, Unters., p. 202; Hatz., Einl., p. 207.

[2] Thumb, Handb., p. 95 f. [3] Ib., p. 98.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179. The pap. (Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 312) show a few examples of **ἑκάτερος, μηδέτερος, ὁπότερος.** Once (Prov. 24:21) the LXX has **μηθέτερος**.

than ἄλλος (150), chiefly in Matthew; Luke, Paul, Heb., never in Revelation, Peter, and only once in Jo. (19:37) and Mk. (16:12) and this latter in disputed part. It is usually in the singular (73 times, plural 24). The distinction (not always observed in the N. T.) between ἄλλος and ἕτερος belongs to Syntax. The use of εἷς τὸν ἕνα as reciprocal (1 Th. 5:11) and of ἑαυτῶν (1 Cor. 6:7) along with other uses of ἄλλος and ἕτερος will receive treatment under Syntax.

V. ADVERBS (ἘΠΙΡΡΗΜΑΤΑ)

1. Neglect of Adverbs. A glance at the average grammar will show that the grammarians as a rule have not cared much for the adverb, though there are some honorable exceptions. Winer has no discussion of the adverb save under Syntax. Still others have not understood the adverb. For instance, Green[1] says that once in the N. T. "a preposition without change is employed as an adverb," viz. ὑπερ ἐγώ (2 Cor. 11:23). That is a perfunctory error which assumes that the preposition is older than the adverb. It is of a piece with the idea that regards some adverbs as "improper" prepositions. Donaldson[2] says that, with compliments to Horne Tooke, "the old grammarian was right, who said that when we know not what else to call a part of speech, we may safely call it an adverb." Certainly it is not easy nor practicable always to distinguish sharply between the adverb and preposition, conjunction, interjections and other particles.[3] But the great part played by the adverb in the history of the Greek language makes it imperative that justice shall be done to it. This is essential for the clear understanding of the prepositions, conjunctions and particles as well as the aldverb itself. Substantive and verb blend at many points and glide easily into each other in English, for instance. Attention has often been called to the use of "but" in English as adverb, preposition, conjunction, substantive, adjective and pronoun.[4]

[1] Handb. to the Gr. of the N. T., p. 138.

[2] Gk. Gr., p. 37. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, pp. 535-643, has the most complete treatment of the adv.

[3] Brug., Gk. Gr., p. 250. In the Sans. the line is still less clearly drawn between the various indeclinable words (Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 403).

[4] Giles, Man., p. 237 f. Cf. Schroeder, Uber die form. Untersch. der Redet., p. 35 f.; Delbruck, Grundr., Bd. III, p. 536 f.

2. Formation of the Adverb. The name suggests a mere addendum to the verb, an added word (like the adjective) that is not necessary. But in actual fact adverbs come out of the heart of the language, expressions fixed by frequent usage.

(a) FIXED CASES. A large number[1] of words retain the case-ending in the adverb and often with the same function. Perhaps the bulk of the adverbs are either the simple case used directly in an adverbial sense or the formation by analogy. It is just because adverbs are usually fixed case-forms or remnants of obsolete case-forms that they deserve to be treated under the head of Declensions. They have to be approached from the standpoint of the cases to understand their history. Leaving analogy for the moment let us see some examples of the cases that are so used. The cases most commonly used thus are the ablative, locative, instrumental and accusative.[2] The dative and genitive are seldom employed as adverbs. The vocative never occurs in this sense, and the nominative (so occasionally in Sanskrit) only in a phrase like καθ' εἷς in the addition to John's Gospel (Jo. 8:9), τὸ καθ' εἷς (Ro. 12:5). Cf. ἀνα-μίξ. Examples of the various cases as used in the N. T. will be given without attempting to be exhaustive. The κοινή and the modern Greek illustrate the same general tendencies as to adverbs that we see in the earlier Greek. Here the N. T. is in close accord with the papyri as to adverbs in use.[3]

(1) *The Accusative.* The most obvious illustration of the accusative in adverbs is the neuter of adjectives in the positive, comparative and superlative (singular and plural). In the comparative the singular is the rule, in the superlative the plural, but variations occur.[4] In the modern Greek accusative plural is more common even in the comparative (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 77). Take for the positive αὖριον, εὐθύ (ς added later), πολλά, μακράν. The comparative may be illustrated by ὕστερον, βέλτιον, and the superlative by πρῶτον (and πρῶτα) and ἥδιστα. Cf. also ταχίστην. Sometimes the article is used with the adjective where the adverbial idea is encroaching, as τὸ λοιπόν, τὰ πολλά, and note also τὴν ἀρχήν (Jo. 8:25), substantive with article. But the substantive alone has abundant examples also, as ἀκμήν, ἀρχήν, δωρεάν, πέραν, χάριν.

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 250 [2] Hirt, Handb. etc., pp. 320 ff.

[3] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 456 ff.

[4] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 251; Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 322. In the Sans. the acc. also is the case most widely used adverbially (Whitney, Sans. Gr., 408). Cf. Delbruck, Grundl., pp. 34 ff.

Σχεδόν is a specimen of the adverb in –**δον**, –δα. Cf. also **ὁμοθυμαδόν, ῥοιζηδόν**. The accusative in adverbs is specially characteristic of the **κοινή** (cf. Mayser, *Gr. d. griech. Pap*., p. 459; Schmid, *Attic*., II, pp. 36 ff.). In the modern Greek the accusative for the adverbs is almost universal. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 77.

(2) *The Ablative*. All adverbs in –**ως** are probably ablatives. **Κ**αλῶς, for instance, is from an original καλῶδ. The δ (Sanskrit t) is dropped and a final ς is added.[1] Cf. old Latin *meritod, facilumed*.[2] The **οὕτως, ὡς** of the Greek correspond exactly with the old Sanskrit *tád, yád*. The ending in –**ως** comes by analogy to be exceedingly common. Practically any adjective can by –**ως** make an adverb in the positive. Some, like **ἀδιαλείπτως**, belong to the later Greek (**κοινή**).[3] Participles also may yield such adverbs as **φειδομένως** (2 Cor. 9:6), **ὁμολογουμένως** (1 Tim. 3:16), **ὄντως** (Mk. 11:32). Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p. 54) cites **ἀρκούντως, τετολμηκότως** (Diod., XVI, 74. 6), etc. The bulk of the adverbs in –**ως** are from adjectives and pronouns. But the examples of –**ως** are rare in the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 77).

(3) *The Genitive*. There are not many adverbs in this case outside of those ending in –**ου**, like **θὐτοῦ, ὅπου, ποῦ, ὁμοῦ** and –ῆς (**ἑξῆς**). This use survives in modern Greek. Cf. the local use of the genitive in **Ἐφέσου** (Ac. 19:26). The common use of **ἡμέρας, νυκτός** verges toward the adverb.[4] Cf. also **τοῦ λοιποῦ** (Gal. 6:17). The genitive is almost never used adverbially in Sanskrit.[5]

(4) *The Locative.* This is a rare use in Sanskrit,[6] but more frequent in Greek. Instance **ἐκεῖ, κύκλῳ, οἴκοι, πρωί**. So also **ἀεί, πέρυσι**, etc. Hirt[7] (but not Brugmann) likewise treats examples like **δημοσίᾳ, ἰδίᾳ, πεζῇ**, etc., as locative. Certainly **ποῖ** is locative, but it does not appear in the N. T. Cf. also **τῷ ὄντι** (article and participle) in adverbial sense (Ro. 7:23).

(5) *The Instrumental*. This case lends itself naturally to the adverb where the idea of manner (associative) is so common.[8] In the Sanskrit it is very common for adverbs to be in the instrumental.[9] Such adverbs as **ἅμα** (cf. ablative **ὅμως** from same root), **εἰκῇ, κρυφῇ(ῇ), λάθρα(ᾳ), μάλα, πάντη(ῃ), παντῃ(ῇ), τάχα**, etc., are doubt-

[1] Giles, Man., p. 240. [2] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 320.

[3] Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 457 f., for further exx. Cf. the Lat. adv. (abl.) *raro, quomodo* etc., Bopp, Vergleich. Gr., § 183. Cf. also Delbruck, Grundl., pp. 48 ff.

[4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 252. [5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 410. [6] Ib.

[7] Handb. etc., p. 321. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 252 (dat. ace. to Brug.).

[8] Hirt, Handb., p. 321. [9] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 409.

less instrumental. In some cases ι is added to bring it in harmony with the locative-dative cases with which it blended.[1] Brugmann[2] also puts here such words as ἄνω, κάτω, ἔξω, ἀνωτέρω, ἀνωτάτω, οὔ-πω. --Πω is by ablaut from --πη (so Laconic πή-ποκα).

(6) *The Dative.* As in the Sanskrit,[3] so in the Greek the dative is very rare in adverbs. Indeed Hirt[4] is not far wrong when he says that it is not easy to find any dative adverbs distinct from the locative, though he accepts παραί χαμαί, κτλ. as dative (p. 260). Brugmann[5] thinks otherwise, and one is slow to dissent from the modern master of comparative grammar. He cites πάλαι, χαμαί, καταί, παραί, κύκλῳ, σπουδῇ, etc. But Delbruck[6] is against Brugmann here. Besides the dative in its proper sense is a little difficult to fit into an adverb. But we have given enough to justify the treatment of adverbs under the declensions.[7]

(b) SUFFIXES. Other adverbs are formed by suffixes which may be relics of lost case-endings that are no longer clear to us. Here only the main suffixes in use in the N. T. will be mentioned. For –άκι-ς take πολλάκις and the numeral adverbs like τετράκις, etc. For –αχοῦ note πανταχοῦ. For --δε take οἴκαδε. For –δον take ὁμοθυμαδόν (Ac. 18:12). For –ης we may note ἐξαίφνης, ἐξῆς, ἐφεξῆς. Those in –θε(ν) are numerous, like ἄνωθεν, ἔξωθεν, οὐρανόθεν, παιδιόθεν, etc. Αὐτόθι is common in the papyri, but not in the N. T.[8] The deictic ί appears in νυνί and οὐχί. An example of --ις appears in μόλις (cf. μόγις Text. Rec. in Lu. 9:39). For –τί note Ἑβραϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί, Λυκαονιστί, Ῥωμαϊστί. For –κα take ἡνίκα. For –ν we have νῦν, πάλιν. For --τε we may mention ὅ-τε, πό-τε. Then –ν is added in the case of δίς, τρίς and various other words like ἄχρις, εὐθύς, χέχρις, οὕτως, τετράκις, χωρίς, etc. Ἐκεῖσε is an instance of --σε. Then -τος appears in ἐκτός, ἐντός, Finally -χα is seen in ἔννυχα. The papyri furnish parallels for practically all these N. T. examples (and many more).[9] Ἅπαξ seems to stand by itself.

(c) COMPOUND ADVERBS. Some adverbs are due to the blend-

[1] Hirt, Handb., p. 321 f.

[2] Griech. Gr., p. 252 f. Cf. Delbruck, Grundr., III, p. 581 f.

[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 410. [4] Handb., p. 321.

[5] Griech. Gr., p. 252. Cf. also p. 229 f., where he acknowledges the other point of view as possible. [6] Grundr., p. 60 f.

[7] In Lat. adv. are partly remnants of case-forms and partly built by analogy. Draeger, Hist. Synt., p. 109. For Gk. see also Lutz, Die Casus-Adv. bei att. Rednern (1891).

[8] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 456.

[9] Ib., pp. 455-459. See also Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 253-257. Cf. Donaldson, New Crat., pp. 449-501, for discussion of these adv. suffixes.

ling of several words into one word, perhaps with modification by analogy. The κοινή is rather rich in these compound adverbs and Paul fairly revels in them. As samples take ἔκπαλαι (2 Pet. 2:3), κατέναντι (2 Cor. 12:19), κατενώπιον (Eph. 1:4), παραυτίκα (2 Cor. 4:17), ἀπροσωπολήμπτως (1 Pet. 1:17), παραχρῆμα (Lu. 1:64), ὑπεράνω (Eph. 4:10), ὑπερέκεινα (2 Cor. 10:16), ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ (1 Th. 3:10), ὑπερλίαν (2 Cor. 11:5), ὑπερπερισσῶς (Mk. 7:37), etc. The intense emotion in 2 Cor. explains the piling-up and doubling of some of these prepositional phrases. Occasionally a verbal clause is blended into one word and an adverb made by analogy with --ως. So (from νοῦν ἔχω) νουνεχῶς (Mk. 12:34), used by Aristotle and Polybius along with another adverb like νουνεχόντως in Isocrates.[1] But in Mark it is used without any other adverb. Ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor. 11:23) is made from the participle and is common in Attic (Xen., Plato). There are, besides, adverbial phrases like ἀπὸ μακρόθεν (Mk. 15:40) ἀπ' ἄνωθεν, ἕως κάτω (Mt. 27:51), etc. Cf. Con. and Stock, *Sel. fr*. LXX, p. 47. See chapter V, p. 170, for discussion of the formation of compound adverbs which are very common in the κοινή. Paul uses the idiom frequently. For the use of adverbs in the see Mayser's careful list from the papyri, pp. 455 ff., and Nach-Manson, *Magn. Inschr*., p. 138 f. New adverbs are continually made in the later Greek, though many of the older ones survive in the modern Greek. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 78ff. He groups tillem under place, time, manner and quantity.

(d) ANALOGY. A word is needed to accent the part played by analogy in the formation of adverbs, though it has already been alluded to. The two examples mentioned above, νουνεχῶς and ὑπερβαλλόντως will serve as good illustrations of the work done by the principle of analogy. The bulk of the –ως adverbs are ablatives made by analogy.[2]

(e) THE COMPARISON OF ADVERBS. In general the adverb is like the adjective save that in the comparative the accusative singular is used, like τάχιον, and the accusative plural in the superlative, like τάχιστα. But, *per contra*, note πρῶτον and κατωτέρω (Mt. 2:16), περισσοτέρως (2 Cor. 1:12), σπουδαιοτέρως (Ph. 2:28), ἐσχάτως (Mk. 5:23), πορρωτέρω (Lu. 24:28. AB –ρον). Cf. further ch. XII, III.

3. **Adverbial Stems.** The derivation of the adverb deserves a further word, though the facts have already been hinted at. Brief mention is all that is here called for by way of illustration.

[1] Giles, Man., p. 240. [2] Ib.

(a) SUBSTANTIVES. As N. T. examples of adverbs from substantives may be mentioned ἀρχήν, δωρεάν, χάριν.

(b) ADJECTIVES. It was and is always possible to make an adverb from any Greek adjective by the ablative ending –ως. Cf. both ταχύ (accusative) and ταχέως (ablative). Indeed the line between the adjective and adverb was never sharply drawn, as will be shown when we come to the study of the syntax of the adjective (cf. English "looks bad," "feels bad," a different idea from the adverb, however). In passing note ἑκοῦσα (Ro. 8:20) and δευτεραῖοι (Ac. 28:13) in strict accordance with the Greek idiom. The comparison of adverbs is another link between adverb and adjective. In most cases, however, it is merely the use of the comparative and superlative forms of the adjective as an adverb. But in some cases the comparative and superlative adverb is made without any corresponding adjective, done by analogy merely. So μᾶλλον, μάλιστα, from μάλα, ἀνώτερον from the adverb ἄνω. Cf. also ἐγγύτερον (Ro. 13:11) from ἐγγύς, κατωτέρω (Mt. 2:16) from κάτω, and πορρώτερον (Lu. 24:28) from πόρρω. Comparative adjectives made from positive adverbs are, on the other hand, seen in ἐξώτερος (Mt. 8:12), ἐσώτερος (Heb. 6:19), κατώτερος (Eph. 4:9). Κατωτέρω, περισσοτέρως (Heb. 2:1, often in Paul; Gal. 1:14), σπουδαιοτέρως (Ph. 2:28), τολμηροτέρως (Ro. 15:15) rather than the forms in —τερον are due to analogy of the ablative –ως. Adverbs made from participles can be looked upon as adjectival or verbal in origin, since the participle is both verb and adjective.

(c) NUMERALS. All that is necessary here is to mention such words as πρῶτον, δίς, ἑπτάκις etc. In Ac. 11:26 we have πρώτως instead of πρῶτον. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 58) cites for –ως Clem., Hom. 9, 4; 16, 20; Polyb. vi, 5. 10; Diod., etc.

(d) PRONOUNS. The pronominal adverbs are very numerous, like οὕτως, ὡσαύτως, etc., αὐτοῦ, ποτέ, τότε, ὧδε, etc. As with the correlative pronouns, so the correlative adverbs are lessening. Of the indefinite adverbs only ποτέ, πού (a few times), and πως (only in εἴπως, μή πως) appear.[1] Forms like οἱ, ὅποι, ποῖ have vanished before οὗ, ὅπου, ποῦ. Cf. English,[2] "where (rather than 'whither') are you going?" Cf. also the accusative τί. (Mk. 10:18) = 'why.'

(e) VERBS. Besides such words as νουνεχῶς (verbal phrase) and participles like ὄντως, ὁμολογουμένως, φειδομένως, ὑπερβαλλόντως one should note ᾽Εβραϊστί (from ᾽Εβραΐζω), ῾Ελληνιστί (from ῾Ελληνίζω),

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 59 f, [2] Green, Handb. to N. T. Gk., p. 137.

etc. In Jas. 4:13; 5:1 ἄγε is used with the plural as an adverb, if indeed it is not in reality an interjection. The modern view of the imperative forms like ἄγε (cf. vocative ἀγέ from ἀγός) is that it is merely the root without suffix.[1] In the case of δεῦρο we actually have a plural δεῦτε. Moulton[2] illustrates the close connection between interjectional adverb and verb by the English "Murder!" which could be mere interjection or verbal injunction according to circumstances.

4. Use of Adverbs. This is still another way of looking at the subject, but it is a convenience rather than a scientific principle. Blass[3] in his *N. T. Grammar* follows this method solely.

(a) ADVERBS OF MANNER. These are very numerous indeed, like πνευματικῶς, σπουδαίως, etc. **Ἐσχάτως ἔχει** (Mk. 5:23) is not like the English idiom. The phrase really means that she has it in the last stages. Cf. βαρέως ἔχουσα (Pap. Brit. M., 42). **Εὖ**, so common in Attic, has nearly gone in the N. T. (only in Mk. 14:7; Mt. 25:21, 23; Ac. 15:29; Eph. 6:3 quot.). **Ἐσχάτως ἔχει** occurs also in Lu. 19:17 (W. H. text, margin **εὖ**). **Καλῶς** is common. **Βέλτιον**, appears once (2 Tim. 1:18) and **κρεῖσσον** often (1 Cor. 7:38). The comparative adverb διπλότερον (Mt. 23:15) is irregular in form (ἁπλούστερον) and late.[4]

(b) ADVERBS OF PLACE. These answer the questions "where" and "whence." "Whither" is no longer a distinct idea in N. T. Greek nor the **κοινή** generally. Even in ancient Greek the distinction was not always maintained.[4] Blass[6] carefully illustrates how "here" and "hither" are both expressed by such words as ἐνθάδε (Ac. 16:28; Jo. 4:16), oddly enough never by ἐνταῦθα, though ὧδε (especially in the Gospels) is the common word (Lu. 9:33, 41). But ἐκεῖ is very common in the sense of 'there' and 'thither' (here again chiefly in the Gospels) as in Mt. 2:15, 22. **Ἐκεῖσε** ('thither') is found only twice, and both times in Acts (21:3; 22: 5), which has a literary element. So **οὗ** in both senses (Lu. 4:16; 10:1) and **ὅπου** (very common in John's Gospel, 14:3 f.). The interrogative **ποῦ** (Jo. 1:39; 3:8) follows suit. The indefinite **πού** is too little used to count (Heb. 2:6) and once without local idea, rather 'about' (Ro. 4:19). **Ἀλλαχοῦ** occurs once (Mk. 1: 38), but πανταχοῦ several times (Lu. 9:6, etc.). **Ὁμοῦ** is found four times only (Jo. 4:36, etc.), and once D adds **ὁμόσε** (Ac. 20:

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 171.

[2] Ib., p. 171 f. But adv. from verbs are "late and always rare," Giles, Man., p. 342.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gr., pp. 58 ff. [4] Ib. [5] Ib. [6] Ib.

18). **Πανταχῇ(η)** likewise is read once (Ac. 21:28), Syrian class **--οῦ.** In Ac. 24:3 **πάντη(η)** is contrasted with **παντοῦ**. Other adverbs of place in the N. T. are **ἄνω, ἐντός, ἐκτός, ἔσω, ἔξω, κάτω.** A number of adverbs answer to the question "whence." They are usually words in **—θεν**. **Ἀλλαχόθεν** (Jo. 10:1) is found only once in the N. T. **Ἄνωθεν** (Mk. 15:38) is more frequent, though never **κάτωθεν.** The only pronominal forms that appear in the N. T. are **ἐκεῖθεν** (Rev. 22:2, rather common in Matthew), **ἔνθεν** (Mt. 17:20), **ἐντ ῦθεν** (twice in Jo. 19:18, and in contrast with **ἐκεῖθεν** Rev. 22:2), **πάντοθεν** (Mk. 1:45), **ὅθεν** (Mt. 12:44), **πόθεν** (Mt. 21:25). The last two are fairly frequent. Blass[1] notes how "stereotyped and meaningless" the ending **—θεν** has become in many examples, especially with **ἔμπροσθεν**, (common in Matthew and Luke) and **ὄπισθεν** (rare). See both in Rev. 4:6. In some cases by a little effort the real force of **–θεν** may be seen, but the old Greek soon allowed it to become dim in these words. In the case of **ἔσωθεν** and **ἔξωθεν** Blass[2] insists on the force of **—θεν**, only in Mk. 7:18, 21, 23; Lu. 11:7. Cf. also **κυκλόθεν** (Rev. 4:8). The addition of **ἀπό** occasionally may be due either to the weakened sense of **—θεν** or to a fuller expansion of its true idea. So **ἀπ' ἄνωθεν** twice (Mt. 27:51, so W. H. against **ℵ**L **ἄνωθεν**, Mk. 15:38), **ἀπὸ μακρόθεν** (Mk. 5:6; 15:40, etc.), **ἐκ παιδιόθεν** (Mk. 9:21). Blass[3] observes that both **μακρόθεν** and **παιδιόθεν** are late words and that late writers are fond of using prepositions with **—θεν** as Homer had **ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν**. But Luke used only **οὐρανόθεν** in Ac. 14:17.

(c) ADVERBS OF TIME. The list is not very great, and yet appreciable. **Ἀεί** (Ac. 7:51) is not in the Gospels at all and is largely supplanted by **πάντοτε** (Jo. 6:34) like the **κοινή** and modern Greek. **Ἠνίκα** is read twice only (2 Cor. 3:15 f.). **Ἔπειτα** (1 Cor. 12:28) and **εἶτα** (Mk. 4:17) are about equally frequent. **Ὅτε** (Mt. 9:25) occurs 101, **ὅταν** (Mt. 9:15) 130 times. **Ὁπότε** appears only in the Syrian class in Lu. 6:3 against the neutral and Western **ὅτε** (so W. H.). **Πότε** (Mt. 17:17) and **ποτέ** (Lu. 22:32) are both far less common than **ὅτε** and **ὅταν**. But **τότε** and **πάλιν** amply atone for this scarcity. All the numeral adverbs (**ἅπαξ, πρῶτον, δίς, ἑπτάκις** etc.) belong here also.

5. Scope of Adverbs. Here again we are retracing ground and crossing our steps, but a brief word will be useful to show how from adverbs grew other parts of speech. The fact has been stated before. What is here called for is some of the proof and illustration.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 59, [2] Ib. [3] Ib.

(a) RELATION BETWEEN ADVERBS AND PREPOSITIONS. When we come to study prepositions (ch. XIII) a fuller discussion of this matter will be given. Here the principle will be stated. "The preposition therefore is only an adverb specialized to define a case-usage."[1] That puts the matter in a nutshell. Many of the older grammars have the matter backwards. The use of prepositions with verbs is not the original one. In Homer they are scattered about at will. So with substantives. "Anastrophe is therefore no exception, but the original type"[2] like τίνος ἕνεκα (Ac. 19:32). To quote Giles[3] again, "between adverbs and prepositions no distinct line can be drawn." As samples of cases in prepositions take παρ-ός (gen.), παρ-αί (dat.), περ-ί (loc.), παρ-ά (instr.). It is unscientific to speak of adverbs which "may be used like prepositions to govern nouns"[4] and then term them "preposition adverbs" or "spurious prepositions." Prepositions do not "govern" cases, but more clearly define them. When adverbs do this, they are just as really prepositions as any others. These will be treated therefore in connection with the other prepositions. They are words like ἅμα, ἄνευ, ἔξω, ὀπίσω, etc.

(b) ADVERBS AND CONJUNCTIONS. These are usually of pronominal origin like ὅ-τε (acc. plus τε) οὗ (gen.), ὡς (abl.), ἀλλά (ace. plural), ἵ-να (instr.), etc. Some conjunctions are so early as to elude analysis, like δέ, τέ, etc.[5] But in most cases the history can be traced. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 60) remarks on the poverty of the N. T. Greek in particles, a poverty as early as the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία of Aristotle, which is much barer than the N. T. These conjunctions and other particles in the N. T. are cited by Blass: ἀλλά, ἅμα, ἄρα, ἄραγε, ἆρα, ἆρά γε, ἄχρι(ς), γάρ, γε, δέ, δή, δήπου, διό διόπερ, ἐάν, ἐάνπερ, εἰ, εἴπερ, εἶτα, εἶτε, ἐπάν ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, ἐπειδήπερ, ἐπείπερ (only as variation in Ro. 3:30), ἔπειτα, ἕως, ἤ, ἦ or εἰ μήν, ἤδη, ἡνίκα (ἤπερ only variation in Jo. 12:43), ἤτοι, ἵνα, καθά, καθάπερ, καθό, καθότι, καθώς, καί, καίπερ, καίτοι(γε), μέν μενοῦνγε, μέντοι, μέχρι(ς) οὗ (μέχρι[ς] variation for), μή, μηδέ, μήτε, μήτι, ναί, νή, ὅμως, ὁπότε, ὅπως, ὅταν, ὅτε, ὅτι, οὐ, οὐχι, οὐδέ, οὐκοῦν, οὖν, οὔτε, περ with other words, πλήν, πρίν τε, τοι, (in καίτοι, μέντοι, etc.), τοι-γαρ-οῦν, τοίνυν, ὡς, ὡσάν, ὡσεί ὥσπερ, ὡσπερεί, ὥστε. Several of these occur only once (δήπου, ἐπειδήπερ, νή, ὁπότε, οὐ-

[1] Giles, Man., p. 341. Cf. also Krebs, Die Prapositionsadverbien in der spateren hist. Grac., Tl. I, 1884.

[2] Giles, ib. On "Nouns used as Prep." see Donaldson, New Crat., pp. 478 ff.

[3] Ib.

[4] Green, Handb., etc., p. 138.

[6] Giles, Man., p. 343.

κοῦν). But Blass has not given a complete list. Cf. also διότι, ὅθεν, οὗ, ὅποι, πότε, etc. Fifteen other Attic particles are absent from this N. T. list. The matter will come up again in ch. XXI.

(c) ADVERBS AND INTENSIVE PARTICLES. **Πέρ** is an older form of περ-ί. Usually, however, as with γε, the origin is obscure. Others used in the N. T. are δή, δήπου, μέν τοί (with other particles). See ch. XXI.

(d) ADVERBS AND INTERJECTIONS. Interjections are often merely adverbs used in exclamation. So with ἄγε, δεῦρο, δεῦτε, ἔα, ἴδε, ἰδού, οὔα, οὐαί, ὦ. Interjections may be mere sounds, but they are chiefly words with real meaning. **Ἄγε** and ἴδε are both verb-stems and ἰδού is kin to ἴδε. The origin of the adverbs here used as interjections is not always clear. **Οὐαί** as in Mt. 11:21 (common in the LXX, N. T. and Epictetus) has the look of a dative, but one hesitates. As a substantive ἡ οὐαί is probably due to θλῖψις or ταλαιπωρία (Thayer). Cf. chapters XII, v, and XVI, v, (e), for use of article with adverb, as τὸ νῦν. For the adverb like adjective, as ἡ ὄντως χήρα (1 Tim. 5:5), see p. 547. In Lu. 12:49 τί may be an exclamatory adverb (accusative case), but that is not certain. Δεῦρο sometimes is almost a verb (Mk. 10:21). The relative adverb ὡς is used as an exclamation in ὡς ὡραῖοι (Ro. 10:15) and ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα (Ro. 11:33). The interrogative πῶς is likewise so employed, as πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστι (Mk. 10:24), πῶς συνέχομαι (Lu. 12:50), πῶς ἐφίλει αὐτόν (Jo. 11:36). Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T.* Gk., p. 258. Thus we see many sorts of adverbs and many ways of making them.

CHAPTER VIII

CONJUGATION OF THE VERB (῾**PHMA**)

I. Difficulty of the Subject. The discussion of the verb gives greater difficulty than that of the noun for two reasons especially. For one thing the declension (κλίσις) of nouns is more stable than the conjugation (συζυγία) of the verb. This difficulty applies to both the forms and the syntax of the verb.[1] There is besides special difficulty in the Greek verb due to the ease and number of new verbal formations.[2] Sanskrit and Greek can be compared with more ease than Greek and Latin. Giles[3] indeed calls the Latin verb-system "only a mutilated fragment" of the original parent stock, so that "a curious medley of forms" is the result, while in the syntax of the verb no two Indo-Germanic languages are further apart than Greek and Latin. Both noun and verb have suffered greatly in the ravages of time in inflection. It is in declension (cases) and conjugation (personal endings) that noun and verb mainly differ.[4] "These suffixes [used for the present tense], however, are exactly parallel to the suffixes in the substantive, and in many instances can be identified with them."[5]

II. Nature of the Verb.

(a) VERB AND NOUN. In itself *verbum* is merely 'word,' any word, and so includes noun also. As a matter of fact that was probably true originally. In isolating languages only position and the context can determine a verb from a noun, and that is often true in English to-day. But in inflected tongues the case-endings and the personal endings mark off noun and verb. But in simple truth we do not know which is actually older, noun or verb; both probably grew up together from the same or similar roots.[6] Schoemann,[7] however, is much more positive that "the first word

[1] Giles, Man., p. 403 f. [2] Hirt, Handb., p. 332. [3] Man., p. 404.

[4] Steinthal, Zeitschr. fur Volkerpsych. etc., p. 351. Cf. Schleicher, Unterscheidung von Nomen und Verbum etc., 4. Bd. der Abh. d. phil. etc., 1865, p. 509. [5] Giles, Man., p. 424.

[6] Schroeder, Uber die form. Untersch. d. Redet. im Griech. und Lat., 1874, pp. 10 ff. [7] Die Lehre von den Redet. etc., 1864, p. 31.

which man spoke was essentially much more a verb than a noun." But, whether the verb is the first word or not, it is undoubtedly the main one and often in the inflected tongue forms a sentence in itself, since the stem expresses the predicate and the ending the subject.[1] It is worth noting also that by the verb-root and the pronominal root (personal endings) the verb unites the two ultimate parts of speech. The verb and noun suffixes, as already said, are often identical (Giles, *Manual*, etc., p. 424). In all sentences the verb is the main part of speech (the word *par excellence*) save in the copula (ἐστί) where the predicate is completed by substantive or adjective or adverb (another link between verb and noun). "A noun is a word that designates and a verb a word that asserts" (Whitney, *Am. Jour. of Philol.*, xiii, p. 275). A man who does not see that "has no real bottom to his grammatical science."

(b) MEANING OF THE VERB. Scholars have found much difficulty in defining the verb as distinct from the noun. Indeed there is no *inherent* difference between nouns and verbs as to action, since both may express that.[2] The chief difference lies in the idea of affirmation. The verb *affirms*, a thing not done by a noun except by suggested predication. Verbs indicate affirmation by the personal endings. Affirmation includes negative assertions also.[3] Farrar[4] cites also the German "abstract conception of *existence*" (Humboldt) and action (*Tütigkeitswort*), but they do not fit the facts. Curiously enough many ancient grammarians found *time* to be the main idea in the verb.

(c) PURE AND HYBRID VERBS. The close kinship between nouns and verbs appears in the verbal nouns which partake of both. The infinitive is a verbal substantive, and the participle is a verbal adjective. There is also the verbal in —τος and –τέος Some of the properties of both verb and noun belong to each. They are thus hybrids. They are generally called non-finite

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 1. In the Sans. it is to be noted that the noun had an earlier and a more rapid development than the verb. The case-endings appear first in the Sans., the verb-conjugation in the Gk., though the personal endings are more distinct in the Sans. [2] Cf. Garnett, Philol. Ess.

[3] Cf. Gr. Gen. of Port Royal; Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 38.

[4] Ib. He considers the verb later than the noun because of its complex idea. Cf. Schramm, Uber die Bedeutung der Formen des Verbums (1884); Curtius, Die Bildung der Tempora und Modi im Griech. und Lat. (1846); Junius, Evolution of the Greek Verb from Primary Elements (1843); Lautensach, Verbalflexion der att. Inschr. (1887); Hogue, Irregular Verbs of Attic Prose (1889).

verbs, because they do not make affirmation. They have no personal endings. They fall short of being mere verbs, but they are more than the noun. The pure verb has personal endings and is thus *finite* (limited). The two must be kept distinct in mind, though they run together sometimes in treatment. The finite verb has person and number expressed in the personal ending.[1] The *verbum finitum* has modes while the verbum infinitum, (infinitive and participle) has no modes.

III. The Building of the Verb. This is not the place for a full presentation of the phenomena concerning verb-structure. The essential facts as to paradigms must be assumed. But attention can be called to the fact that the Greek verb is built up by means of suffixes and affixes around the verb-root. So it was originally, and a number of such examples survive. Afterwards analogy, of course, played the main part. The oldest verbs are those which have the simple root without a thematic vowel like φη-μί or ἔ-βη-ν. This root is the ground floor, so to speak, of the Greek verb. On this root the aorist and present-tense systems were built by merely adding the personal endings. This was the simplest form of the verb. There is no essential difference in form between ἔ-φη-ν and ἔ-στη-ν. We call one imperfect indicative and the other second aorist indicative, but they are originally the same form.[2] The term second aorist is itself a misnomer, for it is older than the so-called first aorist —σα or —α. The thematic stem (vowel added to root) is seen in verbs like —λιπ-ο/ε. On this model the rest of the verb is built. So all Greek root-verbs are either non-thematic or thematic. The denominative verbs like τιμά-ω are all thematic. On roots or stems then all the verbs (simple or compound) are built. The modes, the voices, the tenses all contribute their special part to the whole. The personal endings have to carry a heavy burden. They express not only person and number, but also voice. There are mode-signs and tense-suffixes, but no separate voice suffixes apart from the personal endings. The personal pronouns thus used with the verb-root antedate the mode and tense suffixes. The Sanskrit preserves the person-endings more clearly than the Greek, though the Greek has a more fully developed system of modes and tenses than the later classical Sanskrit.[3] It seems certain that these pro-

[1] Cf. Brug., Grundr., Bd. II, pp. 2, 837. On difference between finite and non-finite verbs see Curtius, Das Verbum d. griech. Spr., p. 1 f.

[2] Hirt, Handb., p. 363 f. Cf. also Giles, Man., pp. 425

[3] Donaldson, New Crat., pp. 570

nominal suffixes, like **--μι**, **—σι**, **--τι,** are not in the nominative, but an oblique case[1] connected with the stem: **με, σε, τι** (cf. demonstrative **τό**). But the subject of personal endings is a very extensive and obscure one, for treatment of which see the comparative grammars.[2] There is a constant tendency to syncretism in the use of these personal endings. Homer has fewer than the Sanskrit, but more than Plato. The dual is gone in the N. T. and other endings drop away gradually. The nominative pronoun has to be expressed more and more, like modern English.

IV. The Survival of --μι Verbs.

(a) A CROSS DIVISION. Before we take up modes, voices, tenses, we are confronted with a double method of inflection that cuts across the modes, voices and tenses. One is called the **—μι**, inflection from the immediate attachment of the personal endings to the stem. The other is the **–ω** inflection and has the thematic vowel added to the stem. But the difference of inflection is not general throughout any verb, only in the second aorist and the present-tense systems (and a few second perfects), and even so the **--μι** conjugation is confined to four very common verbs (**ἵημι**, **ἵστημι**, **δίδωμι**, **τίθημι**), except that a number have it either in the present system, like **δίκ-νυ-μι**. (with **νυ** inserted here), or the aorist, like **ἔ-βη-ν**.[3] The dialects differed much in the use of non-thematic and thematic verbs (cf. Buck, "The Interrelations of the Greek Dialects," *Classical Philology*, July, 1907, p. 724).

(b) THE OLDEST VERBS. This fact is a commonplace in Greek grammar. It is probable that originally all verbs were **–μι** verbs. This inflection is preserved in optative forms like **λύοιμι**, and in Homer the subjunctive[4] **ἐθέλωμι, ἴδωμι**, etc. The simplest roots with the most elementary ideas have the **—μι** form.[5] Hence the conclusion is obvious that the **—μι** conjugation that survives in some verbs in the second aorist and present systems (one or both) is the original. It was in the beginning **λέγ-ο-μι** with thematic as well as **φη-μί** with non-thematic verbs.[6]

(c) GRADUAL DISAPPEARANCE. In Latin the **–μι**, ending is seen only in *inquam* and *sum*, though Latin has many athematic stems. In English we see it in *am*. Even in Homer the **—μι**

[1] Donaldson, New Crat., pp. 570Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 39.
[2] Cf. Hirt, Handb., pp. 355 ff.; Giles, Man., pp. 413 ff.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 232 f.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 51. [5] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 46.
[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 2. Cf. Clyde, Gk. Synt., 5th ed., 1876, p. 54; Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., pp. 347

forms are vanishing before the –ω conjugation. Jannaris (*Hist. Gk.* Gr., p. 234) has an excellent brief sketch of the gradual vanishing of the –μι forms which flourished chiefly in pre-Attic Greek. The LXX MSS. show the same tendency towards the disappearance of –μι forms so noticeable in the N. T., the papyri and other representatives of the κοινή. See numerous parallel illustrations in Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, pp. 104-110. In the LXX the transition to –ω verbs is less advanced than in the N. T. (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 244) and the middle –μι forms held on longest. In the κοινή this process kept on till in modern Greek vernacular εἶμαι is the only remnant left. In the Attic δείκνυμι, for instance, is side by side with δεικνύω. In the N. T. we find such forms as διδῶ (Rev. 3:9), ἱστῶ (Ro. 3:31, EKL), συνιστῶ (2 Cor. 3:1, BD).

(d) N. T. USAGE AS TO **--μι** VERBS. The –μι verbs in the N. T. as in the papyri are badly broken, but still in use.

1. The Second Aorists (active and middle). We take first the so-called second aorists (athematic) because they come first save where the present is practically identical. In some verbs only the second aorist is athematic, the stem of the verb having dropped the **-μι** inflection. A new view[1] makes the second aorist sometimes "a reduced root," but this does not show that in the parent stock the old aorist was not the mere root. Analogy worked here as elsewhere. Kaegi[2] properly calls the old aorists of verbs like βάλλω (**ἔ-βλη-το** instead of the thematic and later **ἐ-βάλ-ε-το**) "primitive aorists." In the early Epic the root-aorists and strong thematic aorists outnumber the *σ* or weak aorists by three to one.[3] The important N. T. –μι verbs will now be considered.

Βαίνω. Only in composition in N. T. (**ἀνα--, προσ-ανα--, συν--ανα--, ἀπο--, δια--, ἐκ--, ἐμ--, κατα--, μετα--, παρα--, προ--, συμ--).** In the LXX it is rare in *simplex*. The papyri use it freely with nine prepositions.[4] Note the common forms like ἀνέβη (Mt. 5:1) . The "contract" forms are in the imperative as in the Attic poets (**εἴσβα, κατάβα**).[5] Mayser[6] gives no examples from the papyri, nor does the LXX have any (LXX only **ἀνάβηθι, κατάβηθι, --βητε,--βήτω, --βήτωσαν**).[7] So ἀνάβα (Rev. 4:1), ἀνάβατε (Rev. 11:12), κατάβα (Syrian class in Mk. 15:30), καταβάτω (Mt. 24:17; 27:42. Cf.

[1] Cf. King and Cookson, Prin. of Sound and Inflexion, 1888, pp. 225
[2] Gk. Gr., 1893, p. 245.
[3] Thompson, Hom. Gr., 1890, p. 127.
[4] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 389.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 50.
[6] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 364 f.
[7] W.-Sch., p. 115. Cf. Veitch, Gk. Verb, p. 110.

also Mk. 13:15; 15:32; Lu. 17:31), μετάβα (Mt. 17:20). On the other hand note the usual κατάβηθι (Mt. 27:40, etc.), μετάβηθι (Jo. 7:3), προσανάβηθι (Lu. 14:10). The forms in –άτω, --ατε, --άτωσαν are like the Doric.

Γινώσκω. This verb in the Ionic and κοινή γιν. form is very common in John's Gospel and the First Epistle. It is used in composition with ἀνα--, δια--, ἐπι--, κατα--, προ--, the papyri adding still other compounds.[1] The N. T. shows the usual second aorist forms like ἔγνων (Lu. 16:4). What calls for remark is the second aorist subjunctive γνοῖ instead of γνῷ. W. F. Moulton's view[2] on this point is confirmed by the papyri[3] parallel in ἀποδοῖ and accepted by W. H. and Nestle. Analogy seems to have worked here to make γνοῖ like δοῖ. But Winer-Schmiedel (p. 115) cite γνοῖ from Hernias, *Mand*. IV, 1, 5 א. It is in accordance with the contraction of –οω verbs when we find forms like γνοῖ, δοῖ, etc., όῃ= οῖ instead of όῃ—ῷ. For γνοῖ see Mk. 5:43; 9:30; Lu. 19:15. But see also γνῷ in Jo. 7:51; 11:57 (D has γνοῖ); 14:31; Ac. 22:24 (ἐπι--). But the MSS. vary in each passage. In the LXX the regular γνῷ occurs save in Judith 14:5, where B has ἐπιγνοῖ.

Δίδωμι. This very common verb is frequently compounded (ἀνα--, ἀντ--, ἀπο--, δια--, ἐκ--, ἐπι--, μετα--, παρα--, προ--) as in the papyri.[4] The old indicative active appears only in παρεδοσαν in the literary preface to Luke's Gospel (1:2).[5] Elsewhere the first aorist forms in --κα (like ἦκα, ἔθηκα) sweep the field for both singular and plural. These κ forms for the plural appear in the Attic inscriptions in the fourth century B.C.[6] and rapidly grow. In the papyri Mayser[7] finds only the κ aorists. The other modes go regularly δός, δῶ, etc. The indicative middle occasionally, as the imperfect, has ε for ο of the root. This is possibly due to proportional analogy (ἐξέδετο: ἐξεδόμην=ἐλύετο: ἐλυόμην).[8] These forms are ἀπέδετο (Heb. 12:16), ἐξέδετο (Mk. 12:1; Mt. 21:33; Lu. 20:9). The usual form ἀπέδοσθε, etc., appears in Ac. 5:8; 23) 7:9. The subjunctive active third singular shows great variation between δοῖ, δῷ (cf. γνοῖ above), and δώῃ (especially in Paul's Epistles).[9] The LXX MSS. occasionally give --δοῖ and

[1] Mayser, Or. d. griech. Pap., p. 391. 2 W.-M., p. 360 note.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 55. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 137, 325, for ὅπως δοῖ.. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, pp. 37, 436.

[4] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 392.

[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T.. Gk., p. 49.

[6] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 188 f.

[7] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 367 f.

[8] So W.-H., Notes on Orth., p. 167 f. Cf. W.-Seh., p. 121. For pap. exx. see Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37.

[9] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49.

even δῇ by assimilation (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 255 f.). For papyri examples see references under **γινώσκω**. Mark four times (all the examples) has also δοῖ according to the best MSS. (4:29; 8:37; 14:10 f.) and John one out of three (13:2). Tisch. (not W. H.) reads ἀποδοῖ in 1 Th. 5:15, but all MSS. have ἀποδῷ in Mt. 18:30. W. H. accept δῷ in Jo. 15:16; Eph. 3:16; 1 Th. 5: 15 (ἀπο--). Most MSS. read δώῃ in Eph. 1:17 and 2 Tim. 2: 25, in both of which places W. H. put δῴη (opt. for δοίη) in the text and δώῃ in the margin. The opt. δῴη appears in the LXX (Jer. 9:2) in the text of Swete. Con. and Stock, *Sel. from LXX,* p. 45, give δῴη twenty-nine times in LXX and δοίη three times as variant. They give an interesting list of other forms of δίδωμι and its compounds in the LXX. Hort[1] is doubtful about such a subjunctive in δώῃ except in the epic poets. Blass[2] is willing to take δώῃ, and Moulton[3] cites Boeotian and Delphian inscriptions which preserve this Homeric form. He adds that the subjunctive seems "a syntactical necessity" in Eph. 1:17 and 2 Tim. 2:25. The opt. δῴη= δοίη (cf. subjunctive δόῃ= δῷ) is without variant in 2 Th. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18.[4] Blass[5] scouts the idea of a possible first aorist active ἔδωσα from ἵνα δώσῃ (Jo. 17:2 א[c]AC), δώσωμεν (Mk. 6:37, אD), on the ground that η and **ει, ο** and ω so often blend in sound in the **κοινή**. The so-called future subjunctive will be discussed later (ch. XIX).

῾**Ιημι.** Not in simplex in N. T. (see p. 314 for details), but ἀφίημι is quite common (especially in the Gospels), and **συνίημι** less so. Besides a few examples occur also of ἀνίημι, καθίημι παρίημι. The papyri[6] use the various prepositions freely in composition with ἵημι. The common **μι** second aorists, like ἄφες (Mt. 3:15), ἀφῇ (Mk. 12:19), ἀνέντες (Ac. 27:40), are found. In the indicative active, however, the form in –κα is used alone in both singular and plural, as ἀφήκαμεν (Mt. 19:27), ἀφήκατε (Mt. 23: 23), ἀφῆκαν (Mk. 11:6). This is true of all the compounds of ἵημι in the N. T. as in LXX (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 252). The form ἀφῆκες (Rev. 2:4) is on a par with the second person singular perfect active indicative as accepted by W. H. in κεκοπίακες (Rev. 2:3), πέπτωκες (Rev. 2:5), εἴληφες (Rev. 11:17).[7] **᾽Αφήκαεμν** is aorist in Mk. 10:28 as well as in its parallel Mt. 19:27

[1] Notes on Orth., p. 168. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 121.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48 f. [3] Prol., p. 55. Cf. Dittenb., Syll., 462. 17, etc.
[4] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168. [5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 49, 212.
[6] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 398.
[7] Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 166. The evidence is "nowhere free from

(= Lu. 18 : 28). So also as to **συνήκατε** in Mt. 13:51. The perfect in **–εῖκα** does not, however, occur in the N. T. nor in the LXX (cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 51), though the papyri have it (Mayser, *Gr. d. griech. Pap.*, p. 331).

῞Ιστημι. This verb is used freely by itself, especially in the Gospels, and occurs in twenty prepositional combinations according to Thayer (**ἀν--, ἐπ-αν--, ἐξ-αν--, ἀνθ--, ἀφ--, δι--, ἐν--, ἐξ--, ἐπ--, ἐφ--, κατ-εφ--, συν-εφ--, καθ--, ἀντι-καθ--, ἀπο-,αθ--, μεθ--, παρ--, περι--, προ--, συν--**), going quite beyond the papyri in richness of expression.[1] The second aorist active indicative **ἔστη** (**ἀπέστη**, etc.) is common and is intransitive as in Attic, just like **ἐστάθη** (cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 50). The other forms are regular (**στῶ, στῆθι**, etc.) save that **ἀνάστα**(like **ἀνάβα**) is read in a few places (Ac. 9:11; 12:7; Eph. 5:14), but **στῆθι, ἀνάστηθι** (Ac. 9:6, 34), **ἐπίστηθι, στῆτε, ἀντίστητε, ἀπόστητε, ἀποστήτω**.[2] Winer[3] cites **ἀπόστα, παράστα** also from late writers and a few earlier authors for **ἀνάστα**. The LXX shows a few examples also.[4]

᾽Ονίνημι. This classic word (not given in the papyri, according to Mayser's *Grammatik*) is found only once in the N. T., the second aorist opt. middle **ὀναίμην** (Phil. 20).

Τίθημι. The compounds of **τίθημι** in the N. T. (**ἀνα--, προσ-ανα--, ἀπο--, δια--, ἀντι-δια--, ἐκ--, ἐπι--, συν-επι--, κατα--, συν-κατα--, μετα--, παρα--, περι--, προ--, προσ--, συν--, ὑπο**—) vie with those of **῞ίστημι** and equal the papyri use.[5] The first aorist active in **–κα** alone appears (so LXX) in the indicative singular and plural as **ἔθηκαν** (Mk. 6:29), but the subjunctive in **–θῶ** (Mt. 22:44), imperative **πρόσθες** (Lu. 17:5). The middle has the regular second aorist **ἔθετο** (Ac. 19:21 and often).

Φημί. If one is surprised to see this verb put under the list of second aorist, he can turn to Blass,[6] who says that it is "at once

doubt," some MSS. read **ἔδωκες** (Jo. 17:7 f.) and **ἀφήκετε** (Mt. 23:23), not to say **ἑώρακες** (Jo. 8:57), **ἐλήλυθες** (Ac. 21:22, B also). Moulton (Prol., p. 52) considers **-ες** a "mark of imperfect Gk." For further exx. of this **-ες** ending in the LXX and **κοινή** see Buresch, Rhein. Mus. etc., 1891, p. 222 f. For **῞ίημι** and its compounds in the LXX see C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 45 f., showing numerous **--ω** forms, **αφῆκαν** (Xen. **ἦκαν**), etc.

[1] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 398. is :

[2] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168. a W.-M., p. 94.

[4] Thack., Gr., p. 254. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 122 f. On **ἱστάναι** and its compounds in the LXX see interesting list in C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 43 f., giving **-ω** forms, transitive **ἔστακα**, etc. [5] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 411.

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 50. The verb is mentioned here to impress the fact that it is aorist as well as imperfect.

imperfect and aorist." It is common in the N. T. as aorist (Mt. 4:7, for instance, **ἔφη**. It is not always possible to decide.

2. *Some —**μι** Presents*. It is difficult to group these verbs according to any rational system, though one or two small groups (like those in –**νυμι**, –**ημι**) appear. The presents are more common in the N. T. than the aorists. The list is based on the uncompounded forms.

Δείκ-νυ-μι. Already in the Attic δεικνύω is common, but Blass[1] observes that in the N. T. the middle-passive –**μι** forms are still rather common. It is compounded with **ἀνα--, ἀπο--, ἐν--, ἐπι--, ὑπο--**, No presents (or imperfects) occur with **ἀνα--** and **ὑπο--**. The word itself is not used very extensively. The form **δείκνυμι** is found once (1 Cor. 12:31), –**ύω** not at all. So on the other hand **δείκνύεις** occurs once (Jo. 2:18), –**υς** not at all. **Δείκνυσιν** is read by the best MSS. (Mt. 4:8; Jo. 5:20). The middle **ἐνδείκνυνται** appears in Ro. 2:15. The –**μι** participle active is found in Ac. 18: 28 (**ἐπιδεινύς**) and 2 Th. 2:4 (**ἀποδεικνύντα**). The middle –**μι** participle is seen in Ac. 9:39; Tit. 2:10; 3:2 (–**ύμενος**, etc.). In Heb. 6:11 the infinitive **ἐνδείκνυσθαι** is read, but **δεικνύειν** (Mt. 16: 21 B –**ύναι**).[2] The other N. T. verbs in –**υμι** (**ἀπόλλυμι, ζώννυμι, ὑποζώννυμι, ὄμνυμι, σβέννυμι, στρώννυμι, ὑποστρώννυμι,** κτλ.) will be discussed in alphabetical order of the simplex. The inscriptions show these forms still in use (Schweizer, *Perg. Inschr*., p. 178). The verbs in **--νυμι** were the first to succumb to the –ω inflection. In the LXX the —**μι** forms are universal in the middle, but in the active the –ω forms are more usual (Thack., *Gr.,* p. 245).

Δίδωμι. See under (d), 1, for list of compounds in the N. T. Attic Greek had numerous examples from the form **διδό-ω (δίδου, ἐδίδουν, –ους, –ου)**. This usage is extended in the N. T. as in the papyri[3] to **διδῶ** (Rev. 3:9), though even here BP have **δίδωμι**. In Wisd. of Sol. 12:19 **διδοῖς** occurs, but Lu. 22:48 has the regular **παραδίδως**. **Δίδωσι** is common (in LXX, Ps. 37:21, **διδοῖ** appears) and **διδόασιν** in Rev. 17:13. The uniform imperfect **ἐδίδου** (Mt. 15:36) is like the Attic. Hort observes that Mk. (15:23) and Ac. (4:33; 27:1) prefer **ἐδίδουν**. Jo. (19:3) has, however, **ἐδίδοσαν** and Acts once also (16:4). **Δίδου** (Attic present imperative) is read by Syrian MSS. in Mt. 5:42 for **δός.** In Rev. 22:2 the

[1] Ib., p. 48.

[2] In the pap. both —**υμι** and –**ύω** but only —**υμαι**. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 392.

[3] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37. Cf. Deiss., B. S., p. 192. Mod. Gk. has **δίδω**.

text has participle ἀποδίδοῦν, for —όν (marg. —ούς), while παραδιδῶν is read by א in Mt. 26:46 and D in Mk. 14:42, etc.[1] The middle-passive forms in —ετο (imperfect) from a present δίδω are like the aorist forms, which see above. So διεδίδετο (Ac. 4:35) and παρεδίδετο (1 Cor. 11:23). So also subjunctive παραδιδοῖ is found only once (1 Cor. 15:24) and is probably to be rejected (BG), though the papyri amply support it.[2] In the imperfect ἐδίδοσαν holds its place in the LXX, while in the present the forms generally prevail (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 250). The LXX is quite behind the N. T. in the transition from --μι to —ω forms.

Δύναμαι. The use of δύνῃ (Mk. 9:22; Lu. 16:2; Rev. 2:2) instead of δύνασαι argues for the thematic δύνομαι. Elsewhere δύνασαι (Lu. 6:42, etc.). This use of δύνῃ is found in the poets and from Polybius on in prose (Thayer), as shown by inscriptions[3] and papyri.[4] Hort[5] calls it a "tragic" form retained in the κοινή. It is not surprising therefore to find B reading δύνομαι (also –όμεθα, --όμενος) in Mk. 10:39; Mt. 19:12; 26:53; Ac. 4:20; 27:15; Is. 28:20 (so א in Is. 59:15). The papyri[6] give plenty of illustrations also. MSS. in the LXX give δύνομαι and δύνῃ.

Εἰμί. The compounds are with ἀπ--, ἐν--, ἔξ-- (only ἔξεστιν, ἐξόν), παρ--, συν--, συν-παρ--. The papyri[7] show a much more extended use of prepositions. This very common verb has not undergone many changes, though a few call for notice. In the present indicative there is nothing for remark. The imperfect shows the middle ἤμην, ἤμεθα regularly (as Mt. 25:43; 23:30), as modern Greek uniformly has the middle present εἶμαι, etc., as well as imperfect middle. Cf. already in ancient Greek the future middle ἔσομαι. The use of seen in the papyri[8] and inscriptions[9] also, served to mark it off from the third singular ἦν. But examples of ἦμεν still survive (Ro. 7:5, etc.). Moulton[10] quotes from Ramsay[11] a Phrygian inscription of εἶμαι for early fourth century A.D. He cites also the Delphian middle forms ἦται, ἔωται, Messenian ἦνται,

[1] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 167. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 121.
[2] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37. [3] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 177.
[4] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 355; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36. Cf. also Dieterich, Untersuch., p. 222; Schmid, Atticismus, IV, p. 597; Deiss., B. S., p. 193.
[5] Notes on Orth., p. 168. Cf. Lobeck, Phryn., p. 359 f.
[6] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 355; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36.
[7] Mayser, ib., p. 394.
[8] Ib., p. 356. [9] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 178.
[10] Prol., p. 56. D (M. shows) alone has ἦν in Ac. 20:18.
[11] Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, II, 565.

Lesbian **ἔσσο**, as early instances of this tendency, not to mention the Northwest Greek.[1] The peculiar classical second person **ἦσθα** is found in Mk. 14:67; Mt. 26:69, but elsewhere is (Jo. 11:21, 32, etc.), the common form in the **κοινή.**[2] **῞Ητε** (Ro. 6:20, for instance) is regular. So with the imperative (Mt. 2:13, etc.). **῞Ητω** (as 1 Cor. 16:22) is less common[3] than the usual **ἔστω** (Gal. 1:8). **῞Εστωσαν** (never **ὄντων** nor **ἔστων**), as in Lu. 12:35, is a form found in Attic inscriptions since 200 B.C.[4] Some of the papyri even have **ἤτωσαν**.[5] Mention has already (Orthography) been made of the irrational **ν** with the subjunctive in the papyri,[6] as in **ὅταν ἦν**—**δηλώσω**. The use of **ἔνι=ἔνεστι** (as 1 Cor. 6:5; Gal. 3:28, etc.) an old idiom. **῞Ενι=ἐν** and in modern Greek has supplanted **ἐστί** in the form **εἶνε** or **εἶναι** (so for **εἰσί**, also).[7] Cf. Sir. 37:2. N. T. has no example of imperative **ἔστε.**

Εἶμι. Only in compounds (**ἀπ--, εἰς--, ἐξ--, ἐπ--, συν--**). The papyri[8] and the inscriptions[9] show only the compound forms. Blass[10] indeed denies that even the compound appears in the popular **κοινή**, but this is an overstatement. The Attic employed **ἔρχομαι** for the present indicative and kept **εἶμι** for the future indicative. The **κοινή** followed the Ionic (and Epic) in the use of **ἔρχομαι** for all the tenses to the neglect of **εἶμι**. In the N. T. only Luke and the writer of Hebrews (once) use these compound forms of **εἶμι** and that very rarely. **῞Απειμι**, only occurs in the imperfect indicative (Ac. 17:10, **ἀπῆεσαν**). **Εἴσειμι** appears four times, two in the present indicative (Ac. 3:3; Heb. 9:6), two in the imperfect indicative (Ac. 21:18, 26), while **εἰσέρχομαι**, appears over two hundred times. **῞Εξειμι** also occurs four times, all in Acts (13:42; 17:15; 20:7; 27:43), against a host of instances of **ἐξέρχομαι. ῞Επειμι** is read five times in Acts and all of them in the participle **τῇ ἐπιούσῃ** (Ac. 7:26, etc.). **Σύνειμι** is found only in Lu. 8:4. B reads **εἴσιθι** in Ac. 9:6, not **εἴσελθε**. Blass[11] rather

[1] Prol., p. 37.
[2] W.-Sch., p.,117:
[3] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 56. Both forms in pap. and inscr. On **ἦμην, ἦς, ἤμεθα, ἦτω, ἔστωσαν** in the LXX see C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 31 f. Thack., Gr., P. 256 f. Beyond this the LXX goes very little.
[4] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 191.
[5] Moulton, Rev., 1901, p. 436.
[6] Ib., p. 38. Cf. Gen. 6:17 E, according to Moulton, Prol., p. 49.
[7] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 51 f.; Thack., p. 257.
[8] Mayser, GrF d. griech. Pap., p. 355.
[9] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 157. [10] Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 52, 54.
[11] Ib., p. 52.

needlessly construes ἐξιόντων (Ac. 13:42) in the aoristic sense (so as to 17:10, 15; 21:18, 26). **Εἶμι** is nearly gone from the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 257).

Ἐπίσταμαι. This verb occurs fifteen times in the N. T., chiefly in Acts (10:28, etc.) and always in the present tense.[1]

Ζεύγνυμι. Only in the compound **συ-ζεύγνυμι** and in the aorist active alone, **συνέζευξεν** (Mk. 10:9 =Mt. 19:6).

Ζώννυμι. The compounds are with **ἀνα--, δια--, περι--, ὑπο--.** Curiously enough the verb does not appear in Mayser, Nachmanson nor Schweizer, though Mayser (p. 397) does mention **ζεύγνυμι** which on the other hand the N. T. does not give save the one form above. But the uncompounded form is read in the N. T. only three times, one aorist indicative (Ac. 12:8), one future indicative (Jo. 21:18), and one imperfect (Jo. 21:18, **ἐζώννυες,** a form in **–ύω**, not **–υμι)**. There is only one instance of the compound with **ἀνα--** and that an aorist participle (1 Pet. 1:13). The three examples of **διαζ**., all in Jo. (13:4, etc.), yield no presents nor imperfects. The same thing is true of the half-dozen instances of **περιζ**., as Lu. 12:35, The LXX has **περιζώννυται** (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 269). The one instance of **ὑποζ**. is in Ac. 27:17 and shows the form in **–υμι, ὑποζωννύντες.**

Ἧμαι. It is only in the compound form **κάθημαι** that this verb is seen in the N. T. and thus very frequently, twice with **συν-** prefixed (Mk. 14:54; Ac. 26:30). It is usually the participle **καθήμενος** that one meets in the N. T. (as Mt. 9:9). The imperfect is regularly **ἐκάθητο**, etc. (as Mt. 13:1), the future **καθήσομαι**, (as Mt. 19:28). No **–ω** forms appear in the present, though **κάθῃ** (Ac. 23:3) is a contract form like **δύνῃ** for **κάθησο** (already in Hyperides).[2] The short imperative **κάθου** for **κάθησαι** (as Jas. 2:3) is already in the LXX (cf. Mt. 22:44 from Ps. 110:1) and indeed in the late Attic (Blass, *ib*.), though chiefly postclassical.[3]

Ἵημι. Like **εἶμι** this verb only appears in the N. T. in the compounded form (**ἀν–, ἀφ--, καθ--, παρ--, συν--**). The same thing appears to be true of the papyri as given by Mayser,[4] though fifteen combinations greet us in the papyri. But the papyri and the **κοινή** inscriptions have not yet furnished us with the **–ω** formation with **ἵημι** compounds which we find in **ἀφ--** and **συνίημι**

[1] Just so the pap., Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 395.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 52. Cf. also for pap., Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 38. For LXX see Thackeray, p. 272.

[3] W.-Sch., p. 118; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 177; Reinhold, De Graec., p. 89.

[4] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 398.

in the N. T.[1] and the LXX.[2] But Philo[3] and the N. T. Apocrypha and early Christian writers[4] follow the LXX and the N. T. **᾽Ανίημι** indeed has only ἀνιέντες (Eph. 6:9) in the present stem. So also **καθίημι** shows only **καθιέμενον (--μένην)** in Ac. 10:11; 11:5, while **παρίημι** has no present, but only an aorist (Lu. 11: 42) and a perfect passive (Heb. 12:12). **᾽Αφίημι** is the form of the verb that is common in the N. T. In Rev. 2:20 ἀφεῖς is probably a present from ἀφέω.[5] But Blass (p. 51, of N. T. Grammar) compares the Attic ἀφίεις and τίθεις. Only ἀφίημι (Jo. 14: 27) and ἀφίησι (Mt. 3:15) occur, but in Lu. 11:4 ἀφίομεν, is from the Ionic ἀφίω (cf. δίδω). So also in Rev. 11:9 ἀφίουσιν and in Jo. 20:23 marg. W. H. have ἀφίονται. Elsewhere ἀφίενται (Mt. 9:2, etc.). In the imperfect ᾕφιεν from αφίω is read in Mk. 1:34; 11:16. **᾽Αφέωνται** (Lu. 5:20, 23, etc.) is a perfect passive (Doric Arcadian, Ionic).[6] Cf. Ionic ἕωκα. Simcox (*Language of the N. T.*, p. 38) quotes also ἀνέωνται from Herodotus. With **συνίημι** the task is much simpler. Blass[7] sums it up in a word. In Ac. 7:25 **συνιέναι**, gives us the only undisputed instance of a **–μι** form. All the others are –ω forms or have –ω variations. However **συνιέντος** is correct in Mt. 13:19 and **συνιέναι** in Lu. 24:45. There is a good deal of fluctuation in the MSS. in most cases. W. H. read **συνίουσιν** (Mt. 13:13), **συνίωσιν**, (Mk. 4:12), **συνίων** (Ro. 3 : 11). In 2 Cor. 10:12 W. H. read **συνιᾶσιν** after B. In the LXX only the compounded verb occurs, and usually the **–μι** forms save with **συνίημι** (Thackeray, Gr., p. 250 f.).

῾Ίστημι. Cf. also ἐπ-ίσταμαι. (see above) and στήκω (from ἕστηκα, imperfect ἕστηκε in Rev. 12:4, στέκω in modern Greek). For the list of compounds[8] see list of aorists (1). But the essential facts can be briefly set forth. The **–μι** form in the present stem has disappeared in the active voice save in **καθίστησιν**, (Heb. 7:28; 2 Pet. 1:8), **συνίστημι** (Ro. 16:1) and **συνίστησι** (2 Cor. 10:18; Ro. 3:5; 5: 8).[9] The middle (passive) forms retain the **–μι** inflection regularly with **῾ίστημι** and its compounds (**ἀν--, ἀφ--, αὐθ--, ἐξ--, ἐφ--, προ--, συν--**), as **καθίστατι** (Heb. 5:1), **περίιστασο**

[1] Mayser, ib., p. 354; Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 167.
[2] W.-Sch p. 123. Herod. is cited for the use of **ἐξίει** and **μετίει** as –ω presents.
[3] Ib. [4] Reinhold, De Graec., p. 94.
[5] So Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 167; W.-Sch., p. 123; Hatz., Einl., pp. 309, 334.
[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 38 f.
[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 51. He gives the MS. variations and parallels in Hermas and Barn. See further A. Buttmann, Gr., p. 48.
[8] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 398.
[9] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168; Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 48.

(2 Tim. 2:16).[1] Two **--ω** forms supplant the **--μι** conjugation of ἵστημι and its compounds, that in –άω and that in –άνω, though usually the MSS. vary greatly between the two.[2] In 1 Cor. 13:2 ℵBDEFG read μεθιστάναι, though W. H. follow ACKL in μεθιστάνειν.[3] The form in –άω is found in various MSS. for ἱστάω (as ἱστῶμεν Ro. 3:31), ἀποκαθ-- (Mk. 9:12 Rec.), ἐξιστάω, καθιστάω, μεθιστάω, συνιστάω, but is nowhere accepted in the W. H. text, though Hort[4] prefers συνιστᾷν to συνιστάνειν in 2 Cor. 3:1. In 2 Cor. 4:2 a threefold division occurs in the evidence. For συνιστάνοντες we have ABP (so W. H. and Nestle), for συνιστάντες ℵCD*FG, for συνιστῶτες D^{c}EKL.[5] The form in –άνω is uniformly given by W. H., though the form in –άω comes from Herodotus on and is frequent in the LXX.[6] But the **--μι** forms hold their own pretty well in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 247). The form in –άνω, may be compared with the Cretan στανύειν and is found in the late Attic inscriptions.[7] Instances of the form in –άνω in the W. H. text are Ac. 1:6; 8:9; 17:15; 1 Cor. 13:2; 2 Cor. 3:1; 5:12; 6:4; 10:12, 18; Gal. 2:18; Ro. 3:31; 6:13, 16). In Mk. 9:12 W. H. (not so Nestle) accept the form ἀποκατιστάνει after B, while ℵD read ἀποκαταστάνει (cf. Cretan στανύω). D has this form also in Ac. 1:6 and 17:15.

Κεῖμα. This defective verb is only used in the present and imperfect in the N. T. as in the papyri,[8] and with a number of prepositions in composition like the papyri also. The prepositions are **ἀνα--, συν-ανα--, ἀντι--, ἀπο--, ἐπι--, κατα--, παρα--, περι--, προ--.** The regular **--μι** forms are always used, and sometimes as the passive of τίθημι, as περίκειμαι (Ac. 28:20; Heb. 5:2). For ἀνάκειμαι only the participle ἀνακείμενος appears (so Mt. 9:10) save once ἀνέκειτο (Mt. 26:20) and twice with σύν (Mt. 9:10 Mk. 2:15). In Lu. 23: 53 ἦν κείμενος follows the Attic, but ℵB have ἦν τεθειμένος in Jo. 19:41.[9] So in the LXX τίθημι partially replaces κεῖμαι (Thackeray, *Gr.*, pp. 255, 272).

Κρέμαμαι. This verb is used as the middle of the active κρεμάννυμι (this form not in N. T.) and does not appear in Mayser's list

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 49.
[2] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49.
[3] Here Hort (Notes, etc., p. 168) differs from Westcott and prefers –άναι.
[4] Ib. [5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48.
[6] Ib. W.-Sch., p. 122.
[7] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 177. For many **--νω** verbs in mod. Gk. see Thumb, Handb., p. 133 f.
[8] Mayser, Or. d. griech. Pap., pp. 354, 399. For the Byz. and mod. Gk. usage see Dieterich, Unters., p. 223. [9] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 51.

for the papyri. The form[1] **κρέμαται** is read in Mt. 22:40 and the participle **κρεμάμενος(ν)** in Gal. 3:13; Ac. 28:4. In Lu. 19:48 **א**B (so W. H. anq Nestle) read **ἐξεκρέμετο**, an –ω form and the only compound form of the verb in the N. T. The other forms are aorists which come from an active present **κρεμάννυμι, ---αννύω, --άω** or **–άζω.** They are **κρεμάσαντες** (Ac. 5:30) and **κρεμασθῇ** (Mt. 18: 6). But none of these presents occurs in the N. T. Cf. Veitch, *Greek Verbs*, p. 343 f., for examples of the active and the middle. So also no present of **κεράννυμι**, (compound **συν--**) is found in the N. T., but only the perfect passive (Rev. 14:10) and the aorist active (Rev. 18:6).

Μίγνυμι. The only —**μι** form is the compound **συν-ανα-μίγνυσθαι** (1 Cor. 5:9, 11) and so 2 Th. 3:14 according to W. H., instead of **συν-ανα-μίγνυσθε**. Elsewhere, as in the papyri,[2] the N. T. has only the perfect passive (Mt. 27:34) and the aorist active (Lu. 13:1).

Οἴγνυμι. This verb does not appear in the N. T. in the simple form, but always compounded with **ἀν–** or **δι-αν--**. Besides it is always an –ω verb as in the papyri[3] and the LXX.[4] It is worth mentioning here to mark the decline of the **–μι** forms.

Ὄλλυμι. Only in the common **ἀπ--** and once with **συν-απ--** (Heb. 11:31). In the active only the –ω forms are found as **ἀπολλύει** (Jo. 12:25), **ἀπόλλυε** (Ro. 14:15). But in the middle (passive) only the **–μι**, forms[5] meet us, as **ἀπόλλυται** (1 Cor. 8:11), **ἀπώλλυντο** (1 Cor. 10:9). So the LXX.

Ὄμνυμι. A half-dozen examples of the present tense of this verb occur in the N. T. All but one (**ὀμνύναι**, Mk. 14:71) belong to the –ω inflection, as **ὀμνύει**. (Mt. 23:21 f.). The Ptolemaic papyri also have one example of **ὄμνυμι**, the rest from **ὀμνύω**.[6] The LXX sometimes has the **–μι** form in the active and always in the middle (Thackeray, Gr., p. 279). Neither **πήγνυμι**. (aorist Heb. 8:2) nor **προσπήγνυμι** (aorist Ac. 2:23) appears in the present in the N. T.

Πίμπλημι. No present tense in the N. T., though a good many aorists, save the compound participle **ἐμπιπλῶν**, from the –ω verb **--άω.** Mayser[7] gives no papyri examples. LXX has –ω form usually.

[1] In the LXX the active goes over to the —ω class. Thack., Gr., p. 273.
[2] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 403.
[3] Ib., p. 404. And indeed the old Attic **ἀνοίγω**, Meisterh., p. 191.
[4] Thack., Gr., p. 277.
[5] So the pap. Mayser, Gr., p. 352; Thackeray, p. 246.
[6] Mayser, ib., pp. 351 f., 404.
[7] lb., p. 406.

Πίμπρημι. The simple verb occurs once only, πίμπρασθαι. (Ac. 28:6) according to W. H.[1] This is the only instance where a present occurs at all in the N. T. The papyri give no light as yet. No simplex in the LXX, but ἐνεπίμπρων in 2 Macc. 8:6 (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 249).

Ῥήγνυμι. The compounds are with δια--, περι--, προσ--. No presents appear save in the simple verb and διαρ--. With διαρ. only the –ω forms are used as διερήσσετο (Lu. 5:6), διαρήσσων (Lu. 8:29). But we have ῥήγνυνται (Mt. 9:17) and ῥήσσει (Mk. 9:18). Mayser gives no papyri examples of the present.

Ῥώννυμι has no presents at all in the N. T., but only the, perfect passive imperative ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29).

Σβέννυμι. This verb has only three presents in the N. T. and all of the form, one active σβέννυτε (1 Th. 5:19, Tisch. ζβεννε), two middle σβέννυται (Mk. 9:48) and σβέννυνται (Mt. 25: 8). The LXX has only --μι forms and in the more literary books (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 284).

Στρώννυμι. The compounds are with κατα--, ὑπο--. There are only two present stems used in the N. T., ἐστρώννυον (Mt. 21:8) and ὑποστ. (Lu. 19:36). Thus the —μι form is wholly dropped as in the papyri[2] and the LXX.[3]

Τίθημι. For the list of compounds see Aorist (1). This verb has preferred the —μι form of the present stem as a rule in the κοινή. The inscriptions[4] do so uniformly and the papyri[5] use the –ω inflection far less than is true of δίδωμι. In the present indicative D has τίθι (τίθει) for τίθησι[6] (Lu. 8:16). In the imperfect ἐτίθει is read twice (Ac. 2:47; 2 Cor. 3:13) from τιθέω, as already in the Attic. So likewise ἐτίθουν (as in Attic) twice (Ac. 3:2; 4:35), but the best MSS. have ἐτίθεσαν in Mk. 6:56 (ℵBLΔ) and Ac. 8:17 (ℵAC, though B has –οσαν and C –εισαν).[7] The reading of B in Ac. 8:17 (ἐτίθοσαν) calls for a present τίθω which the papyri supply against the idea of Winer-Schmiedel,[8] as παρατιθόμενος (BM 239), παρακατατίθομαι (B.0 326).[9] Good cursives show that the late language used τιθέω in the present (Mk. 10:16; 15:17). Cf. ὑποτιθοῦσα in second century papyrus (B.U. 350).[10] In the LXX forms prevail in the present and imperfect (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 250).

[1] Tisch. reads ἐμπιπρᾶσθαι from πιπράω. Nestle agrees with W. H.
[2] Mayser, Gr., p. 352.
[3] Thack., Gr., p. 286.
[4] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 156; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 176.
[5] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 352 f.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49.
[7] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 167.
[8] P. 121.
[9] Deiss., B. S., p. 192 f.; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37.
[10] Ib. Mod. Gk. has θέτω.

Φημί. The only N. T. compound is with **συν**–, none in the papyri according to Mayser.[1] In the papyri **φάσκω** (lengthened form) is usually employed for the participle and infinitive[2] of **φημί**. The participle is so used in the N. T. (Ac. 24:9; Ro. 1: 22). **Σύνφημι** appears only once (Ro. 7:16). The —**μι** inflection is uniform in **φημί** both in the present and the imperfect (aorist). The only forms in the N. T. are **φημί** (1 Cor. 7:29), **φησίν** (Mt. 13:29), **φασίν** (Ro. 3:8), and the common **ἔφη** (Mt. 4:7). It is regular –**μι** in the LXX.

Χρή. This impersonal verb had a poetic infinitive **χρῆναι** of the **--μι** inflection, but Veitch (p. 627) and L. and S. get it from **χράω**. At any rate **χρή** is found only once in the N. T. (Jas. 3:10), **δεῖ** having supplanted it. Mayser does not find it in the papyri nor Nachmanson. and Schweizer in the inscriptions.

3. Some —**μι** Perfects. There are only three verbs that show the active perfects without **(κ)α** in the N. T. (mere root, athematic).

θνήσκω. The compounds are **ἀπο--** (very common), **συν-απο--** (rare). The uncompounded verb occurs nine times and forms the perfect regularly as an –**ω** verb (**τέθνηκα**), save that in Ac. 14: 19 DEHLP read **τεθνάναι** instead of **τεθνηκέναι**, but the –**μι** form is not accepted by W. H. The N. T. has always **τεθνηκώς**, never **τενθνεώς**. In the LXX these shorter second perfect forms occur a few times in the more literary books (Thackeray, *Gr*., pp. 253, 270). They show "a partial analogy to verbs in –**μι**," (Blass, *Gr*., p. 50).

Οἶδα is a —**μι** perfect in a few forms (**ἴσμεν, ἴστε**) from root **ιδ**– (cf. Latin *vid-eo* Greek **εἶδον**). The word is very common in the N. T. and **σύνοιδα** is found twice (Ac. 5:2; 1 Cor. 4:4). The present perfect indicative like the papyri[3] usually has **οἶδα, οἶδας, οἶδε, οἴδαμεν**, **–ατε, --ασιν**, which was the Ionic inflection and so naturally prevailed in the **κοινή**. Three times indeed the literary Attic **ἴστε** appears (Jas. 1:19; Eph. 5:5; Heb. 12:17). The passage in James may be imperative instead of indicative. In Ac. 26:4 **ἴσασιν** (literary Attic also) is read. The imperfect also runs **ᾔδειν, ᾔδεις**, etc. **῏Ηιδεισαν** (Mk. 1:34; 14:40) is like **ἱστήκεισαν** (Rev. 7:11).[4] The other modes go regularly **εἰδῶ** (Mt. 9:6), **εἰδέναι** (1 Th. 5:12), **εἰδώς** (Mt. 12:25). The LXX usage is in accord with the N. T. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 278.

῾Ίστημι. See Aorist (1) for compounds. The second perfect is in the N.T. the infinitive **ἑστάναι** (Lu. 13:25; Ac. 12:14;

[1] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 355. [2] Ib. So inscr., Nachm., p. 157
[3] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 372.
[4] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 114 f. Neither **οἶσθα** nor **ᾔδεισθα** appears in the N. T.

1 Cor. 10:12) and the participle ἑστώς (Mt. 20:3, 6, etc.) though ἑστηκώς (—ω form) also sometimes (Mk. 13:14; 15:35, etc.), ἑστῶσα (1 Cor. 7:26; 2 Pet. 3:5), ἑστός (Mt. 24:15; Rev. 14:1) although ἑστηκός also (Rev. 5:6 text, W. H. marg. –ώς). The same variation occurs in the papyri. Curiously enough the earlier LXX books show less of the short perfect than the later ones and the N. T. Thackeray (*Gr.*, p. 253) suggests an "Atticistic reversion" for a while. The form ἕστακα (papyri also) belongs to the –ω form as well as the late present στήκω from the perfect stem. These —μι perfects of ἵστημι in are always intransitive, while ἕστηκα is intransitive and ἕστακα is transitive.[2] This in brief is the story of the —μι verbs in the N. T.[3] The new transitive perfect ἕστακα is common in the κοινή from second century B.C. onwards. Cf. Schweizer, *Perg. Inschr.*, p. 185; Mayser, *Gr.*, p. 371.

V. The Modes (ἐγκλίσεις). The meaning and use of the modes or moods belongs to syntax. We have here to deal briefly with any special items that concern the differentiation of the modes from each other by means of mode-signs. There is no clearly proper method of approaching the study of the verb. One can begin with tense, voice and then mode or vice versa. The first is probably the historical order to a certain extent, for the matter is complicated. Some tenses are later than others; the passive voice is more recent than the other two, the imperative as a complete system is a late growth. Since no purely historical treatment is possible by reason of this complicated development, a practical treatment is best. There are reasons of this nature for taking up modes first which do not apply to syntax. The two main ideas in a verb are action and affirmation. The state of the action is set forth by the tense, the relation of the action to the subject by voice, the affirmation by mode. Tense and voice thus have to do with action and mode with affirmation. Mode deals only with the manner of the affirmation. The same personal endings used for voice limit the action (hence finite verbs) in person and number.

(a) THE NUMBER OF THE MOODS OR MODES (*Modi*). This is not so simple a matter as it would at first appear. Modern grammarians generally agree in declining to call infinitives, participles and the verbal adjectives in —τός and —τέος moods. Some refuse to call the indicative a mood, reserving the term for the variations

[1] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 370 f. [2] Ib. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 119.

[3] See Hoffmann, Die griech. Dial., Bd. II, pp. 572 ff., for —μι verbs in North Achaia. For the "strong" perfects, like γέγονα, see VII, (g), 2.

from the indicative as the normal verb by means of mode-signs. Thus Clyde[1] thinks of "only two moods, viz. the subjunctive and the optative, because, these only possess, in combination with the personal endings, a purely modal element." There is point in that, and yet the indicative and imperative can hardly be denied the use of the term. Jannaris[2] admits three moods; indicative, subjunctive and imperative. He follows Donaldson[3] in treating the subjunctive and optative as one mood. Others, like Monro,[4] find the three in the subjunctive, optative and imperative. Once again five moods are seen in early Greek by Riemann and Goelzer[5]: the indicative, injunctive, subjunctive, optative, imperative. On the injunctive see Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*, p. 332, though he does not apply the term mode to the indicative. So Hirt, *Handbuch*, p. 421 f. Moulton[6] admits this primitive division, though declining to call the indicative a mode save when it is a "*modus irrealis*." The injunctive is no longer regarded as a separate mood, and yet it contributed so much to the forms of the imperative that it has to be considered in an historical review. The indicative can only be ruled out when it is regarded as the standard verb and the moods as variations. Certainly it is best to let the indicative go in also. The modern Greek, having no optative, has a special conditional mode (**ὑποθετική**). Cf. Sanskrit. Indeed, the future indicative is considered by some grammarians as a separate mode. Cf. Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek*, p. 494; Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 151. Thumb accepts the four modes in modern Greek (*Handbook*, p. 115).

(b) THE DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE MOODS. These are not absolute, as will be seen, either in form or in syntax. The indicative and the imperative blend in some forms, the subjunctive and the indicative are alike in others, the injunctive is largely merged into the imperative and subjunctive, while the subjunctive and optative are closely akin and in Latin blend into one. Greek held on to the optative with separate values to each mood.[7] Moulton[8] indeed despairs of our being able to give the primitive root-idea of each mood. That subject belongs to

[1] Gk. Synt., p. 62. Cf. Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 417.
[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 179.
[3] New Crat., p. 617 f.
[4] Hom. Gr., p. 49.
[5] Phonet., p. 455.
[6] Prol., p. 164 f. Farrar (Gk. Synt., p. 45) refers to Protagoras as the one who first distinguished the moods.
[7] Giles, Man., p. 459.
[8] Prol., p. 164,

syntax, but the history of the mode-forms is in harmony with this position. As with the cases so with the moods: each mood has fared differently in its development and long history. Not only does each mood perform more functions than one, but the same function may sometimes be expressed by several[1] moods. The names themselves do not cover the whole ground of each mood. The indicative is not the only mood that indicates, though it does it more clearly than the others and it is used in questions also. The subjunctive not merely subjoins, but is used in independent sentences also. The optative is not merely a wish, but was once really a sort of past subjunctive. The imperative has the best name of any, though we have to explain some forms as "permissive" imperatives, and the indicative and subjunctive, not to say injunctive, invade the territory of the imperative." It is probable, but not demonstrable, that the indicative was the original verb-form, from which the, others were evolved by morphological changes" (Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek,* p. 494). The origin of the mode-signs cannot yet be explained.

(c) THE INDICATIVE (ὁριστικὴ ἔγκλισις). There is indeed little to say as to the form of the indicative since it has no mode-sign. It is the mode that is used in all the Indo-Germanic languages unless there is a special reason to use one of the others. In fact it is the normal mode in speech. It is probably the earliest and the one from which the others are derived. *Per contra* it may be argued that emotion precedes passionless intellection. The indicative continues always to be the most frequent and persists when others, like the injunctive and optative, die. It is the only mode that uses all the tenses in Sanskrit and Greek. In the Sanskrit, for instance, the future is found only in the indicative (as in Greek save in the optative in indirect discourse to represent a future indicative of the direct) and the perfect appears only in the indicative and participle, barring many examples of the other modes in the early Sanskrit (Vedas). In the Sanskrit the modes are commonest with the aorist and the present.[2] And in Greek the imperfect and past perfect never got beyond the indicative. The future barely did so, never in the subjunctive till the Byzantine period. The perfect subjunctive and optative, not to say imperative, were always a rarity outside of the periphrastic forms and

[1] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 62. Cf. Kohlmann, Uber die Modi des griech. and des lat. Verbums (1883).

[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201.

in the κοινή have practically vanished.[1] Thus we can clearly see the gradual growth of the modes. In modern English we have almost dropped the subjunctive and use instead the indicative. In the modern Greek the indicative survives with as much vigor as ever. The N. T. peculiarities of the indicative can best be treated under Syntax. It may be here remarked, however, that besides the regular indicative forms a periphrastic conjugation for all the tenses of the indicative appears in the N. T. The present is thus found as ἐστὶν προσαναπληροῦσα (2 Cor. 9:12), the perfect as ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον (Ac. 26:26), the imperfect as ἦν διδάσκων (Lu. 5:17), the past perfect as ἦσαν προεωρακότες (Ac. 21:29), even the aorist as ἦν βληθείς (Lu. 23:19), the future as ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14:9), the future perfect as ἔσομαι πεποιθώς (Heb. 2:13). This widening of the range of the periphrastic conjugation is seen also in the LXX. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 195.

(d) THE SUBJUNCTIVE (ὑποτακτική). The function of the subjunctive as of the other modes will be discussed under Syntax. Changes come in function as in form. Each form originally had one function which varied with the course of time. But the bond between form and function is always to be noted.[2] The German grammarians (Blass, Hirt, Brugmann, etc.) call this the conjunctive mode. Neither conjunctive nor subjunctive is wholly good, for the indicative and the optative both fall often under that technical category.[3] It is in the Greek that mode-building reaches its perfection as in no other tongue.[4] But even in the Greek subjunctive we practically deal only with the aorist and present tenses, and in the Sanskrit the subjunctive rapidly dies out save in the first person as an imperative.[5] In Homer ἴμεν is indicative[6] and ἴομεν is subjunctive so that non-thematic stems make the subjunctive with the thematic vowel ο/ε. Thematic stems made the subjunctive with a lengthened form of it ω/η. Cf. in the Ionic, Lesbian, Cretan inscriptions[7] forms like ἀμείψεται. The same thing appears in Homer also in the transition period.[8] Jannaris[9] indeed calls the aorist subjunctive a future subjunctive because he

[1] See discussion bet. Profs. Harry and Sonnenschein in Cl. Rev., 1905-6. Cf. also La Roche, Beitr. zur griech. Gr., 1893; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 197.

[2] For contrary view see Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. I.

[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 45 f.

[4] Bd. II, p. 40.

[5] Giles, Man., p. 458 f.

[6] Ib., p. 459. In the Boeotian dial. the subj. does not appear in simple sentences (Claflin, Synt. of Bmotian, etc., p. 73)

[7] Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 456 f.

[8] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 49.

[9] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 179.

conceives of the aorist as essentially past, a mistaken idea. The subjunctive does occur more freely in Homer than in the later Greek, partly perhaps because of the fact that the line of distinction between it and the indicative (especially the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative) had not been sharply drawn.[1] Add to this the fact that ποιήσῃ and ποιήσει came to be pronounced exactly alike and one can see how the confusion would come again. Cf. ἵνα δώσει (δώσῃ) in the N. T. MSS.[2] On the short vocal ending of the subjunctive and its connection with the indicative one may recall ἔδομαι, πίομαι, φάγομαι, in the N. T., futures which have a strange likeness to the Homeric subjunctive ἴομεν. They are really subjunctives in origin. It is still a mooted question whether the future indicative is always derived from the aorist subjunctive or in part corresponds to the Sanskrit *sya*.[3] The only aorist subjunctives that call for special comment in the N. T. are the forms γνοῖ and δοῖ, for which see this chapter, iv, (d), 1.[4] There are parallels in the papyri as is there shown. The form ὄψησθε in Lu. 13:28 (supported by AL, etc., against ὄψεσθε, BD) is probably a late aorist form like ἔδωσα (δώσῃ) rather than the Byzantine future subjunctive.[5] As already pointed out, the examples in N. T. MSS. of the Byzantine future subjunctive are probably due to the blending of o with ω, ει with η, ε with η, etc. N. T. MSS., for instance, show examples of ἀρκεσθησώμεθα (1 Tim. 6:8), γνώσωνται (Ac. 21:24), γενήσησθε (Jo. 15:8), δώσωσιν (Lu. 20:10; Rev. 4:9), εὑρήσωσιν (Rev. 9:6), ζήσηται (Mk. 5:23), ἥξωσιν (Rev. 3:9), καυθήσωμαι (1 Cor. 13:3), κερδηθήσωνται (1 Pet. 3:1) , πορέσωμαι (Ro. 15:24), σωθήσηται (Ro. 11:26), etc. It is to be admitted, however, that the Byzantine future subjunctive was in use at the age of our oldest Greek N. T. MSS. Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 107. Hort dismisses them all (*Appendix*, "Notes on Orthography," p. 172). The present subjunctive διδοῖ, is parallel to δοῖ. No ex-

[1] Sterrett, Hom. II., Dial. of Homer, p. 27 (1907). Cf. Moulton, The Suffix of the Subj. (Am. Jour. of Philol., 10, 185 f.); La Roche, Die conj. and opt. Formen des Perfects (Beitr. I, pp. 161 ff.).

[2] Cf. already in the Attic inscr. the spelling of the subj. in –ει. Meisterh., Att. Inscr., p. 166. For this phenomenon in the pap. see Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 324.

[3] Cf. Henry, Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., Elliott's transi., 1890, p. 115 f. and note; Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 459.

[4] Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 37, and 1904, p. 111, for subjs. ἀποδοῖ, ἐπιγνοῖ in the pap.

[5] Cf. ἀρξησθε in Lu. 13:25, but ἄρξεσθε (BEG, etc.) and ἄρξησθε (ℵAD, etc.) in verse 26.

ample of the periphrastic present subjunctive appears in the N. T. In Gal. 4 :17 (ἵνα ζηλοῦτε) the contraction of **οη** is like that of the indicative **οε**,[1] unless indeed, as is more probable, we have here (cf. also 1 Cor. 4:6, **φυσιοῦσθε**) the present indicative used with is as in 1 Jo. 5:20 (**γινώσκομεν**). In Gal. 6:12 ACFGKLP read ἵνα **μὴ διώκονται**. Cf. Ro. 14:19. Cf. Homer. The perfect subjunctive does not exist in the N. T. save in the second perfect **εἰδῶ** (ἵνα **εἰδῶμεν**, 1 Cor. 2:12) and the periphrastic form as **ᾖ πεποιηκώς** (Jas. 5:15. Cf. **πεποιθότες ὦμεν**, 2 Cor. 1:9) and usually in the passive as **ᾖ πεπληρωμένη** (Jo. 16:24). In Lu. 19:40 Rec. with most MSS. read **κεκράξονται** (LXX). In the papyri **ᾖν** sometimes is subjunctive =**ᾖι**. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 38, 1904, p. 108; *Prolegomena*, pp. 49, 468. He cites **ὅσα ἐὰν ᾖν** in Gen. 6:17E. But the modern Greek constantly uses **ἐάν** with the indicative, and we find it in the N. T. and papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 203 ff.). Some of the papyri examples may be merely the indicative with **ἐάν**, but others undoubtedly give the irrational **ν**. In the LXX the subjunctive shows signs of shrinkage before the indicative with **ἐάν, ὅταν, ἵνα** (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 194).

(e) THE OPTATIVE (**εὐκτική**). Like the subjunctive the optative is poorly named, as it is much more than the wishing mood. As Giles[2] remarks, difference of formation is more easily discerned in these two moods than difference of meaning. In the Sanskrit the subjunctive (save in first person) gave way before the optative, as in Latin the optative largely (*sim* originally optative) disappeared before the subjunctive.[3] The Greek, as already stated, is the only language that preserved both the subjunctive and the optative,[4] and finally in the modern Greek the optative has vanished, **μὴ γένοιτο** being merely "the coffin of the dead optative."[5] It is doubtful if the optative was ever used much in conversation even in Athens (Farrar, *Greek Syntax,* p. 142), and the unlearned scribes of the late Greek blun-

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48. But in 1 Cor. 16 : 2 we have regularly **εὐοδῶται** (marg. **εὐοδωθῇ**). Hort (Notes on Orth., pp. 167, 172) is uncertain whether **εὐοδῶται** is perf. ind. or subj. (pres. or perf.). He cites **παραζηλοῦμεν** (1 Cor. 10:22) and **διαβεβαιοῦνται** (1 Tim. 1:7) as possible pres. subjs.

[2] Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 458. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 337, for list of works on optative.

[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 202. Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 503 f.

[4] Giles, ib., p. 459. On the blending of subj. and opt. in Ital., Germ. and Balto-Slav. tongues see Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., 2. Tl., p. 585. Cf. the Byz. Gk. mingling of subj. and ind. in Hatz., Einl., p. 216 f.

[5] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 84.

dered greatly when they did use it (Jannaris, *Hist. Gk.* Gr., p. 204). Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 240) agrees with Thumb that the optative was doomed from the very birth of the κοινή and its disappearance was not due to itacism between οι, and η, which was late. Clyde,[1] however, suggests that the blending of sound between οι and η had much to do with the disappearance of the optative. But apart from this fact the distinction was never absolutely rigid, for in Homer both moods are used in much the same way.[2] And even in the N. T., as in Homer and occasionally later, we find an instance of the optative after a present indicative, **οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ἵνα** δῴη (Eph. 1:17, text of W. H., subj. δώῃ or δῷ in marg., question of editing). Jannaris[3] calls the Greek optative the subjunctive of the past or the secondary subjunctive (cf. Latin). Like the indicative (and originally the subjunctive) the non-thematic and thematic stems have a different history. The non-thematic stems use ιη (ιε) and the thematic οι (composed of ο and ι). The σ aorist has α+ι besides the form in —ειαι. This two-fold affix for the optative goes back to the earlier Indo-Germanic tongues[4] (Sanskrit *ya* and *i*). The optative was never common in the language of the people, as is shown by its rarity in the Attic inscriptions.[5] The Boeotian dialect inscriptions show no optative in simple sentences, and Dr. Edith Claflin reports only two examples in subordinate clauses.[6] The optative is rare also in the inscriptions of Pergamum.[7] The same thing is true of the papyri.[8] In the N. T. the future optative no longer appears, nor does the perfect. The classic idiom usually had the perfect subjunctive and optative in the periphrastic forms.[9] Examples of the periphrastic perfect optative survive in the papyri,[10] but not in the N. T. There are only sixty-seven examples of the optative in the N. T. Luke has twenty-eight and Paul thirty-one (not including Eph. 1:17), whereas John, Matthew and James do not use it at all. Mark and Hebrews show it only once each, Jude twice and Peter four times. The non-thematic aorist appears in the N. T. sometimes, as δῴη (perhaps by analogy). So W. H. read without reservation in 2 Th. 3:16; Ro. 15:5; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18. This is the

[1] Gr. S., p. 85. [2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 219. [3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 179.
[4] Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet.,p. 461. Cf. K.-BI., Bd. II, p.40 f.; Brug., Gk. Gr., pp. 337 ff. [5] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 166.
[6] Synt. of Bceot. Dial. Inscr., pp. 77, 81.
[7] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 191.
[8] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 326. [9] K.-B1., Bd. II, p. 99.
[10] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 327.

preferred text in Eph. 1:17; 2 Tim. 2:25, but in Jo. 15:16; Eph. 3:16, W. H. read δῷ (subjunctive). In Eph. 1:17 the margin has δώῃ (subjunctive) also.[1] The inscriptions[2] and the papyri[3] show the same form (--ῲην instead of —οίην). In Eph. 1:17 Moulton[4] considers δώῃ (subjunctive) absolutely necessary in spite of the evidence, for δῳη (optative). But see above. The aorist optative in —αι is the usual form, as κατευθύναι (1 Th. 3:11), πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι (1 Th. 3:12), καταρτίσαι (Heb. 13:21), etc., not the AEolic-Attic —ειε. So also ποιήσαιεν (Lu. 6:11), but ψηλαφήσειαν (Ac. 17:27) according to the best MSS. (B, etc.).[5] Blass[6] comments on the fact that only one example of the present optative appears in the simple sentence, viz. εἴη (Ac. 8:20), but more occur in dependent clauses, as πάσχοιτε (1 Pet. 3:14). The optative is rare in the LXX save for wishes. Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 193.

(f) THE IMPERATIVE (προστακτική). The imperative is a later development, in language and is in a sense a makeshift like the passive voice. It has no mode-sign (cf. indicative) and uses only personal suffixes.[7] These suffixes have a varied and interesting history.

1. *The Non-Thematic Stem*. An early imperative was just the non-thematic present stem.[8] In the imperative the aorist is a later growth, as will be shown directly. Forms like ἵστη, δείκνυ are pertinent.

2. *The Thematic Stem*. Cf. ἄγε, λέγε. This is merely an interjection (cf. vocative λόγε).[9] This is the root pure and simple with the thematic vowel which is here regarded as part of the stem as in the vocative λόγε. The accent εἰπέ, ἐλθέ, εὑρέ, ἰδέ, λαβέ was probably the accent of all such primitive imperatives at the beginning of a sentence.[10] We use exclamations as verbs or nouns.[11]

[1] Hort, Intr. to N. T. Gk., p. 168. Cf. LXX.

[2] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 191.

[3] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 326 f.; Cronert, Mem. Gr. Hercul., p. 215 f.; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 111 f. Δοῖ also appears in pap. as opt. as well as subj.

[4] Prol., p. 55. Cf. Blass' hesitation, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 49 f.

[5] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 114. In the LXX the form in —ειε is very rare. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 68 f. The LXX has also —οισαν, --αισαν 3d plu. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 215. Opt. is common in 4 Macc.

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p 220.

[7] K.-B1., Bd. II, p. 41.

[8] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 464.

[9] Ib., p. 269.

[10] Ib., p. 464. Cf. Brug., Grundr., II, § 958; Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 359. It is coming more and more to be the custom to regard the thematic vowel as part of the root. Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 415.

[11] Moulton, Prol., p. 171 f.

In Jas. 4:13 we have ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες, an example that will illustrate the origin of ἄγε. Note the common interjectional use of ἴδε (so N. T.). Cf. also accent of λάβε. The adverb δεῦρο (Jo. 11:43, Λάζαρε δεῦρο ἔξω) has a plural like the imperative in —τε (Mt. 11:28, δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες).

3. *The Suffix –θι.* The non-thematic stems also used the suffix –θι (cf. Sanskrit *dhi*, possibly an adverb; cf. "you there!"). So γνῶθι for second aorist active, ἴσθι for present active, φάνηθι, λύθητι for second and first aorist passive.[1] In the N. T. sometimes this –θι is dropped and the mere root used as in ἀνάβα (Rev. 4: 1), μετάβα (Mt. 17:20), ἀνὰστα (Eph. 5:14; Ac. 12:7) according to the best MSS.[2] The plural ἀνάβατε (Rev. 11:12) instead of ἀνάβητε is to be noted also. The LXX MSS. exhibit these short forms (ἀνάστα, ἀπόστα, but not ἀνάβα) also. Cf. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.,* p. 70; Con. and Stock, *Sel. from LXX*, p. 46. See ἔμβα, κατάβα, etc., in Attic drama. But ἀνάστηθι (Ac. 8:26), ἐπίστηθι 2 Tim. 4:2), μετάβηθι (Jo. 7:3), κατάβηθι (Lu. 19:5), προσανάβηθι (Lu. 14:10) occur as usual. In the papyri –θι has practically disappeared save in ἴσθι.[3]

4. The Suffix –τω. It is probably the ablative of the demonstrative pronoun (Sanskrit *tad*). It is used with non-thematic (ἔστω) and thematic stems (λεγέ-τω). The Latin[4] uses this form for the second person also (*agito*). In the case of ἔστω (Jas. 1:19) the N. T. has also ἤτω (Jas. 5:12).[5] The form καταβάτω (Mt. 24: 17) has the unlengthened stem, but ἐλθάτω is like the first aorist ἐπιστρεψάτω. The N. T. like the κοινή generally[6] has the plural only in τωσαν which is made by the addition of σαν to τω. Cf. ἔστωσαν (Lu. 12:35). The middle σθω (of uncertain origin)[7] likewise has the plural in the N. T. in σθωσαν. So προσευξάσθωσαν (Jas. 5:14). This is true of the plural of both present and aorist as in papyri and inscriptions. So the LXX cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 69 f.

5. *The Old Injunctive Mood*. It is responsible for more of the imperative forms than any other single source. "The injunctive

[1] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 341. [2] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 168.
[3] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 327.
[4] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 466. Cf. Brug., Gk. Gr., p. 341.
[5] So pap. and late inscr., Moulton, Prol., p. 56.
[6] Cf. for pap. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 327. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 343. It is after iii/B.C. that –τωσαν completely supplants —ντων. Cf. Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 167. Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 149. Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 167.
[7] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 343 (he cfs. ἐπέσθω with ἐπέσθαι); Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 430. Giles (Comp. Philol., p. 467 f.) gets it from τω by analogy of τε and σθε.

was simply an imperfect or aorist indicative without the augment."[1] So λαβοῦ corresponds to ἐ-λάβεσο, λάβεσθε was ἐ-λάβεσθε, λήφθητε was ἐ-λήφθητε, λάβετε was ἐ-λάβετε.[2] So σχές (ἔ-σχες) may be compared with ἔ-λυες (θίγες with ἔθιγες), but δός, ἕς, θές Brugmann considers of uncertain origin, possibly subjunctive.[3] Forms like λυέτε may be injunctive (ἐ-λύετε)[4] or merely the indicative.[5] Note the difficulty of deciding on imperative and indicative in forms like ἐραυνᾶτε (Jo. 5:39), πιστεύετε (Jo. 14:1) ἴστε (Jas. 1: 19). But in these cases, except Jo. 5:39, we probably have the imperative. In the case of ἴστε the N. T. indicative would be οἴδατε.[6] In the N. T. κάθου (Jas. 2:3) is the shorter form of κάθησο, though not by phonetic processes. The injunctive survives to some extent in the Sanskrit and borders on the subjunctive and the imperative and was specially common in prohibitions.[7] It consists of the bare stem with the personal endings.

6. *Forms in –σαι.* These, like βάπτισαι (Ac. 22:16), are probably just the infinitive sigmatic aorist.[8] Cf. δεῖξαι. Cf. also Latin *legimini* with the Homeric infinitive λεγέμεναι.[9] The infinitive is common in the Greek inscriptions in the sense of an imperative.[10] In the N. T. as in the papyri this use is not infrequent. So χαίρειν (Jas. 1:1), στοιχεῖν (Ph. 3:16), μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι (2 Th. 3:14). In modern Greek instead of the imperative in —σαι the form λύσου occurs with the sense of λύθητι.[11]

7. *The Form in —σον (λῦσον).* It is difficult of explanation. It may be injunctive or a verbal substantive.[12] The N. T. has εἶπον (Mt. 4:3) rather than εἶπέ (Mt. 8:8) in about half the instances in W. H.[13] This is merely in keeping with the common κοινή custom of using first aorist endings with second aorist stems. The form εἶπόν is traced to the Syracusan dialect.[14]

8. *First Person*. The Sanskrit used the first person subjunctive as imperative of the first person. Cf. English "charge we the foe." The Greek continued this idiom. But already in the N. T. the use of the imperative ἄφες (Cf. modern Greek as and third person subjunctive) is creeping in as a sort of particle with the subjunctive. So ἄφες, ἐκβάλω (Mt. 7:4). Cf. English "let" with infini-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 165. [2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 332. [3] Ib. [4] Ib.
[5] Hirt, Handb., p. 429 f. [6] W.-Sch.,p. 119. [7] Moulton, Prol., p.165.
8 Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 372. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 345.
[9] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 468; Hirt, Handb., p. 430; Wright, Comp. Gk. Gr., p. 334. [10] Moulton, Prol., p. 179 f.
[11] V. and D., Handb., p. 81. Cf. Dieterich, Unters., p. 205.
[12] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 345; Hirt, Handb., p. 427.
[13] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 164. [14] K.-B1., Bd. II, p. 45.

tive. Cf. An δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν in Mt. 21:38. Besides ἄγε, δεῦτε we may have ὅρα with the subjunctive (Mt. 8:4), βλέπετε with future indicative (Heb. 3:12).

9. *Prohibitions*. Here the aorist subjunctive with μή held its own against the aorist imperative quite successfully. In the Sanskrit Veda the negative *ma* is never found with the imperative, but only with the subjunctive.[1] Later the Sanskrit uses the present imperative with *ma*, but not the aorist. This piece of history in the Greek[2] is interesting as showing how the imperative is later than the other modes and how the aorist imperative never won its full way into prohibitions. However, in the N. T. as in the inscriptions and papyri, we occasionally find the aorist imperative with μή in 3d person. So μὴ καταβάτω (Mt. 24:17).

10. *Perfect Imperative*. In the Sanskrit the imperative is nearly confined to the present tense. The perfect imperative is very rare in the N. T. (only the two verbs cited) as in all Greek. We find ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29; in 23:30 W. H. reject ἔρρωσο) and περίμωσο (Mk. 4:39). The perfect imperative also occurs in the periphrastic form as ἔστωσαν περιεζωμέναι, (Lu. 12:35).

11. *Periphrastic Presents.* Other periphrastic forms of the imperative are ἴσθι εὐνοῶν (Mt. 5:25), ἴσθι ἔχων (Lu. 19:17), μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες (2 Cor. 6:14) and even ἴστε γινώσκοντες (Eph. 5:5).

12. *Circumlocutions*. But even so other devices (see Syntax) are used instead of the imperative, as the future indicative (ἀγαπήσεις, Mt. 5:43); ἵνα and the subjunctive (Eph. 5:33); a question of impatience like οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων (Ac. 13:10), etc.

VI. The Voices (διαθέσεις).

(a) TRANSITIVE AND INTRANSITIVE. The point is that "transitive" is not synonymous with "active." Transitive verbs may belong to any voice, and intransitive verbs to any voice. Take ἐδίδαξα, ἐδιδαξάμην, ἐδιδάχθην, which may be transitive in each voice. On the other hand εἰμί γίνομαι, ἐλύθην, are intransitive. The same verb may be transitive or intransitive in the same voice, as ἄγω. A verb may be transitive in Greek while intransitive in English, as with καταγελάω and *vice versa*. This matter properly belongs to syntax, but it seems necessary to clear it up at once before we proceed to discuss voice. Per se the question of transitiveness belongs to the idea of the verb itself, not to that of voice. We

[1] Monro, Hom. Cr., p. 240.

[2] Ib.; cf. also Delbruck, Synt. Forsch., IV, p. 120. Hence Delbruck argues that the aorist imper. did not come into use until after the pres. imper. The imper. was originally only positive, not negative.

actually find Green[1] making four voices, putting a neuter (οὐδέτερον) voice (using active and middle endings) on a par with the others! The Stoic. grammarians[2] did speak of a neuter voice as neither active (κατηγόρημα ὀρθόν) nor passive (ὕπτιον), meaning the middle (μέση). Jannaris[3] confounds transitiveness with voice, though he properly says (p. 356) that "the active voice is usually transitive," i.e. verbs in the active voice, not the voice itself. Even Whitney[4] speaks of the antithesis between transitive and reflexive action being effaced in Sanskrit. Was that antithesis ever present? Farrar[5] speaks of verbs with an "active meaning, but only a passive or middle form," where by "active" he means transitive. Even the active uses verbs which are either transigive (ἀλλοπαθής) or intransitive (αὐτοπαθής). So may the other voices. If we clearly grasp this point, we shall have less difficulty with voice which does not deal primarily with the transitive idea. That belongs rather to the verb itself apart from voice.[6] On transitive and intransitive verbs in modern Greek see Thumb, *Handb*., p. 112.

(b) THE NAMES OF THE VOICES. They are by no means good. The active (ἐνεργετική) is not distinctive, since the other voices express action also. This voice represents the subject as merely acting. The Hindu grammarians called the active *parasmai padam* (‘a word for another,') and the middle (μέση) *atmane padam* (‘a word for one's self’).[7] There is very little point in the term middle since it does not come in between the active and the passive. Indeed reflexive is a better designation of the middle voice if direct reflexive is not meant. That is rare. The middle voice stresses the interest of the agent. Cf. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 155 f. In truth we have no good name for this voice. Passive (παθητική) is the best term of all, for here the subject does experience the action even when the passive verb is transitive, as in ἐδιδάχθην. But this point encroaches upon syntax.

[1] Handb. to the Gk. of N. T., p. 55.

[2] Cf. Dion. Thr., p. 886. Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 40.

[3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 179.

[4] Sans. Gr., p. 200.

[5] Gk. Synt., p. 41. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 467 f.

[6] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 476: "The distinction between the transitive and intransitive meanings of the active voice depends upon the nature of the root in each case."

[7] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 200. Cf. also Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., II, p. 492. See also Clark, Comp. Gr., p. 182, for the meaningless term "middle." It is as active as the "active" voice. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 119.

(c) THE RELATIVE AGE OF THE VOICES. It is a matter of doubt as between the active and middle. The passive is known to be a later development. The Sanskrit passive is the *ya* class.[1] In Homer the passive has not reached its full development. The passive future occurs there only twice. The aorist middle is often used in passive sense (βλῆτο, for instance).[2] That is to say, in Homer the passive uses all the tenses of the middle with no distinct forms save sometimes in the aorist. In later Greek the future middle (as τιμήσομαι) continued to be used occasionally in the passive sense. The aorist passive in fact used the active endings and the future passive the middle, the passive contributing a special addition in each case (η, θη, ησ, θησ). Some languages never developed a passive (Coptic and Lithuanian, for instance), and in modern English we can only form the passive by means of auxiliary verbs. Each language makes the passive in its own way. In Latin no distinction in form exists between the middle and the passive, though the middle exists as in *potior, utor, plangor*, etc. Giles[3] thinks that the causative middle (like διδάσκομαι, 'get taught') is the explanation of the origin of the Greek passive. Cf. βάπτισαι (Ac. 22:16). It is all speculation as between the active and middle. An old theory makes the middle a mere doubling of the active (as μα-μι=μαι).[4] Another view is that the middle is the original and the active a shortening due to less stress in accent, or rather (as in τίθεμαι and τίθημι) the middle puts the stress on the reflexive ending while the active puts it on the stem.[5] But Brugmann[6] considers the whole question about the relation between the personal suffixes uncertain. Of one thing we may be sure, and that is that both the active and the middle are very old and long antedate the passive.

(d) THE SO-CALLED "DEPONENT " VERBS. These call for a word (cf. ch. XVII, (k)) at the risk of trespassing on syntax. Moulton[7] is certainly right in saying that the term should be applied to all three voices if to any. The truth is that it should not be used at all. As in the Sanskrit[8] so in the Greek some verbs were used in both active and middle in all tenses (like λύω); some verbs in some tenses in one and some in the other (like βαίνω,

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 275; Thumb, Handbuch d. Skt., pp. 394ff.
[2] Sterrett, Hom. Il., Dial. of Hom., p. 27.
[3] Comp. Philol., p. 477.
[4] Clyde, Gk. Syn., p. 55.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 152.
[6] Griech. Gr., p. 346. Cf. Kurze vergl. Gr., II, p. 599. Cf. Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 419.
[7] Prol., p. 153,
[8] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 200.

βήσομαι); some on one voice only (like **κεῖμαι**). As concerns voice these verbs were defective rather than deponent.[1] Note also the common use of the second perfect active with middle verbs (**ἵνομαι γέγονα**).[2] A number of verbs sometimes have the future in the active in the N. T. which usually had it in the middle in the older Greek. These are: **ἀκούσω** (Jo. 5:25, 28, etc., but **ἀκούσομαι**, Ac. 17:32), **ἁμαρτήσω** (Mt. 18:21), **ἀπαντήσω** (Mk. 14:13), **ἁρπάσω** (Jo. 10:28), βλέψω (Ac. 28:26), **γελάσω** (Lu. 6:21), **διώξω** (Mt. 23:34), **ζήσω** (Jo. 5:25), **ἐπιορκήσω** (Mt. 5:33, LXX), **κλαύσω** (Lu. 6:25), **κράξω** (Lu. 19:40), **παίξω** (Mk. 10:34), **ῥεύσω** (Jo. 7:38), **σιωπήσω** (Lu. 19:40), **σπουδάσω** (2 Pet. 1:15), **συναντήσω** (Lu. 22: 10). But still note **ἀποθανοῦμαι, ἔσομαι, ζήσομαι, θαυμάσομαι, λήμψομαι, ὄψομαι, πεσοῦμαι, πίομαι, τέξομαι, φάγομαι, φεύξομαι,** etc. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.,* p. 42 f.; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 107; Moulton, *Prol*., p. 155. See Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept*., p. 89 f.; Thackeray, pp. 231 ff., for illustrations in the LXX. The term "deponent" arose from the idea that these verbs had dropped the active voice. Verbs do vary in the use of the voices in different stages of the language.

(e) THE PASSIVE SUPPLANTING THE MIDDLE. In Latin the middle and passive have completely blended and the grammars speak no more of the Latin middle. Greek indeed is the only European speech which retains the original middle form and usage.[3] In fact, when we consider other tongues, it is not strange that the passive made inroads on the middle, but rather that there was any distinction preserved at all.[4] In most modern languages the middle is represented only by the use of the reflexive pronoun. The Greek itself constantly uses the active with reflexive pronoun and even the middle. Jannaris[5] has an interesting sketch of the history of the aorist and future middle and passive forms, the only forms where the two voices differ. As already remarked, the old Greek as in Homer[6] did not distinguish sharply between these forms. In Homer the middle is much more common than in later Greek,[7] for the passive has no distinct form in the future and not always in the aorist. In the modern Greek the middle has no distinctive form save **λύσου** (cf. **λῦσαι**)

[1] Brug., Furze vergl. Gr., p. 598; Moulton, Prol., p. 153.
[2] Hirt, Handb., p. 334; Moulton, Prol., p. 154.
[3] Delbrtick, Synt. Forsch., Bd. IV, p. 69.
[4] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 55.
[5] Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 362 ff.
[6] Sterrett, Horn. II., Hom. Dial., p. 27.
[7] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 7.

and this is used as passive imperative second singular.[1] Elsewhere in the aorist and future the passive forms have driven out the middle. These passive forms are, however, used sometimes in the middle sense, as was true of ἀπεκρίθη, for instance, in the N. T. The passive forms maintain the field in modern Greek and appropriate the meaning of the middle. We see this tendency at work in the N. T. and the κοινή generally. Since the passive used the middle forms in all the other tenses, it was natural that in these two there should come uniformity also.[2] The result of this struggle between the middle and passive in the aorist and future was an increasing number of passive forms without the distinctive passive idea.[3] So in Mt. 10:26 (μὴ φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς) the passive is used substantially as a middle. Cf. the continued use of τιμήσομαι as future passive in the earlier Greek as a tendency the other way. The history of this matter thus makes intelligible what would be otherwise a veritable puzzle in language. Here is a list of the chief passive aorists in the N. T. without the passive idea, the so-called "deponent" passives: ἀπεκρίθην (Mt. 25:9 and often, as John, Luke chiefly having Attic ἀπεκρίνατο also, Ac. 3:12), διεκρίθην (Ro. 4:20), συνυπεκρίθην (Gal. 2:13), ἀπελογήθην (Lu. 21:14, but see 12:11), ἠγαλλιάθην (Jo. 5:35), ἐγενήθην (Mt. 6:10, but also ἐγενόμην often, as Ac. 20:18); cf. γέγονα and γεγένημαι, ἐδεήθην (Lu. 5:12); ἠγέρθην (Lu. 24:34), ἠδυνάσθην (Mk. 7:24, as New Ionic and LXX) and ἠδυνήθην (Mt. 17:16), διελέχθην (Mk. 9:34), ἐθαυμάσθην (Rev. 13:3, but passive sense in 2 Th. 1:10), ἐθαμβήθην (Mk. 1:27), ἐνθυμηθείς (Mt. 1:20), μετεμελήθην (Mt. 21:32), ἐφοβήθην (Mt. 21:46), εὐλαβηθείς (Heb. 11:7), etc. For the LXX usage see Thackeray, p. 238. The future passives without certain passive sense are illustrated by the following: ἀνακλιθήσομαι (Mt. 8:11), ἀποκριθήσομαι (Mt. 25:37), ἐπαναπαήσεται (Lu. 10:6), θαυμασθήσομαι (Rev. 17:8), κοιμηθήσομαι (1 Cor. 15:51), ἐντραπήσονται (Mk. 12:6), μεταμεληθήσομαι (Heb. 7:21), φανήσομαι (Mt. 24:30), φοβηθήσομαι, (Heb. 13:6). But we have γενήσομαι, δυνήσομαι, ἐπιμελήσομαι, πορεύσομαι. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gr.*, p. 44 f.; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 108. For the rapid development of this tendency in later Greek see Hatzidakis, *Einl.*, p. 192 f. See Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, pp. 97-100, and Thackeray, p. 240 f., for similar phenomena in the LXX. These so-called deponents appear in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 113). Cf. ch. XVII, iv, (e) .

[1] Thumb, Handb., p. 111. So mod. Gk. has only two voices; V. and D., Handb., to Mod. Gk., p. 81.

[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 362.

[3] Ib. κοινή exx. are numerous, like ᾐδέσθην, ἐνεθυμήθην, ἐπορεύθην, ἐφοβήθην, etc.

(f) THE PERSONAL ENDINGS. They are probably pronominal,[1] though Brugmann[2] does not consider the matter as clear in all respects. One point to note is the heavy burden that is placed upon these endings. They have to express voice, person and number, everything in truth that has to do with the subject. Mode and tense are indicated otherwise. There was a constant tendency to slough off these personal endings and get back to the mode and tense-stems. Hence δίδωμι becomes δίδω (papyri) in late Greek. Λέγω was originally λέγομι.[3]

(g) CROSS-DIVISIONS. These personal endings have two cross-divisions. The active and middle have a separate list, the passive having none of its own. Then there is another cleavage on the line of primary and secondary tenses in the indicative, i.e. the unaugmented and the augmented tenses. The subjunctive mode falls in with the primary endings and the optative uses the secondary endings. But the first person active singular of the optative has one primary ending (as λύοιμι).[4] But may it not be a reminiscence of the time when there was no distinction between subjunctive and optative? The imperative has no regular set of endings, as has already been shown, and does not fall in with this development, but pursues a line of its own. As a matter of fact the imperative always refers to the future.

(h) THE ACTIVE ENDINGS. They have received some modification in the N. T. Greek. The imperative can be passed by as already sufficiently discussed. The disappearance of the **--μι** forms in favour of the –ω inflection has been carefully treated also, as ἀφίομεν (Lu. 11:4). The subjunctive δοῖ and optative δῴη have likewise received discussion as well as the optative —αι and –ειε. But some interesting points remain.

The use of —οσαν instead of –ον is very common in the LXX (as Jer. 5:23, 26) and was once thought to be purely an Alexandrian peculiarity (Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 37). For the LXX phenomena see Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, pp. 65-67; Con. and Stock, *Sel. from the LXX*, p. 32 f. The LXX is the principal witness to the —οσαν forms (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 195), where they

[1] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 53. [2] Gk. Gr., p. 346.

[3] Cf. Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 54. The same thing has happened in Eng. where the loss is nearly complete save 2d and 3d pers. sing.

[4] It is not worth while here to take time to make a careful discussion of each of these endings. For the hist. treatment of them see Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 345 ff.; Giles, Comp. Philol., pp. 413 ff.; Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., pp. 348 ff.

are exceedingly frequent (*ib*., pp. 212 ff.). It is not so abundant outside of the LXX, but the Boeotians used it for the imperfect and optative.[1] Mayser[2] has found more examples of it in the Tebtunis Papyri, both aorist and imperfect, than Moulton[3] had discovered. The inscriptions also show it.[4] In the N. T. the contract verb ἐδολιοῦσαν (Ro. 3:13) is a quotation from the LXX. In Jo. 15:22, 24, the imperfect εἴχοσαν has to be admitted. In 2 Th. 3:6 παρελάβοσαν is read by ℵAD and W. H. put it in the margin. The text παρελάβετε is supported by BFG. This use of the —μι inflection may be compared with the use of τω-σαν in the imperative. In the modern Greek it is common with contract verbs (cf. LXX) like ἐδολιοῦσαν above. The modern Greek ἐρωτοῦσα is a new formation (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 171) modelled after it.

Blass[5] needlessly hesitates to accept –αν in the present perfect instead of the usual —ασι, and even Moulton[6] is reluctant to admit it for Paul and Luke, preferring to regard it "a vulgarism due to the occasional lapse of an early scribe." It is certainly not a mere Alexandrianism as Buresch[7] supposed. The ending –αντι in the Doric usually dropped ν and became —ασι in Attic, but the later Cretan inscriptions show –αν after the analogy of the aorist.[8] The Alexandrian κοινή followed the Cretan. The papyri examples are very numerous[9] and it is in the inscriptions of Pergamum[10] also. Hort (Notes on Orthography, p. 166) considers it "curious," but has to admit it in various cases, though there is always some MS. evidence for –ασι. Thackeray (*Gr*., pp. 195, 212) thinks that in some instances --αν with the perfect is genuine in the LXX. The earliest examples are from Lydia, παρείλαφαν (246 B.C.) and ἀπέσταλκαν (193 B.C.). Cf. Dieterich, *Unters*., p. 235 f. The N. T. examples are ἀπέσταλκαν (Ac. 16:36), γέγο-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 33. Cf. Dieterich, Unters., p. 242.

[2] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 323.

[3] Prol., p. 52; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36, 1904, p. 110.

[4] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 148; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p.166. See further Dieterich, Unters., p. 242 f. Cf. Deiss., B. S., p. 191; W.-Sch., p. 112 f.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 46. [6] Prol., p. 52.

[7] Γέγοναν and anderes Vulgargriechisch, Rhein. Mus., 1891, pp. 193 ff. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36. [8] K.-B1., Bd. II, p. 48 f.

[9] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 323 f. "A fair show in the papyri," Moulton, Prol., p. 52.

[10] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 167. Thumb (Hellen., p. 170) rightly denies that it is merely Alexandrian. For LXX exx. (ἑώρακαν, πέπρακαν, etc.) see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 67.

ναν (Ro. 16:7; Rev. 21:6), ἔγνωκαν (Jo. 17:7), εἴρηκαν (Rev. 19: 3), εἰσελήλυθαν (Jas. 5:4), ἑώρακαν (Lu. 9:36; Col. 2:1), πέπτωκαν (Rev. 18:3), τετήρηκαν (Jo. 17:6). On the other hand the Western class of documents (ℵADN Syr. Sin.) read ἥκασιν in Mk. 8:3 instead of εἰσίν. But it is in the LXX (Jer. 4:16), and Moulton[1] finds ἥκαμεν in the papyri. The form of ἥκω is present, but the sense is perfect and the κ lends itself to the perfect ending by analogy.

Another ending that calls for explanation is the use of –ες instead of –ας in the present perfect and the first aorist (in —κα especially). Hort considers the MS. evidence "scanty" save in Revelation. The papyri give some confirmation. Moulton[2] cites ἀφῆκες, ἔγραψες, etc., from "uneducated scribes" and thinks that in Revelation it is a mark of "imperfect Greek." Deissmann[3] finds the phenomenon common in a "badly written private letter" from Fayum. Mayser[4] confirms the rarity of its occurrence in the papyri. In the inscriptions Dieterich[5] finds it rather more frequent and in widely separated sections. In Mt. 23:23 B has ἀφήκετε; in Jo. 8:57 B has ἑώρακες; in Jo. 17:7 and in 17:8 B has ἔδωκες; once more in Ac. 21:22 B gives ἐλήλυθες.[6] It will hardly be possible to call B illiterate, nor Luke, whatever one may think of John. D has ἀπεκάλυψες in Mt. 11:25.[7] W. H. accept it in Rev. 2:3 (κεκοπίακες), 2:4 (ἀφῆκες), 2:5 (πέπτωκες) 11:17 (εἴληφες), all perfects save ἀφῆκες. It is rare in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 215); found in A (Ex. 5:22, ἀπέσταλκες) and in ἔδωκες (Ezek. 16:21; Neh. 9:10). The modern Greek has it as in ἔδεσα, --ες (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 152).

We have both ἦσθα (Mt. 26:69) and is (Mt. 25:21). The form in –θα is vanishing (Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 166). Cf. also Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 321. The papyri have (acts, as N. T., and ἔφης. But see –μι Verbs.

Much more common is the use of the first aorist endings –α, –ας, etc., with the second aorist stem and even with the imperfect. This change occurs in the indicative middle as well as active. This matter more technically belongs to the treatment of the

[1] Prol. p. 53. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 169. The N. T. does not follow illiterate pap. in putting —ασι to aorist stems (Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36).

[2] Ib.; Prol., p. 52.

[3] B. S., p. 192. [4] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 321.

[5] Unters. etc., p. 239. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 46, cites Apoll., Synt., I, 10, p 37, as saying that εἴρηκες, ἔγραψες, γραψέτω, etc., gave the grammarians trouble. [6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 46. [7] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 113.

aorist tense, as the -α is part of the tense-stem, but it is also conveniently discussed here. The Attic already had εἶπα, ἔπεσα, ἤνεγκα. The Attic inscriptions indeed show ἔσχα, εὐράμην and even the imperfects ἤλπιζα, ἔφερα.[1] This tendency towards uniformity spread in the κοινή somewhat extensively.[2] Moulton[3] finds the strong aorists with --α chiefly in "uneducated writing" in the papyri, but common in general. This process of assimilation of the strong with the weak aorist was not yet complete.[4] Blass[5] thinks it an "intermediate" form already in the ancient Greek which spread in the κοινή. Cf. the liquid form ἤγγειλα. But both the strong and the weak aorists appear in the N. T. Thackeray (Cr., p. 195; cf. also pp. 210 ff.) notes that the --αν termination was finally extended to all past tenses, though in the LXX the imperfect forms are due to later copyists. In the modern Greek we note it regularly with κατέλαβα, ἤθελα, εἶχα, etc. (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 152, 160, etc.). Hort[6] has a detailed discussion of the matter in the N. T. This mixture of usage is shown in εἶπα and εἶπον. The -α form is uniform with endings in –τ (εἴπατε, εἰπάτω, εἰπάτωσαν). Both εἰπόν and εἰπέ occur. We have ἀπειπάμεθα (2 Cor. 4:2) and προείπαμεν (1 Th. 4:6). The participle is usually –ών, but sometimes εἴπας. Both εἶπας and εἶπες, εἶπον and εἴπαν meet us. We always have the ἤνεγκα inflection save in the infinitive and the imperative. And even here we once have ἀνενέγκαι (1 Pet. 2:5) and once also προσένεγκον (Mt. 8:4 BC). So also with ἔπεσα we have the weak or first aorist inflection in the indicative and imperative plural πέσατε (Lu. 23:30; Rev. 6:16). But in these two examples Hort[7] (against W. 1-1.) favours πέσετε on MS. grounds (ℵABD, ℵBC). In Lu. 14:10; 17:7 ἀνάπεσε is correct. The other forms that are accepted by W. H. are ἔβαλαν

[1] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 183 f.

[2] Dieterich, Unters., p. 237 f. For the inscr. see Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 181 f.; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 166 f.

[3] Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 368 f.

[4] Ib. Cf. Deiss., B. S:, p. 190 f. 2

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 45. The LXX is in harmony with this tendency also. Is it Cilician according to Heraclides? W.-Sch., p. 111 note. Cf. in Hom. forms like ἤξοντο, ἐβήσετο, where the sec. aorist endings go with the first aorist stern (Sterrett, Hom. 11., N. 42).

[6] Notes on Orth., p. 164 f. See also Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 45; W.-Sch., p. 111 f. The LXX MSS. tally with the N. T. in the use of –α. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 62-65; C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 35 f.

[7] Notes on Orth., p. 164. Moulton (Prol., p. 51) speaks of "the functionally useless difference of ending between the strong and the weak aorist."

once (Ac. 16:37); ἐπέβαλαν twice (Mk. 14:46; Ac. 21:27); εἶδαν, εἴδαμεν in a few places (Mt. 13:17; Lu. 10:24; Mt. 25:37, etc.); the indicatives ἀνεῖλαν (Ac. 10:39), ἀνείλατε (Ac. 2:23), ἀνείλατο (Ac. 7:21), εἴλατο (2 Th. 2:13), ἐξειλάμην (Ac. 23:27), ἐξείλατο (Ac. 7:10; 12:11); εὗραν once (Lu. 8:35, or ἀνεῦραν, εὕραμεν once (Lu. 23:2), and εὑράμενος once (Heb. 9:12); the imperatives ἔλθατε, ἐλθάτω uniformly; both ἦλθαν and ἦλθον, once ἀπῆλθα (Rev. 10:9), regularly ἤλθαμεν (Ac. 21:8). There are many other examples in various MSS. which W. H. are not willing to accept, but which illustrate this general movement, such as ἀπέθαναν (Mt. 8:32, etc.), ἔλαβαν (Jo. 1:12), ἐλάβαμεν (Lu. 5:5), ἐλάβατε (1 Jo. 2:27), ἐξέβαλαν (Mk. 12:8), ἔπιαν (1 Cor. 10:4 D), ἔφυγαν (Lu. 8: 34 D), κατέφαγαν (Mk. 4:4 D), συνέσχαν (Ac. 7:57 D), γενάμενος (Lu. 22:41 ℵ), etc. But let these suffice. Moulton[1] is doubtful about allowing this –α in the imperfect. But the papyri support it as Deissmann[2] shows, and the modern Greek[3] reinforces it also as we have just seen. W. H. receive εἶχαν in Mk. 8:7; Ac. 28:2 (παρεῖχαν); Rev. 9:8; εἴχαμεν, in 2 Jo. 5. But D has εἶχαν in Jo. 15:22, 24; ℵ has ἔλεγαν in Jo. 9:10; 11:36, etc. There is a distinct increase in the use of the sigmatic aorist as in ἡμάρτησα (Mt. 18:15), ὄψησθε (Lu. 13:28). It appears already in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 235). But see further under vii, (d).

The past perfect has the –ειν forms exclusively as uniformly in the κοίνη.[4] So εἱστήκεισαν (Rev. 7:11), ᾔδεισαν (Mk. 14:40), πεποιήκεισαν (Mk. 15:7). So the LXX. Cf. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, p. 68. But the imperfect ἐξῄεσαν (Ac. 17:15) is to be observed.

(i) THE MIDDLE ENDINGS. These call for less remark. βούλει (Lu. 22:42) is the only second singular middle form in —ει, for ὄψῃ (Mt. 27:4) displaces ὄψει. The inscriptions[5] sometimes show βούλῃ. Blass[6] regards βούλει a remnant of literary style in Luke,

[1] Prol., p. 52. So Buresch, Rhein. Mus., 46, 224. Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 165) needlessly considers ἐκχέετε (Rev. 16:1) a second aorist upper. instead of the present. Cf. ἐξέχεαν (usual form in Rev. 16:6). Cf. WT.-Sch., p. 111. But κατέχεεν (Mk. 14:3) is the usual Attic aorist. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 55.

[2] B. S., p. 191, ἔλεγας, etc.

[3] Cf. Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 36; Geldart's Guide to Mod. Gk., p. 272 note.

[4] With rare variations in the inscr. and pap. Moulton, Prol., p. 53. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 320

[5] Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 168. Cf. also Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 328. The pap. do not show οἴει and ὄψει, but only βούλει.

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 47. For οἴῃ, ὄψῃ, and βούλῃ in LXX MSS. see Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 60 f.; C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p. 33 f. B in the LXX shows a fondness for —ει forms (itacism). Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 217.

but the papyri also have βούλει. The occasional use of δύνῃ (Mk. 9:22 f.) has been discussed under –μι. Verbs. It appears only once in the LXX, but the "poetic and apparently Ionic" ἐπίστῃ is more frequent (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 217). Cf. also κάθου (Jas. 2:3) as LXX and κάθῃ (Ac. 23:3). On the other hand we have φάγεσαι and πίεσαι (Lu. 17:8). This revival of the use of –σαι parallel with –μαι, –ται in the perfect of vowel verbs in the vernacular amounts to a "new formation" in the view of Blass.[1] So Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 54 f. To call this revival a "survival" is "antediluvian philology." In the LXX πίεσαι is universal and φάγεσαι outside of the Pentateuch where φάγῃ holds on (Thackeray, p. 218). The –σαι form is universal in modern Greek. The love of uniformity made it triumph. But see Contract Verbs for further discussion. The middle form ἤμην (Mt. 25:35) and ἤμεθα (Mt. 23:30) is like the κοινή generally and the modern Greek εἶμαι. Cf. also ἔσομαι. For ἐξέδετο (Mt. 21:33) with loss of root o and ω inflection (thematic ε) see –μι Verbs. Cf. also ἐξεκρέμετο (Lu. 19:48). The LXX has --εντο for –οντο (Thackeray, p. 216).

(j) PASSIVE ENDINGS. As already observed, the passive voice has no distinctive endings of its own. The second aorist passive, like ἐ-φάνη-ν, is really an active form like ἔ-βη-ν (ἐ-φάνη-ν, is the proper division).[2] Cf. Latin *tace-re*. So ἐ-χάρη-ν from χαιρέω. The first aorist in –θην seems to have developed by analogy out of the old secondary middle ending in –θης (ἐ-δό-θης) parallel with σο (Sanskrit *thas*).[3] The future passive is a late development and merely adds the usual σο/ε and uses the middle endings. The ending in –θην is sometimes transitive in Archilochus,[4] as the middle often is, and perhaps helps to understand how in the κοινή these forms (first aorist passive) are so often transitive ("deponents") as in ἀπεκρίθην, ἐφοβήθην, etc. The second aorist passive as noticed above is really an active form. So the passive forms have a decidedly mixed origin and history. There is nothing special to note about these passive endings in the N. T. save the increased use of them when even the passive idea does not exist. In some verbs σ is inserted contrary to Attic practice. So κέκλεισται (Lu. 11:7), λέλουσμαι (Heb. 10:22). It is a common usage in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, pp. 219 ff.). See also VII,

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 47. Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 328.

[2] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 410, 427.

[3] Ib., pp. 411, 422. On "Passive Formations" see Hadley, Ess. Phil. and Crit., p. 199. On the strong passive forms in LXX see C. and S., Sel. fr. LXX, p.41.

[4] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 411.

(g), 9. In Rev. 8:12; 18:23, W. H. print **φάνῃ** (first aorist active, cf. **ἐπιφᾶναι** in Lu. 1:79) rather than the passive **φανῇ**. Note **ἐκφύῃ** (Mt. 24:32, but Rec. **ἐκφυῇ**, though **ἐκφύῃ** in Mk. 13:28), **συνφυεῖσαι** (Lu. 8:7) and **παρεισεδύησαν** (Ju. 4) for **ἔδυν** (Rec. Mk. 1:32) which the LXX retains (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 235). In the LXX, when a verb had both first and second aorist passive forms, the first disappeared (*ib.*, p. 237). But see (d), for further discussion.

(k) CONTRACT VERBS. The use of –σαι was mentioned above. It appears[1] in **καυχᾶσαι** (1 Cor. 4:7; Ro. 2:17, etc.) and **ὀδυνᾶσαι** (Lu. 16:25) where **αε** regularly contracts into **α**. See **χαρίεσαι** (=–**εῖσαι**) P. Oxy. 292 (A.D. 25).

Verbs in –αω. The confusion with verbs in —**εω** is already seen in the Ionic (Herodotus). The LXX in general preserves the distinction between –αω and —**εω** verbs, but **א**AB occasionally have the confusion (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 241). In the modern Greek the blending is complete. One conjugation is made up, some forms from –αω, some from –**εω** (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 169 f.). The N. T. MSS. vary. W. H. receive **ἠρώτουν** in Mt. 15:23 (**א**BCD), but **ἠρώτων** in Mk. 4:10 though –**ουν**, is here supported by **א**C and by single MSS. elsewhere. Hatzidakis (*Einl. in d. Neug.*, p. 128 f.) considers **ἠρώτουν** due to Ionic influence. In Mt. 6:28 we have **κοπιοῦσιν**, LP in B 33, but W. H. reject[2] it, as they do **νικοῦντι** in Rev. 2:7, 17; 15:2, and **κατεγέλουν** (Lu. 8:53). In Mk. 14:5 W. H. read **ἐνεβριμῶντο** (**א**C –**οῦντο**) and in Jo. 11:38 **ἐμβριμώμενος** (**א**A –**ούμενος**). So there is a variation as to **ἡττῶνται** (2 Pet. 2:20) from **ἡττάομαι** and **ἡσσώθητε** (2 Cor. 12:13) from **ἐσσόω** after the analogy of **ἐλασσόω**.[3] W. H. print **ζῇν** (Ro. 8:12). This is a matter of much dispute with the editors, but it is more than doubtful if W. H. are correct. On the other side see Winer-Schmiedel[4] and Moulton.[5] But both –ζάω (Ro. 8:12) and **χράομαι** (1 Tim. 1:8) have the 17 contraction rather than **α** (--**ηω** verbs, Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 54). In Ro. 7:9 B even has **ἔζην** for **ἔζων**. But the **κοινή** uses **χρᾶσθαι**, though not in the N. T.[6] Paul

[1] Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 328, for **χαριεῖσαι**. The LXX (1 Ki. 14 : 6 A) shows **ἀπεξενοῦσαι**. The only certain instance in the LXX is **κτᾶσαι**. (Sir. 6:7). See Thack., p. 218. Cf. further Hatz., Einl., p. 188.

[2] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 166.

[3] Ib. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 36) cites **ἐνίκει** and **τιμοῦντες** from pap.

[4] Pp. 42, 116 note.

[5] Prol., p. 54. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 61. The pap. support **ζῆν**, not **ζῇν.** Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 347. So in general the pap. are in harmony with N. T. usage here, Mayser, pp. 346 ff.

[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 54.

has χρῆται (pres. subj.) in 1 Tim. 1:8. Elsewhere also the α forms prevail in the κοινή as in διψᾶν and πεινᾶν. So πεινᾷ (1 Cor. 11:21), πεινᾶν (Ph. 4:12), διψᾷ, (Ro. 12:20) as subjunctive (so πεινᾷ same verse). The LXX keeps Attic ζῆν and χρῆσθαι, but διψᾶν and πεινᾶν (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 242).[1]

Verbs in --εω sometimes show forms in –αω. So ἐλλόγα in Phil. 18, ἐλλογᾶται in Ro. 5:13, ἐλεᾶτε in Ju. 22, 23, and ἐλεῶντος in Ro. 9:16, but ἐλεεῖ in Ro. 9:18. LXX has both forms. The κοινή usually has the –ειῦ forms.[2] For further examples of this confusion between –αω and –εω in LXX and isolated N. T. MSS. see Winer-Schmiedel.[3] In 1 Cor. 11:6 all editors print ξυρᾶσθαι (cf. κείρασθαι just before), though in 1 Cor. 11:5 ἐξυρημένη and ξυρήσονται (Ac. 21:24) probably come from ξυρέω.[4] Cf. ἐάω, ἐάσω.[5]

Contraction does not always take place with εε in verbs in –εω. In Lu. 8:38 W. H. follow BL in giving ἐδεῖτο but Hort[6] admits that it is not free from doubt. Blass[7] and Moulton[8] consider ἐδέετο correct and the contraction a mere correction, and it is supported by the LXX and papyri. AP even have ἐδεῖτο. In Rev. 16:1 ἐκχέετε is undoubtedly right and ἐξέχεεν, in 16:2, but note ἐκχεῖται (Mt. 9:17). In Mk. 14:3 κατέχεεν is to be noticed also (cf. Attic aorist). On the other hand in Jo. 3:8 note πνεῖ, ἐξέπλει (Ac. 18:18), πλεῖν, ἀποπλεῖν (Ac. 27:1 f.). In the LXX these words appear now one way, now the other.[9] Δέω ('to bind'), ῥέω have no εε forms in the N. T. W. H. accept in text only ἐξουθενέω in all the dozen examples in the N. T. (as Lu. 18:9, ἐξουθενοῦντας), but in Mk. 9:12 they have δ instead of θ.[10] Observe also ἀφέωνται (Lu. 5:20, etc.) instead of ἀφῶνται or the regular ἀφεῖνται. In the N. T., W. H. give ἐρρέθη (Gal. 3:16; Mt. 5:21, etc.), but Hort[11] thinks the Attic ἐρρήθη should appear always in Matthew.

Verbs in –οω have two knotty problems. In Gal. 4:17 ζηλοῦτε and 1 Cor. 4:6 φυσιοῦσθε are regular if indicative. But if they are subjunctive, the contraction οη is like the indicative οε (cf. indica-

[1] W.-Sch., p. 116 note. Cf. κατηραμένος (Mt. 25:41).

[2] Hatz., Einl., p. 128 f. Moulton (Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 110) cites φρονῶντες and *per contra* ἀγαποῦντες from pap.

[3] P. 117 note.

[4] Hort (Notes on Orth., p. 166) prefers ξύρασθαι after Plut. and Lucian.

[5] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 116 f. See further on this mixing of contract verbs, Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 349. The LXX MSS. show much the same situation as to contract verbs that we find in the N. T. and the pap. Helbing (Gr. d. Sept., pp. 110-112) gives the facts in detail.

[6] Notes on Orth., p. 166.

[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 47.

[8] Prol., p. 54.

[9] Cf. Thack., Gr., pp. 242ff.; W.-Sch., p.115 note.

[10] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 166.

[11] Ib. BD always have it.

tive and subjunctive of —οω verbs). So Blass[1] and Moulton.[2] Hort[3] doubts the indicative here. If εὐδῶται (1 Cor. 16:2) be regarded as a present subjunctive no problem in contraction is raised.[4] But in Col. 4:17 we have the subjunctive in ἵνα πληροῖς as in Attic for both indicative and subjunctive. In Ro. 3:13 ἐδολιοῦσαν is the common LXX form in —οσαν. The other point is the infinitive in —οῦν, or —οῖν. W. H. give —οῖν for this infinitive everywhere except πληροῦν in Lu. 9:31.[5] Cf. and —ῆν in W. H. Blass[6] considers the —οῖν termination "hardly established for the N. T." since even in the N. T. the evidence is "small," though "of good quality " Hort contends.[7] In Mt. 13: 32 κατασκηνοῖν is supported by BD (in Mk. 4:32 by B), in 1 Pet. 2:15 φιμοῖν has **א**, and in Heb. 7:5 ἀποδεκατοῖν has BD. Moulton[8] finds no support earlier in date than B save one inscription cited in Hatzitiakis (*Einl*., p. 193) and one papyrus of second century A.D. Mayser[9] likewise finds no infinitive in —οῖν till after first century and gives some references for this late infinitive form. It looks as if the case will go against W. H. on this point. The form is probably due to some late grammarian's refinement and is linguistically unintelligible.

Πιεῖν, is often contracted (sounded finally **ιι**, then **ι)** into πεῖν (so W. H., Jo. 4:7, 9, etc.) and in some MSS. (**א** 8/9 times) into πῖν. But πιεῖν is the Syrian reading (Mt. 20:22, etc.).[10] Contraction in —αω**, --**εω**, --**οω verbs, of course, takes place only in the present, imperfect and present participle.

VII. **The Tenses** (χρόνοι).

(a) THE TERM TENSE. It is from the French word *temps*, 'time,' and is a misnomer and a hindrance to the understanding of this aspect of the verb-form. Time does come finally to enter relatively into the indicative and in a limited way affects the optative, infinitive and participle. But it is not the original nor the general idea of what we call tense.[11] Indeed it cannot be shown of

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48. Cf. K.-B1., Bd. II, p. 587.
[2] Prol., p. 54.
[3] Notes on Orth., p. 171 f.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 54. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 167.
[5] Hort, ib., p. 166.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48.
[7] Notes on Orth., p.166.
[8] Prol., p. 53. Cf. Nestle (Am. Jour. of Theol., July, 1909, p. 448) for μαστιγγοῖν, in Coptic.
[9] Cr. d. griech. Pap., p. 349; Raderm., p. 74.
[10] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 170.
[11] Cf. Delbruck, Grundl. d. griech. Synt., Bd. IV, p. 80; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 469 f.; Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 481 f. See Swete, 0. T. in Gk., p. 305, for remarks about tenses in the LXX.

any verb-form that it had originally any reference to time. We must therefore dismiss time from our minds in the study of the forms of the tenses as well as in the matter of syntax. It is too late to get a new name, however.

(b) CONFUSION IN NAMES. The greatest confusion prevails in the names given to the various tenses. The time idea appears in the names present, past perfect and future. The state of the action rules in the names aorist, imperfect and perfect. Thus it is clear that the time idea did not prevail with all the names that the grammarians used. In the indicative, indeed, in the past three tenses appear, in the present two, in the future one (sometimes two). In the other modes as a rule only three tenses are found; in truth, in the subjunctive, optative and imperative practically only two are in common usage, the aorist and the present.

As a matter of fact there are nine possible tenses for each voice in the indicative: the aorist present, the imperfect present, the perfect present, the aorist past, the imperfect past, the perfect past; the aorist future, the imperfect future, the perfect future. These ideas do occur. In the past the distinction is clear cut. In the present no sharp line is drawn between the aorist and durative (unfinished or imperfect) save when the periphrastic conjugation is used or when *Aktionsart* comes in to help out the word itself. In the future, as a rule, no distinction at all is made between the three ideas. But here again the periphrastic conjugation can be employed. As a rule the future is aoristic anyhow. For further discussion see Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 180; Farrar, *Greek Syntax,* p. 120, and the references there to Harris' *Hermes*, Harper's *Powers of the Greek Tenses,* and H. Schmidt's *Doctrina Temporum Verbi Graeci et Latini*. The modern Greek preserves as distinct forms the aorist, present, imperfect; the future, the perfect and past perfect using periphrastic forms. Mr. Dan Crawford reports 32 tenses for Bantu.

(c) THE VERB-ROOT. There were originally two types of verb-roots, the punctiliar and the durative. The tense called aorist (ἀόριστος, 'undefined action') is due to the use of the punctiliar verbs (the idea of a point on a line). The present tense comes out of the durative verb-root. But it is worth repeating that tenses are a later development in the use of the verb.[1]

Hence it was natural that some verbs never developed a present tense, like εἶδον, and some made no aorist, like ὁράω. The defective verbs thus throw much light on the history of the tenses.

[1] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 482 f.

Out of these two ideas grew all the tenses. Each language had its own development. Some aorists in Sanskrit had no presents, like the Greek εἶπον. Each tense in the Greek pursued its own way. It is a complex development as will be seen. The idea of comparing the aorist to a point and the present to a line is due to Curtius, but it has since been worked out at length.[1] Instead of saying "irregular" verbs, Delbruck (*Vergl. Syntax*, Tl. II, p. 256) speaks of "several roots united to one verb."

This *Aktionsart* or kind of action belongs more specifically to syntax.[2] But it is not possible to make a modern study of the tense formations without having clearly in mind this important matter. It will come out at every turn. Along with the various tense-suffixes which came to be used to express the tense-distinctions as they were developed there remains also the meaning of the verb-root itself. This is never to be left out of sight. Prepositions also enter into the problem and give a touch much like a suffix (perfective). So θνήσκειν is 'to be dying' while ἀποθανεῖν is 'to die' and ἀποτεθνηκέναι is 'to be dead.' Cf. ἔχει, and ἀπέχει, ἔφαγον and κατέφαγον. But more of this in Syntax. The point here is simply to get the matter in mind.

(d) THE AORIST TENSE (ἀόριστος χρόνος). It is not true that this tense was always the oldest or the original form of the verb. As seen above, sometimes a durative root never made an aorist or punctiliar stem. But the punctiliar idea is the simplest idea of the verb-root, with many verbs was the original form, and logically precedes the others. Hence it can best be treated first. This is clearer if we dismiss for the moment the so-called first aorists and think only of the second aorists of the --μι form, the oldest aorists. It is here that we see the rise of the aorist. Henry[3] has put this matter tersely: "The ordinary grammars have been very unfortunate in their nomenclature; the so-called second perfects are much more simple and primitive than those called first perfects; the same is the case with the second aorists passive as contrasted with the first aorists," etc. The same remark applies to second aorists active and middle. The non-thematic second aorists represent, of course,

[1] Cf. Mutzbauer, Grundl. der Tempuslehre (1893); Delbruck, Grundl. d. grieeh. Synt., II, pp. 13 ff.; Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 470 ff.; Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 480 f.; Moulton, Prol., pp. 108 ff.

[2] Thumb (Handb., p. 123) likewise feels the necessity of a word about Aktionsart under Morphology.

[3] Comp. Gr. of the Gk. and Lat., Elliott's transl., 1890, p. 105 f. note. Cf. Leo Meyer, Griech. Aoriste, 1879, p. 5 f.

the most primitive form. The survivals of these forms in the N. T. have been discussed under —μι Verbs. The difference between the strong aorist (both thematic and non-thematic) and similar presents is syntactical and not formal.[1] The point is that the strong aorists and the corresponding presents represent the simple stem of the verb. Brugmann[2] indeed treats them together. It is not possible to make an etymological distinction between the imperfects ἔφην, ἔγραφον and the aorists ἔστην, ἔφυγον. The imperfect, of course, differs from the present only in the augment and secondary endings.[3] The kinship between the aorist and present stems is further shown in reduplication. Reduplication in the aorist, as ἤγαγον, is supposed to be originally causative.[4] Cf. the use of it with inceptive presents like γι(γ)νώσκω. The aorist was quite common in the older Sanskrit, but is rare in the later language.[5] Cf. the blending of the aorist and the present perfect forms in Latin. The strong aorist (both non-thematic and thematic) is far more common in Homer than in the later Greek.[6] Indeed in the modern Greek the strong aorist has well-nigh vanished before the weak aorist.[7]

As often, the grammars have it backwards. The so-called second is the old aorist, and the so-called first is the late form of the verb. This weak form of the aorist has a distinct tense-sign, σ, the sigmatic aorist. The σ (—σα) was not always used, as with liquid verbs,[8] like ἔστειλα. This sigmatic aorist appears also in the Sanskrit.[9] The distinction was not always observed between the two forms, and mixed aorists of both kinds occur in Homer, like ἤξοντο, ἤνεικα.[10] No wonder therefore that uniformity gradually prevailed at the expense of the strong aorist in two ways, the disuse of the strong aorist (so ἦξα) and the putting of first aorist endings to the second aorist stems, as εἶπα, ἔσχα.

The κ aorists in the indicative (ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἧκα) continued to hold their own and to be used usually in the plural also. An ex-

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 268.

[2] Ib. Cf. also Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., pp. 396, 410, 414. So K.-B1., II, p. 92 f.

[3] Cf. Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 453 f.

[4] So Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 308. Cf. Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 371. Cf. K.-B1., II, p. 30 f., for list.

[5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 298.

[6] See interesting lists in Sterrett's II., N. 38 ff.

[7] V. and D., Handb. etc., p. 79 f.

[8] K.-B1., II, p. 102 f. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 313; Delbruck, Grundl., etc., IV, pp. 75 ff. Hartmann (De aoristo secundo, 1881, p. 21) makes too much distinction between the second and first aorists.

[9] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 313.

[10] Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 42.

tension of this usage (after the analogy of the perfect) is seen in the Byzantine and modern Greek[1] form ἐλύθηκα for ἐλύθην.

There is one more aorist form, the aorist passive. As already shown, the so-called second aorist passive (--ην), like ἐφάνην, ἐχάρην, is merely the second aorist active.[2] The so-called first aorist passive in --θην is a Greek creation after the analogy of the old Indo-Germanic.[3] Homer makes little use of either of these passive aorists, but the second is the more frequent with him and the form in --θην is very rare.[4]

If this emphasis upon the aorist forms seem unusual to modern students, they may be reminded that in English we have only two tenses (apart from the periphrastic conjugation) and that they are usually punctiliar, as "I sing," "I sang." One is a present aorist, the other a past aorist.[5] We do not here enter into the *Aktionsart* of the aorist (whether ingressive, constative or effective).[6] That belongs to syntax.

The inscriptions agree with the development shown above in the aorist and support the N. T. phenomena.[7] Mayser[8] gives a careful discussion of the papyri development. In brief it is in harmony with what has already been observed. The non-thematic strong aorist is confined to a few verbs like βῆναι, γνῶναι, δοῦναι, δῦναι, θεῖναι, πρίασθαι, στῆναι. The κ aorists are used exclusively in both singular and plural. The thematic strong aorist is disappearing before the weak sigmatic aorist.

In the N. T. the κ aorists ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἀφῆκα occur always except that Luke (1:2 in the literary introduction) has παρέδοσαν. Elsewhere ἐδωκατε (Mt. 25:35), ἔθηκαν (Mk. 6:29), ἀφήκατε (Mt. 23:23), etc., and quite frequently.[9] The LXX also nearly always has κ with these aorists in the plural.[10]

The non-thematic aorists in the N. T. are not numerous. The list is found in the discussion of –μι verbs and includes ἀνέβην, ἔγνων, ἔστην, ἔφην, ὠνάμην, and all the forms of δοῦναι, εἶναι and θεῖναι save the indicative active.

[1] V. and D. Handb., etc., p. 81, but in particular Thumb, Handb., p. 144.
[2] Cf. K.-B1., II, p. 93 f. [3] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 399 f.
[4] Sterrett, Hom. IL, N. 42 f.
[5] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 126. Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 45.
[6] Munro, ib., p. 47.
[7] Cf. Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., pp. 180 ff.; Nachm., Magn. Inschr., pp. 162 ff.; Meisterh,, Att. Inschr., pp. 181, 185, 187.
[8] Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 358-370. [9] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 119.
[10] See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p.94 f., for similar exx. in the LXX, and Thack., Gr., p. 255.

The thematic strong aorist in the N. T. shows the two developments noted above. The use of –α instead of –ον with the strong aorist-stem is very common. See this chapter, vi, (h), for N. T. list like ἔβαλαν, etc. The MSS. vary much in the matter.[1] The other change is the increased use of the sigmatic aorist. Here again Blass[2] has a careful presentation of the facts. **Ἐ**βίωσα (1 Pet. 4:2) is a case in point instead of the old Attic ἐβίων. So is ἐβλάστησα (Mt. 13:26; Heb. 9:4; Jas. 5:18) rather than ἔβλαστον. Both ἐγάμησα (Mt. 5:32) and ἔγνμα (Mt. 22:25) occur. Cf. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, p. 93 f., and Thackeray, *Gr.*, pp. 233 ff., for LXX illustrations.

Ἦξα occurs a few times instead of the common ἦγαγον, as ἐπάξας (2 Pet. 2:5), ἐπισυνάξαι (Lu. 13:34). Blass justifies it as appearing at least in dialects, LXX and late writers.[3] It is part of the tendency towards the sigmatic aorist. Likewise ἁμαρτήσω is slipping in beside ἁμάρτω (Mt. 18:15; Ro. 5:14, 16, cf. verse 12). Blass finds it in Emped., LXX, Lob., *Phryn.*, 732. W. H. accept ἔδυσεν (Mk. 1:32 on the authority of BD (**א**A, etc., ἔδυ). Luke in Ac. 24:21 has the reduplicated aorist ἐκέκραξα like the LXX, but usually the N. T. has the late form ἔκραξα as in Mt. 8:29 (ἔκραξαν), though once the Attic ἀνέκραγον appears (Lu. 23:18). Once Luke (Ac. 6:2) has καταλείψαντας, a form that Blass[4] finds in Herm., Vis. VIII, 3. 5, and Mayser[5] observes ἀντειλῆψαι in the papyri.

Ὄψησθε (Lu. 13:28) finds a parallel in an old Homeric aorist ὠψάμην (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 109). In Rev. 18:14 the Text. Rec. (without any known authority) has an aorist form εὗρησα. So in Jas. 4:13 some MSS. have ἐμπορευσώμεθα. Indeed some verbs have dropped the strong aorist form entirely like βιόω, βλαστάνω, ἐγείρομαι, κτείνω. See careful discussion of Winer-Schmieclel, p. 109 f. MSS. frequently read δώσῃ, δώσωμεν, etc., as if from an aorist ἔδωσα, as Jo. 17:2; Rev. 4:9. Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 120. Cf. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, p. 90 f., for LXX examples that further parallel these illustrations.

Conversely is to be noted a new strong aorist ἀνέθαλον (Ph. 4: 10) which Blass[6] takes in a causative sense (ἀνεθάλετε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν).

Verbs in --ζω make the aorist both in σ and ξ. Most of these

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 45 f. [2] Ib., p. 43.

[3] Ib. Mayser (Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 369) finds it in the pap. as well as ἀγαγῆσαι.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 43. Cf. καταλείψῃ Mk. 12:19 **א**.

[5] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 370. [6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 43.

verbs have dental stems in Attic, but some have guttural. Hence the σ forms prevail till to-day. The LXX agrees with the N. T. (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 222 f.). So ἐνύσταξαν (Mt. 25:5), ἐμπαῖξαι, (Mt. 20:19), ἐπεστήριξαν (Ac. 15:32); but on the other hand ἐστήρισεν (Lu. 9:51), ἥρπασεν (Ac. 8:39), ἡρμοσάμην, (2 Cor. 11:2), σλαπίσῃς (Mt. 6:2).[1] The tendency in the papyri and the inscriptions on the whole is towards the use of σ and not ξ with the verbs in --ζω.[2] Cf. βαπτίζω, λογίζομαι, νομίζω, etc.

Like καλέω and τελέω[3] we have ε in ἐφορέσαμεν (1 Cor. 15:49) and ἐρρέθη (Mt. 5:21), but εὐφόρησα (Lu. 12:16), ῥηθέν (Mt. 1:22) and ἐπεπόθησα (1 Pet. 2:2). Cf. also ἦνεσα, ἤρκεσε, ἐμέσαι. Cf. ἐπείνασα (Mt. 4:2), but διψήσω, though D has —α— in Jo. 6:35 and ℵ in Rev.

The liquid verbs in —αίνω and —αίρω generally retain *a* even when not preceded by ε or ι as in Attic. So ἐβάσκανα (Gal. 3:1); once κερδανῶ (1 Cor. 9:21), elsewhere —ησα; ἐξεκάθαρα (1 Cor. 5:7); ἐλεύκαναν (Rev. 7:14); ἐσήμανα (Rev. 1:1); ἐπιφᾶναι (Lu. 1:79). In Rev. 8:12 and 18:23 note φάνῃ, not φανῇ. The κοινή begins to use —ανα and --αρα with all verbs, and it is well-nigh universal in modern Greek. The LXX agrees with the N. T. (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 223). A few --νηα forms survive in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 140 f.).

The second aorist passive has a few late developments of its own. This substitution of the second aorist passive for the first is a favorite idiom in the N. T.[4] The κοινή shows likewise fondness for the —ην formations.[5] This is true of the inscriptions' and the papyri.[7] This development is directly the opposite of that in the case of the second and first aorist active and middle. It has already been observed that in Homer the passive aorist is very rare. Perhaps the increase in the use of --ην forms is partly due to the general encroachment of aorist passive forms on the middle, and this is the simplest one. The Attic, of course, had many such forms also. Here are the chief N. T. examples: ἠγγέλην (ἀπ--, ἀν--, δι--, κατ--, Lu. 8:20, etc.) is in the LXX and the papyri; ἠνοίγην (Mk. 7:35, etc.), but ἠνοίχθησαν also (Rev. 20:12); ἡρπάγην (2 Cor. 12:2, 4), but the Attic ἡρπάσθη (Rev. 12:5); διορυγῆναι is read by some MSS. in Mt. 24:43; διετάγην (Gal. 3:19), ὑπετάγην (Ro. 8:20, etc.), but the Attic διαταχθέντα (Lu. 17:9 f.);

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 105.

[2] Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 360 ff., for careful discussion and references for further research.

[3] So πονέω and φορέω(ε) in the LXX. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 105.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 43. [5] Cf. Schmid, Atticismus, IV, p. 594 f.

[6] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 171; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 190 f.

[7] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 381 f. Cf. Reinhold, De Graac., p. 76 f.

κατεκάην (Rev. 8:7; 1 Cor. 3:15), but Attic ἐξεκαύθησαν (Ro. 1: 27); κατενύγην (Ac. 2:37); ἐκρύβην (Jo. 8:59). So also ἐφύην instead of ἔφυν follows the analogy of ἐρρύην (Heb. 2:1) and ἐχάρην (Lu. 22:5). Thus we have ἐκφυῇ (Mk. 13:28)[1] and συμφυεῖσαι (Lu. 8:6-8). Forms like ἐπλήγην (Rev. 8:12) and ἐφάνην (Mt. 1:20) are Attic. On the other hand the poetical ἐκλίθην (Mt. 14:19 ἀνακλιθῆναι) has displaced the Attic ἐκλίνην. Ἀπεκτάνθην occasionally appears (as in Mk. 8:31 and Rev, six times) where the Attic would have ἀπέθανον, and ἐτέχθην (Lu. 2:11) when the Attic would usually have ἐγενόμην. Both ἐγενήθην (Mt. 6:10 and often in 1 Th.) and ἐγενόμην (Mt. 7:28) are common, as ἠδυνήθην (Mt. 17:16) and ἠδυνάσθην (Mk. 7:24). The many aorist passives in the deponent sense have already been noticed under VI, (e).

(e) THE PRESENT TENSE (ὁ ἐνεστὼς χρόνος). The present indicative, from the nature of the case, is the most frequent in actual use and hence shows the greatest diversity of development. Brugmann[2] finds thirty-two distinct ways of forming the present tense in the Indo-Germanic tongues and thirty of them in the Greek. But some of these represent very few verbs and for practical purposes a much simpler classification is sufficient.[3] Unfortunately the grammars by no means agree on the simplification. As samples see Giles, *Man. of Comp. Philol.,* p. 425 f.; Hadley and Allen, p. 122 f.; Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 9; Riemann and Goelzer, *Phonetique*, pp. 394 ff.; Kuhner-Blass, II, pp. 88 ff. In simple truth the facts are so varied that they lend themselves to many combinations more or less artificial. One of the most satisfactory is that of Monro, who has the historical instinct at least in his arrangement.

1. *The Root Class*. This is the simple non-thematic present like φημί. This is the logical one to put first, as with the aorist like ἔ-βη-ν. This class is disappearing in the N. T. though δυνα-μαι, εἰμί, εἶμι in composition (εισ--, ἐξ--), κάθ-η-μαι, κεῖ-μαι, κρέμα-μαι appear.

2. *The Non-Thematic Reduplicated Present.* So δί-δω-μι, ἵ-η-μι, ἵ-στη-μι, κί-χρη-μι, ὀνίνη-μι, πίμ-πλη-μι, τί-θη-μι. It was never a very large class, but holds on in the N. T. And –ω forms are common with these verbs.

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 110, for exx. in Jos. and LXX. Cf. also Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 95 f. MSS. simply read –φυη.

[2] Grundr., II, pp. 836-1330. In Hom. the same root will form a present in several ways, as ἔχω, ἴσω, ἰσχω, ἰσχάνω. Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 40.

[3] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 423.

3. *The Non-Thematic Present with* —**να**— *and* —**νυ**—. So in the N. T. **ἀμφι-έ-ννυ-μι, ἀπ-όλ-λυ-μι, δείκ-νυ-μι, ζεύγ-νυ-μι, ζών-νυ-μι, κατ-άγ-νυ-μι, κερά-ννυ-μι, κορέθννυ-μι, κρε-μά-ννυ-μι, μίγ-νυ-μι, ὄμ--νυ-μι, πήγ-νυ-μι, ῥήγ-νυ-μι, σβέννυ-μι, στρώννυ-μι**, but these all have more commonly the **-ω** forms.[1]

4. *The Simple Thematic Present.* So **λέγω, λύω**. This was a constantly increasing class at the expense of the **--μι** verbs. It had several branches also including root-verbs like **ἄγω, γράφω**, a strengthened vowel like **πείθ-ω (πιθ), λείπ-ω (λιπ), φεύγ-ω (φυγ), σήπω, τήκω, τρώγω, θλίβω, πνίγω**, etc., Hadley and Allen's "strong vowel class,"[2] and the many contract denominative verbs like **τιμά-ω, φιλέ-ω, ἀξιό-ω**. But see the **ι**. Class for these contract verbs. New verbs were added to this list from nouns and some also from verb-stems, **γρηγορέ-ω** from the old perfect **ἐγρήγορα** (this tense never in the N. T.),[3] **στήκ-ω** (Mk. 11: 25) from **ἕστηκα** (modern Greek **στέκω**).[4] In Lu. 1:24 **περιέκρυβεν** is probably imperfect, not aorist, from **κρύβω (κρύπτω)**. Cf. **ἐκρύβην**.[5] The LXX shows these new presents from perfect stems (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 224 f.).

5. *The Reduplicated Thematic Present*. So **γίνομαι, (γίγν-ο-μαι, *γι-γένομαι), πίπτ-ω** (***πι-πέτ-ω**), **τίκτ-ω** (***τι-τέκ-ω**), **--γν---, --πτ--, --κτ--,** being weak forms of **–γεν--, --πετ--, --τεκ--.** The N. T. has also **ἰσχύ-ω** from **ἴσχω** (***σι-σέχ-ω**).

6. *The Thematic Present with a Suffix*. There are five (—**ι**, —**ν**, **--σκ –τ, --θ**). Each of these divisions furnishes a number of verbs.

(a) *The* **ι** *class*. It is very large. This suffix is used to make verbs from roots and substantives. It is probable[6] that originally the suffix was —**γι**. It is thought that contract verbs in **–αω, --εω, --οω**, etc., originally had this **ι** as *j* or *y* which was dropped.[7] It is thus the chief way of forming denominative verbs and is pre-eminently a secondary suffix.[8] Some of these verbs are causative, some intensive, some desiderative.[9] The special Greek desiderative in **--σείω** does not appear in the N. T., but forms like **κοπιάω** are found. In particular, forms in **-ιζω** become so common that they no longer have an intensive, iterative or causative force,[10]

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 48. 2 Gr., p. 122.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 40.

[4] Ib., p. 41. The LXX MSS. show both **γρηγορέω** and **στήκω**. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 82.

[5] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 41.

[6] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 34; Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 380.

[7] Hirt, ib., p. 383 f. 8 Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 440.

[9] Ib., pp. 445 ff. On the whole subject of contract verbs see Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 207 ff. [10] Jann., ib., p. 222.

but are used side by side with the older form, as βάπτω, βαπτίζω; ῥαίνω, ῥαντίζω, etc. In all the --ζω forms the ι has united with a palatal (guttural) or lingual (dental), a matter determined by the aorist or future. So φυλάσ-σω is from φυλάκ-jω, φράζω from φράδ-jω. Other familiar combinations are ι and λ, as βάλ-jω=βάλλω, ι with ν by transposition, as φάν-jω=φαίνω, ι with ρ likewise, as ἄρ-jω=αἴρω. In καίω and κλαίω the υ has dropped between α and ι. In the N. T. verbs in –αίνω, -αίρω have –ανα, --αρα in the first aorist active as already shown under the aorist tense (d). Ἀμφιάζω (Lu. 12:28) is an example of a new present for ἀφιέννυμι. Cf. also ἀποκτεννοντων (Mt. 10:28) in some MSS. for the older ἀποκτείνω, -ννω, -νjω). See Blass[1] for the variations in the MSS. at many places in the N. T. with this word. So ἐκχύννω (Mt. 26:28, etc.) in the best MSS. for ἐκχέω. Only in Mt. 9:17 we have ἐκχεῖται from ἐκχέω and in Rev. 16:1 ἐκχέατε[2] in some MSS.

(β) *The ν class* is also well represented in the N. T. with thematic stems. It takes various forms. There is the ν alone, as κάμ-νω, --αν as ἁμαρτ-άνω, --νε as ἀφ-ικ-νέο-μαι. Sometimes the ν is repeated in the root, as λαμβάνω (λαβ), μανθάνω (μαθ), τυγχάνω (τυχ). In the κοινή (so LXX. and N. T.) this inserted ν (μ) is retained in the aorist and future of λαμβάνω (ἐλήμφθην, λήμψομαι) contrary to literary Attic. So the papyri.

(γ) *The σκ class*. It is commonly called Inceptive,[3] but Delbruck[4] considers these verbs originally terminative in idea, while Monro[5] calls attention to the iterative idea common in Homer with the suffix —σκε, --σκο. The verbs with σκ may be either without reduplication, as βό-σκω, θηύ-σκω, ἰλά-σκομαι, φά-σκω, or with reduplication as γι(γ)νώ-σκω, δι-δά-σκω (for δι-δάχ-σκω), μι-μνή-σκω, πά-σχω (for πάθ-σκω). Cf. ἀρέ-σκω, γαμ-ίσκω, γηρά-σκω, εὑρ-ίσκω, μεθύ-σκω. Reduplication is thus a feature with root-verbs (non-thematic) like δί-δω-μι and thematic like γί(γ)νο-μαι as well as the σκ class. For reduplication in the aorist and the perfect see (h). The iterative idea of some of these σκ verbs suits well the reduplication.

(6) *The τ class*. It is not a very numerous one (about 18 verbs), though some of the verbs are common. The verb has

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 41. The LXX has these new presents. Thack., p.225.

[2] Blass, ib. The LXX MSS. illustrate most of these peculiarities of verbs in the present tense. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 82-84;

[3] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 436.

4 Grundr., IV, p. 59. Cf. Brug., Grundr., II, § 669.

[5] Hom. Gr., p. 34.

always a labial stem like ἅπ-τω, βάπ-τω, τύπ-τω. The root may end in β as in καλύπ-τω, π as in τύπ-τω, or φ as in βάπ-τω. It is even possible that πτ may represent an original πj (cf. iota class).

(ε) *The θ class.* Cf. ἁλή-θω, ἔσ-θω, κνή-θω, νή-θω in the present. The modern Greek has developed many new presents on the basis of the aorist or the perfect (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 143).

(f) THE FUTURE TENSE (ὁ μέλλων χρόνος). The origin of this tense has given rise to much discussion and some confusion. Vincent and Dickson[1] even say that the first aorist is derived from the σ future! Like the other tenses there has been a development along several lines. No general remark can be made that will cover all the facts. As already remarked, the future tense is fundamentally aoristic or punctiliar in idea and not durative or linear. The linear idea can be accented by the periphrastic form, as ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14: 9). Cf. also Mt. 24:9; Lu. 1:20; 5:10; Mk. 13:25. But as a rule no such distinction is drawn. The truth is that the future tense is a late development in language. In the Sanskrit it is practically confined to the indicative and the participle, as in the Greek to the indicative, infinitive and participle (optative only in indirect discourse, and rarely then, not at all in N. T.). And in the Rigveda the *sya* form occurs only some seventeen times.[2] The Teutonic tongues have no future form at all apart from the periphrastic, which existed in the Sanskrit also.[3] In the modern Greek again the future as a distinct form has practically vanished and instead there occurs θά and the subjunctive or θέλω and the remnant of the infinitive, like our English "shall" or "will."[4] Giles[5] thinks it uncertain how far the old Indo-Germanic peoples had developed a future.

Probably the earliest use of the future was one that still survives in most languages. It is just the present in a vivid, lively sense projected into the future. So we say "I go a-fishing" as Simon Peter did, ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν (Jo. 21:3). The other disciples respond ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί. This usage belongs to the realm of syntax and yet it throws light on the origin of the future tense. So Jesus used (Jo. 14:3) the present and future side by side (ἔρχο-

[1] Handb. of Mod. Gk., p. 82.

[2] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 401.

3 Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 446; Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 333 f.

[4] Thumb, Handb., pp. 161 f., 173.

[5] Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 446. On the whole subject of "Indo-European Futures" see Hadley, Ess. Phil. and Crit., pp. 184 ff.

μαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι). We have seen already that a number of aorists and presents like φη-μί had identically the same root and with no original distinction. That is, the durative idea was not distinguished from the aoristic or punctiliar. It is not strange, therefore, to see a number of these roots with primary endings (cf. subj. and opt. aorists) used as futures without any tense-suffix at all. Some were originally either present or future in sense (cf. ἔρχομαι above), others came to be used only as future. These verbs appear in Homer naturally, as βίομαι, ἔδομαι, εἶμι, πίομαι, etc.[1] Cf. N. T. φάγομαι. It is possible that those with variable vowel like ἔδομαι may really be the same form as the Homeric subjunctive (like ἴομεν as opposed to ἴμεν).[2] Πίομαι is common in Attic. (N. T.) and is from aorist root (ἔ-πι-ον). The form φάγομαι (LXX and N. T.) is analogous (aorist, ἔφαγον). The Attic used χέω as future also, but LXX and N. T. have χεῶ (Blass, *Gr. of N. T.* Gk., p. 42). Cf. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, p. 88, for LXX illustrations to the same effect. The LXX has the classic ἔδομαι; not in the N. T. (Thackeray, p. 231).

It used to be said that the a future was merely a variation of the Sanskrit *sya*, the *y* or *j* sound disappearing in the Greek. This gave a simple explanation of the σ futures. But a rival theory has been advanced which derives the σ future from the a aorist.[3] The frequency of the aorist subjunctive in Homer with κέ (ἄν) in principal clauses much like the future indicative in Attic, and the absence of a future passive, not to say future optative, in Homer give some colour to this contention.[4] Thus δείξω and the Latin *dixo* would be identical in form and meaning.[5] But Brugmann[6] has perhaps solved the problem by the suggestion that both explanations are true. Thus γράψω he derives from the aorist subjunctive γράψω, a mixed tense with a double origin. The use of —σιο/ε in the Doric lends weight to the derivation of these verbs at least from the *sya* (Sanskrit) type.[7] Hirt[8] regards σεο/ε (Doric) as a combination of the σ future and the ε future (liquid verbs, for instance) and considers it a new Greek formation. This Doric future therefore may be as old as any,

[1] Sterrett, Hom. IL, N. 38.

[2] Giles, Man., p. 447. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 184; Riern. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 438.

[3] Ib., p. 446. Cf. also Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 401 f.

[4] Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 27. [5] Giles, Man., p. 446.

[6] Griech. Gr., p. 320. This position is accepted by p. 105.

[7] Ib., p. 105 f. [8] Handb. etc., p. 403 f.

if not the oldest suffix, in fact the really distinctively future suffix. In the N. T. this Doric form survives in **πεσοῦμαι**[1] (Mt. 10:29). ῥ**Ρέω** has **ῥεύσω** (Jo. 7:38), **κλαίω** has **κλαύσω** (Lu. 6:25), while **φεύγω** has **φεύξομαι** (Jo. 10:5). The other forms common in Attic have no future in the N. T. This mixed[2] origin of the future (partly aorist subj., partly Indo-Germ. *sio*) shows itself in the *Aktionsart* of the tense. So Moulton notes **προάξω** (Mk. 14:28) as durative, but **ἄξει** (1 Th. 4:14) as aoristic. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 123.

Thus we may gain further light[3] on the Ionic-Attic future of verbs in **–ιζω.** It is like the Doric **—σεο/ε**. So we have **–ισέω**, dropping **σ** we get **–ιέω---ιῶ.** These verbs in are very common in the later Greek. In the N. T. the usage varies between this form of the future and the aoristic form in **—σο/ε**. The LXX, like the Ptolemaic papyri (Thackeray, p. 228), has usually **–ιῶ** in first singular and so **μετοικιῶ** (Ac. 7:43) and **παροργιῶ** (Ro. 10:19), both quotations. Elsewhere W. H.[4] prefer the forms in **—ίσω**, and Blass[5] thinks that in the original passages of the N. T. the **—ίσω** forms are genuine. So the forms in **—ίσει** (like **βαπτίσει**) are uniform in the N. T. (Lu. 3:16) save **καθαριεῖ** (Heb. 9:14) and **διακαθαριεῖ**, (Mt. 3:12).[6] MSS. vary between **ἀφοριεῖ** and **–ίσει, φωτιεῖ** and **—ίσει, χρονιεῖ**, and **–ίσει**. Cf. Blass.[7] So in Eph. 6:8; Col. 3:25, the MSS. vary between **κομιεῖται** and **κομίσεται**. Some MSS. read **κομιούμενοι** in 2 Pet. 2:13.[8] All editors[9] accept **κομιεῖσθε** in 1 Pet. 5:4. The active plural W. H.[10] print as **–ιοῦσι** always (as **μακαριοῦσιν**, Lu. 1:48) save in **γνωρίσουσιν** (Col. 4:9).

The syncopated futures[11] from the dropping of **σ** do not survive in the N. T. in **καλέσω, τελέσω** which always retain the **σ**.[12] So even **ἀπολέσω** (Mt. 21:41), though **ἀπολῶ** is common in the LXX and

[1] And this **πεσοῦμαι** is possibly not from **πετ-σοῦμαι**, but a change of **τ** to **σ**. Cf. K.-B1., II, p. 107; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 322; Hirt. Handb., p. 404. Henry (Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., p. 116) considers the Doric future to be the affix of the future twice over, as **σεσο, σεο**.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 149. [3] Cf. K.-B1., II, p. 106 f.

[4] Notes on Orth., p. 163. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 356.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 42.

[6] Ib. But Blass (ib.) prefers **ἐγγιεῖ** (Jas. 4:8) .

[7] Ib. See Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 84 f., 87 f., for the LXX exx. of verbs in **–ζω.**

[8] Ib. [10] Ib.

[9] Notes on Orth., p. 163. [11] Giles, Man., p. 446 f.

[12] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 41 f. Brug. (Griech. Gr., p. 321) considers this a new formation after the aor. subj. suffix. The LXX keeps **σ**. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 86; Thack., Gr., p. 230.

is quoted once in the N. T. (1 Cor. 1:19). However, the middle ἀπολοῦμαι is the N. T. form (Lu. 5:37) like ἀποθανοῦμαι. Ἐλαύνω has no future in the N. T. The N. T., like the LXX, has a future form ἀφελῶ (Rev. 22:19) from the aorist εἷλον of αἱρέω.

The liquid verbs in λ, ν, ρ present few problems. They belong to the aorist subjunctive type of formation.[1] Here again we have syncopation of the σ. Verbs like βάλλω (βαλῶ), μένω (μενῶ), αἴρω (ἀρῶ) form the future with the variable vowel ο/ε added to the stem without a in the N. T. as in the earlier Greek.

Blass[2] has shown that in the N. T. the future active has largely displaced the future middle with verbs that were defective in the active voice. These futures are as follows: ἁμαρτήσω (Mt. 18:21), ἀπαντήσω (Mk. 14:13), ἁρπάσω (Jo. 10:28), βλέψω (Ac. 28:26), γελάσω (Lu. 6:21), διώξω (Mt. 23:34), κλαύσω (Lu. 6:25), κράζω (Lu. 19:40 ℵBL), παίξω (Mk. 10:34), ῥεύσω (Jo. 7:38), σπουδάσω (2 Pet. 1:15), συναντήσω (Lu. 22:10). We see this tendency already in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 231 f.). On the other hand the future middle alone occurs with ἀποθανοῦμαι (Jo. 8:24), γνώσομαι (1 Cor. 4: 19), λήμψομαι (Mt. 10:41), ὄψομαι (Mt. 24:30), πεσοῦμαι (Doric, Mt. 10:29), πίομαι (Mk. 10:39), φάγομαι (Lu. 14: 15), φεύξομαι (Jo. 10:5). Χαρήσομαι (Lu. 1:14) Blass[3] regards as Attic future from the aorist (ἐχάρην) as compared with the future χαιρήσω from the present. Both ἀκούσω (Jo. 5:25) and ἀκούσομαι, (Ac. 21:22, chiefly in the Acts) are found, and ζήσω (Jo. 5:25) and ζήσομαι (Jo. 11:25).

The so-called second future passive as seen in the case of χαρήσομαι above is really just the middle ending with σ put to the aorist active stem. There is no difference in form or sense between βή-σο-μαι and σταλ-ή-σο-μαι save the –η-- which was really a part of the active stem of these verbs.[4] The point is that fundamentally these so-called second future passives are really future middles corresponding to active aorists like the future middles and presents above (λήμψομαι, for instance). This point is made clearer by the fact that the Doric[5] used only active endings like ἀναγραφησεῖ (not -εται). Homer, besides, only has one second future passive (μιγήσομαι, really middle) and none in -θησ--.[6] Instead he uses the middle future as later Greek continued to do with verbs like τιμήσομαι. Cf. γενήσομαι from ἐ-γεν-όμην. Some verbs indeed used both this second future passive like φανήσομαι (Mt. 24:30) which

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 321.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 42.
[3] Ib., p. 43.
[4] Giles, Man., pp. 410, 427.
[5] Ib., p. 447.
[6] K.-B1., II, p. 111.

is punctiliar and **φανοῦμαι** (1 Pet. 4:18) which may be durative like the Attic as Moulton[1] argues. So **παύσονται** (1 Cor. 13:8) and **ἐπαναπαήσεται** (Lu. 10:6). Cf. also **ἀνοιγήσομαι** (Mt. 7:7), **ἁρπαγήσομαι** (1 Th. 4:17), **φανήσομαι** (Mt. 24:30), **ὑποταγήσομαι** (1 Cor. 15:28), **ψυγήσομαι** (Mt. 24:12), **χαρήσομαι** (Lu. 1:14, see above).

The first future passive so-called is built upon the distinctively[2] Greek aorist in –**θη**–. It is unknown to Homer, as stated above, and, like the second aorist passive, is aorist in origin and idea. Here again the Doric used the active endings[3] like **συναχθησοῦντι**. This later form in –**θησ**-- grew continually in usage over the merely middle form like **τιμήσομαι**. But the passive future did not always have the passive sense, as has been shown in the case of **ἀνακιθήσομαι** (Mt. 8:11), **ἀποκριθήσομαι** (Mt. 25:37), etc.[4] **Ἀνοιχθήσομαι** also appears in Lu. 11:9 f. in some MSS. As an example of the usual forms in the N. T. take **γνωσθήσομαι** (1 Cor. 14:7). Only **μνησθήσομαι** (not **μεμνήσομαι**) and **σταθήσομαι** (not **ἑστήξω**) appear in the N. T.[5]

For a periphrastic future passive expressing continuance see **ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι** (Mt. 10:22).[6] This is naturally not a very common idiom for this tense, though the active periphrastic future is less infrequent as already shown.

(g) THE PERFECT TENSES (**τέλειοι χρόνοι**).

1. *The Name*. It does fairly well if we do not think of time in connection with the tense, a mistake that Clyde makes.[7] The completed state does not of itself have reference to present time. That comes later and by usage in the indicative alone in contrast to past and future. Originally the perfect was merely an intensive or iterative tense like the repetition of the aoristic present.[8]

2. *The Original Perfect.* The Greek perfect is an inheritance from the Indo-Germanic original and in its oldest form had no reduplication, but merely a vowel-change in the singular.[9] Indeed 191:6a (Sanskrit *veda*, Latin *vidi*, English *wot*) has never had reduplication.[10] It illustrates also the ablaut from **ιδ**-- to **οιδ**-- in the singular, seen in Sanskrit and Gothic also.[11] Cf. Latin *capio*, *cepi* (*a* to *e*). Note also **κεῖ-μαι** in the sense of **τέ-θει-μαι**.

[1] Prol., p. 150.
[2] Giles, Man., pp. 420, 447.
[3] Ib., p. 447.
[4] See VI, (e), in this chapter.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 36.
[6] Ib p. 204.
[7] Gk. Synt., p. 71.
[8] Giles, Man., p. 449.
[9] Hirt, Handb. etc., pp. 406, 410.
[10] Giles, Man., p. 449.
[11] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 410.

But the vowel-change characteristic of the original perfects is seen in other verbs which did use reduplication. Reduplication will receive separate treatment a little later, as it pertains to the present and aorist tenses also. It may be here remarked that the reduplicated form of some iterative presents doubtless had some influence in fastening reduplication upon the perfect tense. Note the English "mur-mur " (Greek γογ-γύζω, ἀρ-αρ-ίσκω), where the syllable is doubled in the repetition. It was a natural process. A number of these reduplicated forms with the mere change in the vowel appear in the N. T. This so-called second perfect, like the second aorist, is a misnomer and is the oldest form.[1] In Homer indeed it is the usual form of the perfect.[2] These old root-perfects, old inherited perfect forms according to Brugmann,[3] persist in the κοινή and are reasonably common in the papyri,[4] the inscriptions[5] and the N. T. They are of two classes: (1) real μι perfects without any perfect suffix, like ἑστάναι (Ac. 12:14); (2) second perfects in —α, like γέγονα, λέλοιπα. As N. T. examples may be mentioned ἀκήκοα (Ac. 6:11), γέγονα (1 Cor. 13:1)), εἴωθα (Lu. 4:16), γέγραθα (Jo. 19:22), οἶδα (Jo. 10:4), ὅλωλα (ἀπ--, Mt. 10:6), etc. These forms are found in the LXX. Cf. Helbing, *Gr. d. Sept.*, p. 103; Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 252 f. But the κοινή gave up the shorter (without –α) forms of the plural indicative active perfect of ἵστημι (ἕσταμεν, ἕστατε, ἑστᾶσιν). See this chapter, iv, (d), 3, for details.

3. *The κ Perfect.* This is a new type created by the Greek language of which no adequate explanation has yet been offered. The Attic inscriptions already had the κ form (Meisterhans, p. 189 f.). It is apparently at first in the singular, as in ἕστηκα (pl. ἕσταμεν), etc.[6] One might think that just as ἥκω has a perfect sense like κεῖμαι and finally had a few perfect forms[7] (like ἥκασιν), so by analogy some κ verbs became the type and analogy did the rest. But Giles[8] observes that the stems of the twelve or fourteen κ perfects in Homer all end in a vowel, a liquid or a nasal, not one in κ. And then the

[1] Riem. and Goelzer, Phonet., p. 445.

[2] Sterrett, Hom. II., N. 43. So γέγονα, εἴωθα, λέλοιπα, πέποιθα, etc.

[3] Gk. Gr., p. 323.

[4] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 372 ff.

[5] Nachm., Magn. Inschr., p. 159 f.

[6] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 412 f.

[7] In the LXX ἥκαμεν, ἥκατε, ἥκασιν occur. The pap. add καθηκυίας, ἡκότων, ἡκέναι. Wackern., Theol. Literaturzeit., 1908, p. 38. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 103 f.; Thack., Gr., p. 269. The pap. show the perfect forms in the plural. Mayser, p. 372.

[8] Man., p. 450.

three **κ** aorists (ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἧκα) call for explanation. But *per contra* there are some perfects in Homer which have **κ** stems like δέδορκα, ἔοικα, τέτηκα, etc. So that after all analogy may be the true explanation of the **κ** perfects which came, after Homer's time, to be the dominant type in Greek. But the —**κα** perfects are rare in Homer. The examples are so common (δέδωκα, etc.), in the **κοινή** as in the classic Greek, as to need no list. Note ἕστηκα intransitive and ἕστακα transitive.

4. *The Aspirated Perfects*. They are made from labials and palatals (**φ**, **χ**) and are absent from Homer. Even in the early classical period they are confined to πέπομφα and τέτροφα.[1] Homer did use this aspirate in the peculiar middle form like τετραφαται.[2] He has indeed τέτροφα from τρέφω[3] and probably just here, we may see the explanation by analogy of τέτροφα from τρέπω and so of all the aspirated forms.[4] An important factor was the fact that **κ, γ, χ** were not distinguished in the middle perfect forms. As a N. T. example of this later aspirated perfect take προσενήνοχα (Heb. 11:17). Cf. also εἴληφα, πέπραχα, τέταχα.

5. *Middle and Passive Forms*. It is only in the active that the perfect used the **κ** or the aspirated form (**φ, χ**). We have seen already that in the **κοινή** some active perfect forms drop the distinctive endings and we find forms like ἑώρακαν and ἑώρακες. Helbing (*Gr. d. Sept.*, pp. 101-103) gives LXX examples of root-perfects like ἔρρωγα, **κ** perfects like τέθεικα, ἕστηκα and transitive ἕστακα, aspirated perfects like ἔρρηχα. The middle and passive perfects did use the reduplication, but the endings were added directly to this reduplicated stem as in λέ-λυ-μαι. On the history of the ending —**κα** see Pfordten, *Zur Geschichte des griechischen Perfectums*, 1882, p. 29.

6. *The Decay of the Perfect Forms*. In the Sanskrit the perfect appears in half the roots of the language, but in the later Sanskrit it tends more and more to be confused with the mere past tenses of the indicative (aorist and imperf.) and grows less common also.[5] In the Latin, as is well known, the perfect and the aorist tenses blended. In *vidi* and *dedi* we see preserved[6] the old perfect and in *dixi* we see the old aorist. The Greek of the Byzantine period shows a great confusion between the perfect and the aorist, partly due to the Latin influence.[7] Finally

[1] Giles, Man., p. 451.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 325.
[3] Sterrett, Hom. IL, N. 43.
[4] Giles, Man., p. 451.
[5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., pp. 279, 295 f.
[6] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 451.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 142.

in the modern Greek vernacular the perfect form is lost save in the perfect passive participle like κεκλημένος. The perfect active is now made with ἔχω and the passive participle (ἔχω δεμένο) or with ἔχω and a root similar to the third singular aorist subjunctive (ἔχω δέσει or δέσῃ). Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 161. The only κ perfect in modern Greek is εὕρηκα, "the only certain remnant of the ancient perfect" (ib., p. 148). Cf. ἔχε με παρῃτημένον (Lu. 14:18). Cf. also πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν (Mk. 8 : 17). This is much like the English perfect in reality, not like the Greek ἔχω and aorist participle (like ἔχω ἀκούσας). Cf. Sonnenschein, *Greek Grammar*, Syntax, 1894, p. 284. The perfect passive in modern Greek vernacular is formed like ἔχω λυθῆ (—ει) or λελυμένος εἶμαι.[1] But we are in no position to throw stones at the Greeks, for we in English have never had a perfect save the periphrastic form. How far the perfect and the aorist may have become confused in the N. T. in sense is a matter of syntax to be discussed later.[2]

7. *The Perfect in the Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative*. Hence the perfect is practically[3] confined to the indicative. No example of the perfect optative occurs even in the periphrastic form. The subjunctive perfect, except the form εἰδῶ (εἰδῆτε, 1 Jo. 5 : 13), appears only in the periphrastic conjugation, of which a few examples remain. So the active, as ᾖ πεποιηκώς (Jas. 5:15), πεποιθότες ὦμεν (2 Cor. 1:9), and the passive, as ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι (Jo. 17:23), ᾖ κεκλημένος (Lu. 14:8), ᾖ πεπληρωμένη (Jo. 16:24). So also Jo. 17: 19, 1 Cor. 1:10, etc. The imperative makes a little worse showing. We still have ἴστε (Jas. 1:19; Eph. 5:5; Heb. 12:17 all possible indicatives), πεφίμωσο (Mk. 4:39) and ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29). The periphrastic imperative perfect is also found as ἔστωσαν περιεζωσμέναι (Lu. 12:35). In simple truth, as previously remarked (see proof in Prof. Harry's articles), the perfect subjunctive, optative and imperative never had any considerable vogue in Greek, not as much as in Sanskrit. In Homer the perfect subjunctive active is more common than in later Greek, but it is rare in Homer.[4]

8. *The Perfect Indicative*. It is to the indicative that we turn

[1] Thumb., Handb., p. 165. Certainly the aorists in -κα are very common in the mod. Gk. (Thumb, Handb., pp. 140, 146 ff.).

[2] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 143 f.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200 f. Cf. discussion between Prof. Harry and Prof. Sonnenschein in Cl. Rev., 1906, and La Roche, Beitr. z. griech. Gr., 1893.

[4] Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 43.

for the real development of the perfect. Here the perfect was for long very frequent indeed, and the time element comes in also. The ancients did not agree in the names for the three tenses of perfect action in the indicative. The Stoics[1] called the present perfect συντελικὸς (or τέλειος) χρόνος ἐνεστώς, the past perfect συντελικὸς (τέλειος) χρόνος παρῳχημένος, the future perfect συντελικὸς (τέλειος) χρόνος μέλλων. Sometimes the present perfect was called merely ὁ παρακείμενος χρόνος, the past perfect ὁ ὑπερσυντελικὸς χρόνος, and the future perfect ὁ μετ᾽ ὀλίγον μέλλων χρόνος (*futurum exactum*). The name **plu-perfect** is not a good one. The tense occurs in the N. T. with 22 verbs and 15 have the augment (H. Scott). Thus τεθεμελίωτο (Mt. 7:25) and ἐληλύθει (Jo. 6:17), but ἐβέβλητο (Lu. 16:20) and περιεδέδετο (Jo. 11:44). Cf. εἶχον ἀποκειμένην (Lu. 19:20) in the light of modern Greek. In the N. T. the past perfect is not very frequent, nor was it ever as abundant as in the Latin.[2] It goes down as a distinct form with the present perfect in modern Greek. Hirt[3] calls attention to the fact that Homer knows the past perfect only in the dual and the plural, not the singular, and that the singular ending is a new formation, a contraction of --εα into –η. In the N. T., however, only –ειν is used. It is not certain whether the past perfect is an original Indo-Germanic form. The **future perfect** was always a very rare tense with only two active forms of any frequency, ἑστήξω and τεθνήξω. The middle and passive could make a better showing. In Heb. 8:11 εἰδήσουσιν, is probably future active (from LXX),[4] and in Lu. 19:40 some MSS., but not ℵBL (rejected by W. H.), give κεκράξονται (cf. LXX). In Heb. 2:13 (another quotation from the LXX) we have the periphrastic form ἔσομαι πεποιθώς. The future perfect passive occurs in the N. T. only in the periphrastic form in such examples as ἔσται δεδεμένον (Mt. 16:19), ἔσται λελυμένα (Mt. 18:18), ἔσονται διαμεμερισμένοι (Lu. 12 : 52). Cf. ἔσῃ κατ[α]τεθειμ[έ]νο(σ) B.G.U. 596 (A.D. 84). In the nature of the case the future perfect would not often be needed. This *periphrastic* future perfect is found as early as Homer.[5] The papyri likewise show some examples.[6]

[1] K.-Bl., II, p. 2 f.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201. Brug. calls the past perf. a "neue Bildung."

[3] Handb. etc., p. 415 f.

[4] So Hirt follows Wackern. in seeing a new stem here εἰδη--. Cf. ib., p. 416. B in Deut. 8:3 has εἴδησαν like the aorist εἴδησα from Arist. onwards. Cf. Mayser, Gr., p. 370; Thack., Gr., p. 278.

5 Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 27.

6 Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 377. In the Boeotian inscr. the past perf. and the fut. perf. are both absent.

The present perfect and the past perfect also have the periphrastic conjugation. So we find with comparative indifference[1] ἔστιν γεγραμμένα (Jo. 20:30) and in the next verse γέγραπται. So also ἦν γεγραμμένον (Jo. 19:19) and ἐπεγέγραπτο (Ac. 17:23). Cf. also Lu. 2:26. The active has some examples also, though not so many, as ἑστώς εἰμι (Ac. 25:10), and ἦσαν προεωρακότες (Ac. 21:29).

9. *Σ in Perfect Middle and Passive and Aorist Passive.* It may be due to a variety of causes. Some of these verbs had an original σ in the present stem, like τελέσ)ω, ἀκού(σ)ω. Hence τετέλεσμαι, ἤκουσμαι (ἠκούσθην) etc.[2] Others are dental stems like πείθ-ω, πέ-πεισμαι. Others again are ν stems which in Attic (apparently analogical) changed to σ, as φαίνω, πέφασμαι, but in the N. T. this ν assimilates to the μ as in ἐξηραμμένος (Mk. 11:20) from ξηραίνω, μεμιαμμένος (Tit. 1:15) from μιαίνω. Then again some verbs take the σ by analogy merely, as in the case of ἔγνωσμαι, ἐγνώσθην (1 Cor. 13:12), κέκλεισμαι (Lu. 11:7), λέλουσμαι (Heb. 10:22).

(h) REDUPLICATION (διπλασιασμός or ἀναδίπλωσις).

1. *Primitive*. Now this primitive repetition of the root belongs to many languages and has a much wider range than merely the perfect tense. Hence it calls for separate treatment. It is older, this repetition or intensifying of a word, than either the inflection of nouns or the conjugation of verbs.[3] Root reduplication existed in the parent language.[4]

2. *Both Nouns and Verbs*. Among nouns note ἀγ-ωγός, βάρ-βαρος, βέ-βηλος, etc. But it was among verbs that reduplication found its chief development.[5]

3. *In Three Tenses in Verbs*. It is in the aorist, the present and the perfect. This is precisely the case with the Sanskrit, where very many aorists, some presents and nearly all perfects have reduplication.[6] In Homer[7] the reduplication of the second

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 202 f.; Brug. (Griech. Gr., p. 330 f.) points out how in prehistoric times the periphrastic form alone existed in the subj. and opt. middle and passive, as indeed was practically true always for all the voices.

[2] Ib., p. 326. Cf. Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., p. 100 f.; Thack., pp. 219 ff., for LXX illustr. of both σ and ν (μ).

[3] Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), vol. IV, p. 10. See note there for books on Reduplication. Add Lautensach, Gr. Stud. (1899).

[4] Ib., p. 11. Cf. K.-B1., II, p. 8.

[5] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 176. Fritzsche (Ques. de redupl. graeca; Curtius, Stud. zu griech. and lat. Gr., pp. 279 ff.) considers the doubling of the syllable (iteration) the origin of all reduplication like ἀρ-αρ-ίσκω, βι-βά-ζω.

[6] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 222. [7] Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 32.

aorist is much more frequent than in later Greek, but forms like **ἤγαγον, ἤνεγκον, εἶπον**, persist in N. T. Greek and the **κοινή** generally. Cf. **ἐκέκραξα** in Ac. 24 : 21. The Greek present shows reduplication in three classes of presents, viz. the root class (like **δί-δωμι, ἵ-η-μι, ἵ-στημι**, etc.), the thematic presents (like **γί-γνο-μαι, πι-́πτω**, etc.), inceptive verbs (like **γι-γνώ-σκω**, etc.). The most common reduplication in Greek is, of course, that in the perfect tense, where it is not like augment, mode-sign or personal endings. It is an integral part of the tense in all modes, voices and persons, until we see its disappearance (p. 365) in the later Greek. In the vernacular the extinction is nearly complete.[1] Even presents[2] like **γνώσκω** occur in modern Greek. Dieterich[3] gives numerous examples of dropped reduplicatiion in inscriptions and papyri. It is absent in the modern Greek vernacular, even in the participle.[4]

4. *Three Methods in Reduplication.* Perhaps the oldest is the doubling of the whole syllable, chiefly in presents and aorists, like **γογ-γύζω, ἀρ-αρίσκω, ἤγ-αγ-ον**, etc. This is the oldest form of reduplication[5] and is more common in Greek than in Latin.[6] The later grammarians called it Attic reduplication because it was less common in their day,[7] though, as a matter of fact, Homer used it much more than did the Attic writers.[8] But perfects have this form also, as **ἀκήκοα, ἐλήλυθα**, etc. But the reduplication by **ι** is confined to presents like **δί-δωμι, γί-γνομαι, γι-γνώσκω**, etc. And most perfects form the reduplication with **ε** and the repetition of the first letter of the verb as **λέ-κυκα**. But Homer had **πέπιθον** and other such aorists. **Εἶπον** is really an example of such an aorist.

5. *Reduplication in the Perfect.* The history is probably as follows in the main. Originally there were some perfects without reduplication,[9] a remnant of which we see in **οἶδα**. The doubling of the whole syllable was the next step like **ἀκ-ήκοα, ἐ-γρή-γορ-α, ἐλ-ήλυθα, ἀπόλωλα**, etc., like the present and aorist usage.[10] Then comes the **ε** with repetition of the initial letter of a consonant-

[1] See Jann., Hist. Gr., p. 190 f., for exx. like **ἔτακτο** even in Polyb., and later **γραμμένος**, etc.

[2] Ib. Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 148 f.

[3] Unters. etc., p. 215.

[4] Thumb, Handb., p. 148 f.

[5] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 369.

[6] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 409.

[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 190.

[8] Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 32.

[9] Cf. Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), IV, p. 384. Cf. also Hirt, Handb. etc. p. 407; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 259.

[10] Ib., Helbing, Gr. d. Sept., pp. 70-82, treats together augment and reduplication, not a very satisfactory method.

stem like λε-λοιπα. But here some further modifications crept in. The aspirates did not repeat, but we have τέ-θεικα. Those with a did not repeat it, but instead used the rough breathing as ἕστηκα or the smooth like ἔ-σχηκα. This was all for euphony. But forms like ἔ-σχηκα, ἔ-σπασμαι fall under another line also, for, if the verb begins with a double consonant, the consonant need not be used. So ἔ-γνωκα, but βέ-βληκα, γέ-γραφα. The Cretan dialect has indeed ἔγρατται=γέ-γραπται.[1] So far the N. T. phenomena are in harmony with the general Greek history, as indeed is the case with the papyri[2] and the inscriptions.[3] In Lu. 1:27 and 2:5, we have ἐ-μνηστευμένη, not μεμν. (cf. μέμνημαι). Just as σ verbs did not repeat, so with ῥ verbs sometimes. So ἐριμμένοι (Mt. 9:36), ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29), etc. But in Rev. 19:13 W. H. read ῥεραντισμένον, though Hort[4] advocates ῥαραμμένον. D has ῥεριμμένοι in Mt. 9:36 above. This reduplication of initial ῥ is contrary to Attic rule. For the LXX see Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 204 f. This use of ε begins to spread in the κοινή and is seen in LXX MSS., as in A ἐπέγραπτο (Deut. 9:10). For similar forms in Ionic and late writers see Winer-Schmiede1.[5] Once more several verbs that begin with a liquid have ει as the reduplication in the Attic and Ionic, though not in all dialects. Perhaps euphony and analogy entered to some extent in the case of εἴ-ληφα (λαμβάνω), εἴρηκα (cf. ἐρρήθην). Note also εἴληχα and εἴλοχα. With verbs beginning with a vowel there was sometimes the doubling of the syllable as ἀκήκοα, or the mere lengthening of the vowel as ἤκουσμαι, or the addition of ε alone with contraction as εἰθισμένος, or uncontracted as ἔοικα (from εἴκω). Cf. εἴωθα. In Jo. 3:21 (so 1 Pet. 4:3) we have εἴργασμαι as in Attic and εἰλκωμένος in Lu. 16:20. In ὁραω we have ἑορακα in Paul's Epistles (1 Cor. 9:1) and sometimes a sort of double reduplication (like εἴωθα) as ἑώρακα (Jo. 1:18). So Attic. See Additional Note. In Col. 2:1 the form ἑόρακαν calls for notice both for its reduplication and its ending (cf. ἑώρακαν Lu. 9: 36). So also ἀνέῳγεν (1 Cor. 16:9; א ἠνεῳγώς, Jo. 1 : 51) and ἀνεῳγμένη (2 Cor. 2:12). Indeed in this last verb the preposition may re- additional reduplication (treble therefore), as in ἠνεῳγμένη (Rev. five times). See also ἠμφιεσμένον (Mt. 11:8 = Lu. 7:25) from ἀμφιέννυμι. But as a rule with compound verbs in the N. T. re-

[1] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 408.
[2] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 338
[3] Nachm., p. 150 f.; Schweizer, Perg. Inschr., p. 171.
[4] Notes on Orth., p. 170.
[5] F. 103. Cf. also K.-B1., II, p. 23, and Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 38.

duplication comes only between the prepositions and the verb. Sometimes the reduplication is not used, as in εὐαρεστηκέναι (Heb., 11:5), but ℵDEP have εὐηρ--. We have ᾠκοκόμητο (Lu. 4:29), but οἰκοδομῆσθαι (Lu. 6:48).[1] Cf. οἰκοδομήθη (Jo. 2:20) for absence of augment. Reduplication in the perfect has disappeared from the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 119) and is showing signs of decay in the κοινή. For suppression of reduplication in papyri see Mayser, p. 341.

(i) AUGMENT (αὔξησις).

1. The Origin of Augment. It has never been explained. It is generally conceded to be an independent word, an adverb, added to the verb, which is an enclitic after the augment like ἔ-λιπε.[2] We have mere conjectures for the origin of the adverb, possibly a locative of the pronoun-stem. In Sanskrit it is *a*.

2. *Where Found.* It is found in Sanskrit, Iranian, Armenian and Greek, and only in the past tenses of the indicative. But in Mt. 12:20 we actually have κατεάξει. (fut. ind. of κατάγνυμι, and in Jo. 19:31 κατεαρῶσιν) (aor. pass. subj.), probably to distinguish these forms from κατάγω). So Winer-Schmiedel, p. 98. This "false augment" is very common in later Greek (Hatzidakis, *Einl*., p. 64). Augment persists in modern Greek (Thumb, p. 117).

3. *The Purpose of Augment*. It denotes past time. The secondary endings do that also and with sufficient clearness at first. More than half of the past tenses of the Sanskrit do not have the augment.[3] In Homer some verbs like ὁράω never had augment, and often for metrical reasons the augment is not found in Homer. He used much freedom in the matter.[4] Jannaris[5] is probably right in the opinion that this freedom is due to the original fulness of the verb-endings. Augment won a firm foothold in prose before it did in poetry,[6] but never was everywhere essential. It varied greatly in its history as will be shown.

4. *The Syllabic Augment* (αὔξησις συλλαβική). Its use with the past tenses of the indicative was not exactly uniform, being less constant with the past perfect than with the aorist and imperfect. The syllabic augment occurs also with some initial vowel verbs due to original digamma *F*, *σ* in the *anlaut*. So εἴασεν (Ac. 28:4),

[1] Moulton (Cl. Rev., Feb., 1901, p. 36) cites ἀπαιτῆσθαι, ἑτοιμάκαμεν from the pap.

[2] Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), IV, p. 25. Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 185) thinks it is an archaic form of the imperf. of εἰμί (ε, εν).

[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 221.

[4] Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 30 f.

[5] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 185.

[6] Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), IV, p. 32.

εἴδομεν (Mt. 2:2), εἶπεν (Mt. 2:8), εἴλατο (2 Th. 2:13), etc. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 200 f. In the N. T. it is absent from the past perfect more frequently than it is present, as is true of the papyri[1] and late Greek generally.[2] So, for instance, τεθεμελίωτο (Mt. 7:25), πεποιήκεισαν (Mk. 15:7), παραδεδώκωισαν (Mk. 15:10), ἐληλύθει. (Jo. 6:17), etc. On the other hand the augment does appear in such examples as ἐπεποίθει (Lu. 11:22), ἐβέβλητο (Lu. 16:20), ἐγεγόνει (Jo. 6:17), συνετέθειντο (Jo. 9:22), περιεδέδετο (Jo. 11:44), etc. It was only in the past perfect that both augment and reduplication appeared. The κοινή strove to destroy the distinction between reduplication and augment so that ultimately reduplication vanished (Thumb, *Hellenismus*, p. 170). But first the augment vanished in the past perfect. The Attic sometimes had ἑστήκειν (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 100). Hort (*Notes on Orthography*, p. 162) contends for ἱστήκειν uniformly in the N. T. as more than mere itacism for εἱστήκειν, for even B has ι five times in spite of its fondness for ει. So W. H. uniformly, as Rev. 7:11 and even in Jo. 1:35 and Lu. 23:49. Cf. similar itacism between εἶδον and ἴδον in the MSS. (Hort, *Notes on Orthography*, p. 162). On augment in the LXX see Conybeare and Stock, *Sel. from LXX*, pp. 36 ff.; Swete, *Intr. to 0. T.*, p. 305; Thackeray, *Gr*., pp. 195 ff. Syllabic augment was much more tenacious with the aorist and imperfect than the temporal.

5. *The Temporal Augment* (αὔξησις χρονική). The simplicity of the syllabic and the resulting confusion of the temporal had undoubtedly something to do with the non-use of the temporal augment in many cases.[3] The κοινή shows this tendency.[4] Even the Attic was not uniform in the use of the temporal augment. At bottom there is no real distinction between the temporal and syllabic augment. Both express time and both make use of the syllabic ε. The difference is more one of the eye and ear than of fact. What we call the temporal augment is the result of the contraction of this ε with the initial vowel of the verb.[5] As remarked above, this very confusion of result, difficult to keep clear as the vowel-sounds tended to blend more and more, led to the disuse of this ε and contraction with initial vowel verbs, especially with diphthongs.[6] Hence in the N. T. we meet such examples as the

[1] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 333. [2] W.-Sch., p. 99.
[3] See good discussion in Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 186.
[4] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 336. [5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 185.
[6] Ib., p. 186. Hence in mod. Gk. temporal augment is nearly gone. Already in the LXX the movement toward the loss of the temporal augment is

following: of **αι,** ἐπαισχύνθη (2 Tim. 1:16); of **ευ,** εὐλόγησεν (Mt. 14:19), εὐδόκησα (Mt. 17:5), εὐνούχισαν (Mt. 19:12), εὐκαίρουν (Mk. 6:31), εὐφραίνοντο (Ac. 7:41), εὐπορεῖτο (Ac. 11:29), εὐθυδρομήσαμεν, (Ac. 16:11), εὐχαρίστησεν (Ac. 27:35).[1] But on the other hand we have ηὕρισκον (Mk. 14:55), προσηύξαντο (Ac. 8:15), ηὐχόμην (Ro. 9:3), ηὐδόκησαν (Ro. 15:26); of **οι,** οἰκοδομήθη (Jo. 2:20), etc., but ᾠκοδόμησεν (Lu. 7:5), etc.; of **ει,** εἴξαμεν (Gal. 2: 5) just like Attic; of **ε,** διερμήνυσεν (Lu. 24:27), διεγείρετο (Jo. 6: 18), ἀνέθη (Ac. 16:26), ἀφέθησαν (Ro. 4:7, Ps. 32:1); of **ο,** προορώμην (Ac. 2:25; Ps. 16:8), and some MSS. in Lu. 13:13 (ἀνορθώθη) and Ro. 9:29 (ὁμοιώθημεν); of **ι,** ἴσχυσεν (Lu. 8:43), ἱκάνωσεν, (2 Cor. 3:6) and ἰᾶτο (Lu. 9:11); of **ω,** ὠνέομαι has no augment, ὠνήσατο (Ac. 7:16), and the same, thing is true of ὠθέω, as ἀπώσατο (Ac. 7:27), ἐξώσεν (Ac. 7:45). ᾽**Ε**ργάζομαι has η, not ει, as its augment according to W. H. So ἠργάζοντο (Ac. 18:3), but always εἶχον.

6. *Compound Verbs* (παρασύνθετα). The language varied in the way it regarded compound verbs, though usually a verb derived from a compound is treated as a unit. So ἐθηριομάχησα, ἐλιθοβόλησαν, ἐμοσχοποίησαν (Ac. 7:41), ἐναυάγησα, ἐπροφήτευσεν (Mk. 7: 6), ἐπαρρησιάσατο (Ac. 9:27), ἐσυκοφάντησα, but εὐηγγελίσατο (Ac. 8:35) in late Greek and προευγγελίσατο (Gal. 3:8). If the compound embraces a preposition, the augment as in Attic usually follows the preposition like ἀπήντησαν (Lu. 17:12). Some verbs derived from nouns already compounded are augmented like verbs compounded with a preposition, as διηκόνει (Mt. 8 : 15) unlike Attic. As further examples note ἀπεδήμησεν (Mt. 21:33), ἐπεθύμησαν (Mt. 13:17), κατηγρόρουν (Mk. 15:3), ἐπεχείρησαν (Lu. 1:1), ἀπελογεῖτο (Ac. 26:1), συνήργει (Jas. 2:22). Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 102. But in Mt. 7:22 and 11:13 the Syrian class of MSS. have προεφητεύσαμεν and -σαν. Sometimes the preposition itself is treated as a part of the verb when put directly to the verb, as ἤφιεν (Mk. 1:34), ἤνοιξεν (Rev. 6:1), διήνοιγεν (Lu. 24:32), ἐκάθευδον (Mt. 25:5), ἐκάθητο (Mt. 13:1), ἐκάθισεν (Jo. 19:13), ἐκαθεζετο (Jo. 4:6). In Mt. 13:15 ἐκάμμυσαν (from Is. 6:10) is assimilation of καταμύω. Verbs beginning with εὐ-- vary in augmented tenses between εὐ-- and ηὐ--, but when followed by a vowel, the verb is treated as a compound like εὐηγγελίσατο above.

7. *Double Augment*. It is fairly common in the N. T. In the

seen (Thack., Gr., pp. 196, 199 f.). The pap. often have –ειρέθην for --ηρέθην (Mayser, pp. 127, 335).

[1] See W.-Sch., p. 100 f. Cf. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 162 f.

case of ἤγαγον and εἶπον the augment is added to the aoristic reduplication. But in ἑώρων (Jo. 6:2 in Tischendorf's text, W. H. ἐθεώρουν) there is a clear case of double augment like the double reduplication in ἑώρακα. So also the N. T. regularly ἠδυνήθην (Mt. 17:16) and even ἠδυνάσθη (Mk. 7:24). Both ἐδύνατο (Mk. 6:5) and ἠδύνατο (Mk. 14:5) appear and the MSS. vary much. This η (analogy to ἤθελον) first arises in the Attic in 300 B.C.[1] With μέλλω, ἤμελλον is the usual form (Jo. 4:47), though ἔμελλον occurs also (Jo. 7:39). **Βούλομαι** in the N. T. never has η, though the Text. Rec. has it in 2 Jo. 12. On the other hand θέλω always has η (Gal. 4:20, ἤθελον) even after the initial ε was dropped. **Ἀποκαθίστημι** has always a double augment, one with each preposition. So ἀπεκατέστη (Mk. 8:25) and ἀπεκατεστάθη (Mk. 3:5).[2] So LXX and later Greek.[3] But in Heb. 12:4 ἀντικατέστητε is the true text.[4] **Ἀνοίγω** has a peculiar history. It now has single augment on the preposition, as ἤνοιξεν (Rev. 6:3), now double augment of the verb, as ἀνέῳξεν (Jo. 9:14), now a triple augment on verb and preposition, as ἠνεῴχθησαν (Mt. 9:30). **Ἀνέχομαι**, on the other hand, has only one augment, as ἀνεσχόμην (Ac. 18:14) and ἀνείχεσθε (2 Cor. 11:1). For double augment in the LXX see Thackeray, *Gr.*, pp. 202 ff.

VIII. The Infinitive (ἡ ἀπαρέμφατος ἔγκλισις). The most striking development of the infinitive in the κοινή belongs to syntax, and not accidence.[5] Hence a brief discussion will here suffice. Blass, for instance, in his *Grammar of N. T.* Greek, has no discussion of the infinitive under "Accidence," nor has Moulton in his *Prolegomena*. But the infinitive has a very interesting history on its morphological side.

1. *No Terminology at First*. Originally it was a mere noun of action (*nomen actionis*). Not all nouns of action developed into infinitives. Brugmann[6] quotes from Plato τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δόσιν ὑμῖν where a noun of action (δόσις) is used with the dative. This is, of course, not an infinitive. The older Sanskrit shows quite a variety of nouns of action used in a "quasi-infinitive sense,"[7] governing cases like the verb, but having no tense nor voice.

2. *Fixed Case-Forms.* The first stage in the development was reached when these nouns of action were regarded as fixed ease-

[1] Meist erh., Att. Inschr., p. 169.
[2] So inscr. Letronne, Rec. II, p. 463.
[3] W.-Sch., p. 103.
[4] Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 163.
[5] Dieterich, Unters., p. 209.
[6] Comp. Gr. (transl.), II, p. 471.
[7] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 203. On these infs. in posse see Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 599.

forms. That stage was obtained in the Sanskrit. At first the dative was the most common case so used along with the accusative, genitive, ablative and sometimes the locative. In the later Sanskrit the accusative supplanted the rest (*tum* or *itum*). Cf. the Latin supine.[1] But the Sanskrit infinitive, while governing cases, never developed tense nor voice, and so remained essentially a substantive.

3. *With Voice and Tense.* But the second stage appears in the Greek and Latin where it had its most characteristic development.[2] The infinitive becomes a real verbal substantive. Here voice and tense are firmly established. But while, by analogy, the Greek infinitive comes to be formed on the various tense and voice stems, that is an after-thought and not an inherent part of the infinitive. There was originally no voice, so that it is even a debatable question if τιμῆ-σαι, for instance, and *haberi* are not formed exactly alike.[3] The active and the passive ideas are both capable of development from δυνατὸς θαυμάσαι, 'capable for wondering.'[4] The passive infinitive had only sporadic development in single languages.[5] The middle is explained in the same way as active and passive. The tense-development is more complete in Greek than in Latin, the future infinitive being peculiar to Greek. The Latin missed also the distinctive aorist infinitive. But here also analogy has played a large part and we are not to think of λῦσαι, for instance, as having at bottom more kinship with ἔλυσα than with λύσις.[6] Indeed the perfect and future infinitives are both very rare in the N. T. as in the κοινή generally.[7] This weakening of the future infinitive is general[8] in the κοινή, even with μέλλω as well as in indirect discourse. In Jo. 21:25 late MSS. have χωρῆσαι instead of χωρήσειν. Indeed the papyri in the later κοινή show a hybrid infinitive form, a sort of mixture of aorist and

[1] Whitney, ib., p. 347. Cf. ger. of Lat. For special treatises on the inf. see Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), IV, pp. 595 ff.; Griech. Gr., p. 359. Cf. also Grunewald, Der freie formelhafte Inf. der Limitation im Griech. (1888); Birklein, Entwickelungsgesch. des substant. Inf. (1888); Votaw, The Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk. (1896); Allen, The Inf. in Polyb. compared with Bibl. Gk. (1907). Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 480 ff., 568 ff.) has a very good sketch of the history of the inf. in Gk. On p. 572 f. he discusses John's use of the inf. with verbs (129 exx.). Cf. Jolly, Gesch. des Inf. im Indog. (1873); Gildersleeve, Contrib. to the Hist. of the Articular Inf. (Transl. Am. Phil. Ass., 1878, A. J. P., vol. III, pp. 193 ff.; vol. VIII, pp. 329 ff.; vol. XXVII, p. 105 f.).

[2] Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), II, p. 471.

[3] Hirt, Handb. etc., p. 433.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 203.

[6] Hirt, Handb., p. 431.

[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 204.

[7] Votaw, Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 59.

[8] Moulton, Prol., p. 204.

future like ἐπελεύσασθαι (even in early papyri).[1] In the LXX we find τεύξασθαι (2 Macc. 15:7) and ἐκφεύξασθαι in 2 Macc. 9:22. In other cases the two are used side by side. It is only in the state of the action that the infinitive has any true tense-action developed save in indirect discourse where the infinitive tense represents the time of the direct discourse. The infinitive thus is like a verb in that it expresses action, governs cases, has voice and tense.[2]

4. *No Personal Endings*. The infinitive never developed personal endings and remained undefined, unlimited. The infinitive and the participle are thus both infinitives in this sense, that they are the unlimited verb so far as personal endings are concerned. They are both participles in that they participate in both noun and verb. The terms have no inherent distinction, but serve merely as a convenience.[3] In the nature of the case neither can have a subject in any literal sense. But it is to be admitted even here that the line between the finite and the infinite verb is not absolute.[4] Cf. the forms φέρε and φέρειν, for instance. But the cases used with the infinitive will be discussed in Syntax.

5. *Dative and Locative in Form.* The infinitive continued a substantive after the voice and tense-development. At first the case-idea of the form was observed, but gradually that disappeared, though the form remained. The Greek infinitives are always either datives or locatives, "dead datives or locatives" usually.[5] All infinitives in —αι are datives. Thus all those in –ναι, –σαι, ---έναι, --μεναι (Homer), –σθαι, (–θαι). Those in --σθαι alone give any trouble. It is probably a compound (σ, θαι), but its precise origin is not clear.[6] The locative is seen in –ειν, and Homeric –μεν, but the origin of –ειν is again doubtful.[7] But no distinction remains between the two cases in actual usage.[8] In Homer[9] the dative sense as well as form remain extremely common, as indeed is true of all Greek where the infinitive remains. The very common infinitive of purpose, like ἦλθον ἀγοράσαι, is a true dative. (Cf. Mt. 2:2.) But the very essence of the infinitive as a complete development is that this dative or locative form could be

[1] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 385. Cf. Moulton, Cl. Rev., Feb., 1901, p. 36 f. Cf. Hatz., Einl., p. 190.

[2] Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), IV, p. 7.

[3] K.-B1., II, p. 4.

[4] Brug., Comp. Gr. (transl.), p.7.

[6] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 90.

[6] Cf. Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 469 f.; Brug., Grundr., II, § 1093. 8.

[7] Hirt, Handb., p. 432; Giles, Man., p. 470.

[8] Moulton, Prol., p. 202.

[9] Monro, Horn. Gr., p. 154.

used in any case like any other substantive without inflection, an indeclinable substantive in a fixed case-form.

6. *The Presence of the Article.* After Homer's day it was common and chiefly in the Attic,[1] but this is a matter to be treated further in Syntax. The point to observe here is that the article did not make a substantive of the infinitive. It was that before voice and tense were used with it. But it is true that even in Homer the verbal aspect is more prominent than the substantival. In the vernacular the article was never much used with the infinitive; perhaps for convenience it was not so employed.

7. *The Disappearance of the Infinitive*. The old forms in —ειν and —ναι remain longest (Thackey, *Gr*., pp. 210, 257). The causes for the, disappearance of the infinitive in later Greek till in the modern Greek vernacular it is (outside of the Pontic dialect) dead and gone, lie largely in the region of syntax. The infinitive as a whole disappears before ὅτι and ἵνα (modern Greek νά). Farrar[2] calls attention to the absence of the infinitive in Arabic. It was always a matter of discretion with a Greek writer whether in certain clauses he would use the infinitive or an object-clause (ὅτι, ὅπως, ἵνα).[3] Cf. Latin. The English infinitive has an interesting history also as the mutilated form of the dative of a gerund.[4]

8. *Some N. T. Forms.* Not many N. T. forms call for special remark and those have been explained already, such as —οῖν (Mt. 13:32; Heb. 7:5), πεῖν and even πῖν for πιεῖν (Jo. 4:9). In Lu. 1:79 ἐπιφᾶναι instead of the Attic ἐπιφῆναι is noticeable. In Ph. 4:12 we have πεινᾶν, not –ῆν. The Coptic has the infinitive pastιγγοῖν (cf. W. H. κατασκηνοῖν, Mt. 13:32 = Mk. 4:32, and ἀποδεκατοῖν in Heb. 7:5). In 1 Cor. 11:6 we find both κείρασθαι and ξυρᾶσθαι. In Mk. 14:71 ὀμνύναι is the regular –μι form. In Heb. 11:5 εὐαρεστηκέναι is without reduplication in AKL. In Lu. 9: 18 (11:1) a periphrastic infinitive appears, ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον. The augment occurs with ἀνεῳχθῆναι. in Lu. 3:21. Cf. ἔσομαι διδόναι in Tob. 5:15 B.

IX. The Participle (n metoxn).

1. *The Name*. This does not really distinguish this verbal adjective from the verbal substantive, the infinitive. Both are par-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 213 f.

[2] Gk. Synt., p. 164.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 221. Thumb (Handb. of Mod. Gk.) has no discussion of the infinitive.

[4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 169. Cf. Donaldson, New Crat., p. 603.

ticiples and both are infinitives. Voss[1] calls the participles "mules" because they partake of both noun and verb, but the infinitives are hybrid in exactly the same sense. Like the infinitive, the Greek participle has voice, tense, and governs cases, and may use the article. Unlike the infinitive the participle has regular inflection like other adjectives. Clyde[2] would include participles in the infinitive. So Kuhner-Blass.[3] Dionysius Thrax[4] puts the participle right: **Μετοχή ἐστι λέξις μετέχουσα τῆς τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἰδίοτητος.**

2. *Verbal Adjectives.* As a matter of fact no absolutely clear line can be drawn between verbal adjectives and other adjectives.[5] An adjective may not only be used with a case like **κενός** with the ablative, but may even take on a verbal, nature in certain connections.[6] Some, like **κλυτός,** were always purely adjectival.[7] Most of the forms in **–τος** in Greek are adjectival, but many of them have a verbal idea developed also, either that of completion, as **ἀγαπητός** ('beloved,' Mt. 3:17) , or of possibility or capability, as **παθητός** ('liable to suffering,' Ac. 26:23) . In Greek these verbals in **–τος** never became a part of the verb as in Latin perfect passive participle.[8] Moulton[9] shows how *amatus est* and "he is loved" represent different tenses, but *scriptum est* and "it is written" agree. But there was no reason why the **–τος** should not have had a further verbal development in Greek. For the structure of this verbal adjective see the chapter on Formation of Words, where a list of the chief examples is given. Moulton[10] points out the wavering between the active and passive idea when the true verbal exists in the N. T., by the example of **ἀδύνατος**, in Ro. 8:3. Is it 'incapable' as in Ro. 15:1 or 'impossible' as is usual? Blass[11] indeed denies the verbal character of the **—τος** form in the N. T. to any examples except **παθητός** (Ac. 26:23). But this is too extreme, as Moulton[12] clearly proves. **Ἀσύνετος** is active in Ro. 1:31 while **ἀσύνθετος** is middle (**συντίθεμαι**). With the forms in **–τος** therefore two points have to be watched: first, if they are verbal at all, and then, if they are active, middle or passive. There is no doubt as to the verbal character of the form in **—τέος**, which expresses the idea of necessity. This is in fact a ge-

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 169.
[2] Gk. Synt., p. 94.
[3] II, p. 4.
[4] § 19.
[5] Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 605.
[6] Ib., II, p. 456,
[7] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 474.
[8] Ib.
[9] Prol., 221.
[10] Ib.
[11] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 37.
[12] Prol., p. 222.

rundive and is closely allied to the –τος form.[1] It has both a personal construction and the impersonal, and governs cases like the verb. It is not in Homer[2] (though —τος is common), and the first example in Greek is in Hesiod.[3] The N. T. shows only one example, βλητέον (Lu. 5:38), impersonal and governing the accusative. It appears in a few MSS. in the parallel passage in Mk. 2: 22. One further remark is to be made about the verbals, which is that some participles lose their verbal force and drop back to the purely adjectival function. So **ἑκών, μέλλων** in the sense of 'future.' Cf. *eloquens* and *sapiens* in Latin.[4] In general, just as the infinitive and the gerind were surrounded by many other verbal substantives, so the participle and the gerundive come out of many other verbal adjectives. In the Sanskrit, as one would expect, the division-line between the participle and ordinary adjectives is less sharply drawn.[5]

3. *True Participles*. These have tense and also voice. Brugmann[6] indeed shows that the Greek participle endings go back to the proethnic participle. Already in the Sanskrit the present, perfect and future tenses (and in the Veda the aorist) have participles in two voices (active and middle),[7] thus showing an earlier development than the infinitive. The endings of the Greek participles are practically the same as those of the Sanskrit. The Latin, unlike the Sanskrit and the Greek, had no aorist and no perfect active participle, and the future participle like acturus may have come from the infinitive.[8] The Greek has, however, two endings for the active, —ντ for all tenses save the perfect, just like the Sanskrit. The perfect ending (*wes, –wos, –us*, Greek —ως, —οτ, –ω) is difficult of explanation, but is likewise parallel with the Sanskrit.[9] The perfect participle is more common in Homer than any other form of the perfect (Sterrett, *Homer's Iliad,* N. 44). The middle ending –μενο is uniform and is like the Sanskrit. The Greek aorist passive participle ending (--θεντ) is peculiar to the Greek and is made by analogy from the old active form like **φαν-έντ-ς (φαν-είς)**,

[1] Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 605. [2] Sterrett, Hom. Il., N. 28.

[3] Hirt, Handb., p. 438. Moulton (Cl. Rev., Mar., 1904, p. 112) finds one ex. of —τέος in the pap. and "the —τος participle is common in neg. forms." Note that he calls it a participle.

[4] Brug., Comp. Gr., II, p. 457.

[5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 347.

[6] Indog. Forsch., V, pp. 89 ff. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 221.

[7] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 202.

[8] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 474.

[9] Hirt, Handb., p. 436 f.

like Latin, *manens*.[1] The participles survive in modern Greek, though the active, like the third declension, takes on the form γράφοντας (γράφων).[2]

The modern Greek uses chiefly the present active, the past passive participle (Dieterich, *Unters.*, p. 206), and some middle or passive participles in –**ούμενος** or –**άμενος** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 167). The use of the aorist and perfect active participles gave Greek a great superiority over the Latin, which had such a usage only in deponent verbs like *sequor, secutus*. But Greek used the other participles far more than the Latin. English alone is a rival for the Greek in the use of the participle. One of the grammarians calls the Greeks **φιλομέτοχοι** because they were a participle-loving people.[3] The use of the tenses of the participle belongs to syntax. One may merely remark here that the future participle is very rare in the N. T. as in the papyri and **κοινή** generally (cf. Infinitive). The LXX has it seldom (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 194). It is found chiefly in Luke in the N. T., as Lu. 22:49; Ac. 8:27; 20:22; 22:5; 24:11, 17.[4] The N. T. itself presents no special peculiarities as to the forms of the participle. In Rev. 19:13 **ῥεραμμένον** has been cited under the question of reduplication. **Ἑστώς** is more frequent than **ἑστηκώς**. Other perfects like **ἀπολωλώς** call for no comment.

4. *In Periphrastic Use*. The participle is common in the N. T. in the periphrastic tenses. These have been given in detail under the various tenses, but a summary at this point is desirable. This use of the participle with various forms of the verb "to be" is so common in all languages, ancient and modern, as hardly to require justification. Modern English uses it largely in its verb-inflection, as does modern Greek. The use of the participle as the predicate is found all through the Indo-Germanic languages.[5] It is very frequent in the Sanskrit, especially in the later language.[6] Its oldest usage seems to be in the perfect tense, which exists as far back as we can go.[7] In the N. T. the perfect optative does

[1] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 473. Cf. the Sans. passive part. in *–ta* or *–na,* Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 340.

[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 206. Cf. Hatz., Einl., p. 1432%

[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 169.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 37. He cites elsewhere Mt. 27:49, *σώσων*, Jo. 6:64, 1 Cor. 15:37; Heb. 3:5; 13:17; 1 Pet. 3:13. Then there are the doubtful forms **καυσούμενα** (2 Pet. 3:10, 12) and **κομιούμενοι** (2 Pet. 2:13).

[5] Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 444.

[6] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 394.

[7] Brug., Comp. Gr., IV, p. 446.

not appear, though once a good chance for the periphrastic perfect optative arises as in Ac. 21:33, ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη καὶ τί ἐστιν πεποιηκώς. The perfect subj. save εἰδῶ is seen in the N. T. only in the periphrastic form both in the active, as ᾖ πεποιηκώς (Jas. 5:15), and the passive, as ᾖ πεπληρωμένη (Jo. 16:24).[1] So 2 Cor. 9:3. The periphrastic perfect imperative is illustrated by ἔστωσαν περιεζωσμέναι (Lu. 12:35). No example of the periphrastic perfect infinitive appears in the N. T., so far as I have noticed, except κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν (Ac. 19:36). A periphrastic perfect participle also is observed in ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους (Col. 1:21). Colloquial Attic has it (Arist. Ran. 721) and the inscriptions (Syll. 928[52] ii/B.C.) ἀποκεκριμένης οὔσης (Moulton, Prol., p. 227). In the indicative the periphrastic form is the common one for the future perfect, both active, as ἔσομαι πεποθώς (Heb. 2:13), and passive, as ἔσται λελυμένα (Mt. 18:18). Cf. Lu. 12:52. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 227) finds three papyri with aorist participles in future perfect sense. With γίνομαι note γεγόνατε ἔχοντες (Heb. 5:12). Cf. Rev. 16:10, ἐγένετο ἐσκοτισμένη. Cf. 2 Cor. 6:14; Col. 1:18; Rev. 3:2. The past perfect is very common in the passive, as ἦν γεγραμμένον (Jo. 19:19), but less frequent in the active, as ἦσαν προεωρακότες (Ac. 21:29). In Ac. 8:16 we not only have ἦν ἐπιπεπτωκώς, but even βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον (cf. also 19:36). Cf. also ἦν κείμενος as equal to ἦν τεθειμένος (Lu. 23:53); ἦν ἑστώς (Lu. 5:1); εἶχον ἀποκειμένην (Lu. 19:20), like ἔχε παρῃτημένον (Lu. 14:18), since κεῖμαι is perfect in sense. The present perfect is more common in the periphrastic form than in the active, as ἑστώς εἰμι (Ac. 25:10), and especially in the passive, as γεγραμμένον ἐστίν (Jo. 6:31).

The periphrastic aorist appears only in ἦν βληθείς (Lu. 23:19) and only in the indicative.[2] But note ἐγένετο στίλβοντα (Mk. 9:3).

The periphrastic future indicative is found several times in the active, as ἔσονται πίπτοντες (Mk. 13:25), and the passive, as ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι (Lu. 21 : 17).

The present tense is written periphrastically in the imperative, as ἴσθι εὐνοῶν (Mt. 5:25; cf. Lu. 19:17), and even with γίνομαι, as μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες (2 Cor. 6:14). Cf. Rev. 3:2. In Col. 1:18 we find an aorist subjunctive with a present participle, ἵνα γένηται πρωτεύων. The present infinitive occurs in ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον (Lu. 9:18; 11:1). As an example of the present indicative active take ἃ ἐστιν ἔχοντα (Col. 2:23), and of

[1] Brug., Griech. Or., p. 331. **Κ**εκτῶμαι and κεκτήμην had no following in Gk.

[2] Blass, Or. of N. T. Gk., p. 204. I am chiefly indebted to Blass for the facts in this summary.

the passive take ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον, (Jo. 1:42), though this last is not strictly an instance in point. Cf. also ἐστὶν προσαναπληροῦσα (2 Cor. 9:12).

The periphrastic imperfect is the most common of all. It is not unknown to the old Greek, and is abundant in the papyri and the κοινή generally, but it is even more frequent in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 195) and in the Aramaic. As Blass[1] shows, not all the examples in the N. T. are strictly periphrastic, like ἦσαν . . . ἀγραυλοῦντες (Lu. 2:8). But they are abundant enough, as one can see on almost any page of the Gospels. Take ἦσαν ἀναβαίνοντες καὶ ἦν προάγων (Mk. 10:32). So Ac. 2:2, ἦσαν καθήμενοι, and Gal. 1:22, ἤμην ἀγνοούμενος.

For list of important verbs in the N. T. see Additional Notes and my *Short Grammar of the Greek N. T*. (third ed.), pp. 48-56, 241-244. For such verbs in the LXX see Thackeray, *Gr*., pp. 258-920 (Table of Verbs); Helbing, *Gr. d. LXX*, pp. 128-135. For list in the papyri see Mayser, *Gr*., pp. 387-415.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 203.

PART III

SYNTAX

CHAPTER IX

THE MEANING OF SYNTAX (ΣΥΝΤΑΞΙΣ)

I. Backwardness in the Study of Syntax. What the Germans call *Laut- und Formenlehre* has received far more scientific treatment than has syntax. In 1874 Jolly[1] lamented that so little work on syntax of a really valuable nature had been done. To a certain extent it was necessary that the study of the forms should precede that of syntax.[2] The full survey of the words and their inflections was essential to adequate syntactical investigation. And yet one can but feel that syntax has lagged too far behind. It has been the favourite field for grammatical charlatans to operate in, men who from a few examples drew large inductions and filled their grammars with "exceptions" to their own hastily made rules. Appeal was made to logic rather than to the actual facts in the history of language. Thus we had grammar made to order for the consumption of the poor students.

Others perhaps became disgusted with the situation and hastily concluded that scientific syntax was impracticable, at least for the present, and so confined their researches either to etymology or to the forms. In 1891 Muller[3] sees no hope of doing anything soon for modern Greek syntax except in the literary high style on which he adds a few remarks about prepositions. Thumb[4] likewise has added a chapter on syntax to his *Handbuch*. If you turn to Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, you will find no separate syntax, but merely some additional remarks on the "uses" of the aorist, the present, the subjunctive, etc. Monro in his *Homeric Grammar* follows somewhat the same plan, but with much more attention to the "uses" of cases and modes. Brugmann[5] in his *Griechische Grammatik* devotes far more space to *Formenlehre*,

[1] Schulgr. und Sprachw., p. 71.
[2] Riem. and Goelzer, Gr. Comparee du Grec et du Lat., Synt., p. 7.
[3] Hist. Or. der hell. Spr., p. 172.
[4] Handb. der neugr. Volksspr., 1895; Handb. of Mod. Gk. Vernac., pp. 179-206.
[5] P. vii.

even in the third edition, which chiefly differs from the second in the increased attention to syntax. Giles in his *Manual of Comparative Philology*, even in the second[1] edition (1900), kept his discussion of the uses of the noun and verb apart and did not group them as syntax. When he wrote his first[2] edition (1895) nothing worthy of the name had been done on the comparative syntax of the moods and tenses, though Delbruck had written his great treatise on the syntax of the noun. When Brugmann planned his first volume of *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik* (1880), he had no hope of going on with the syntax either with the "Grundriss" or the "Kurze," for at that time comparative grammar of the Indo-Germanic tongues was confined to *Laut- und Formenlehre*.[3] But in the revision of Kuhner the Syntax by B. Gerth has two volumes, as exhaustive a treatment as Blass' two volumes on the Accidence. In the Riemann and Goelzer volumes the one on Syntax is the larger. Gildersleeve (*Am. Jour. of Philol.*, 1908, p. 115) speaks of his convictions on "Greek syntax and all that Greek syntax implies." No man's views in this sphere are entitled to weightier consideration. May he soon complete his Syntax of Classical Greek.

As to the dialectical inscriptions the situation is still worse. Dr. Claflin[4] as late as 1905 complains that the German monographs on the inscriptions confine themselves to *Laut- und Formenlehre* almost entirely. Meisterhans in Schwyzer's revision (1900) is nearly the sole exception.[5] Thieme[6] has a few syntactical remarks, but Nachmanson,[7] Schweizer[8] and Valaori[9] have nothing about syntax, nor has Dieterich.[10] The same thing is true of Thumb's *Hellenismus*, though this, of course, is not a formal grammar. A few additional essays have touched on the syntax of the Attic inscriptions[11]and Schanz in his *Beitrage* has several writers[12] who have noticed the subject. The inscriptions do indeed have limitations as to syntax, since much of the language is official and formal, but there is much to learn from them. Thackeray has not yet published his *Syntax of the LXX*. nor has Helbing.

[1] P. xi. [2] P. viii f. [3] Kurze vergl. Gr., 3. Lief., 1904, p. iii f.
[4] Synt. of the Bceot. Dial. Inscr., p. 9.
[5] Gr. der att. Inschr. But even he has very much more about the forms,
[6] Die Inschr. von Magn. etc., 1906.
[7] Laute und Formen der magn. Inschr., 1903.
[8] Gr. d. perg. Inschr., Beitr. zur Laut- und Formenl. etc., 1898.
[9] Der delph. Dial., 1901. [11] Claflin, Synt. of the Boeot. Dial. Inser., p. 10.
[10] Unters. etc., 1898. [12] Dyroff, Weber, Keck.

We are somewhat better off as to the papyri as a result chiefly of the work of Dr. James Hope Moulton, who has published his researches in that field as applied to the New Testament.[1] Cronert in his *Mem. Graeca Hercul*. has a good many syntactical remarks especially on the cases,[2] but no formal treatment of the subject. Volker[3] has not finished his good beginning. No syntax has come from Mayser yet who stopped with *Laut- und Formenlehre*, though he is at work on one. Moulton does not profess[4] to cover all the syntactical points in the papyri, but only those that throw light on some special points in the N. T. usage.

II. New Testament Limitations. It is evident therefore that the N. T. grammarian is in a poorer plight when he approaches syntax. And yet, strange to say, the N. T. grammars have largely confined themselves to syntax. Winer-Moulton, out of 799 pages, has only 128 not syntax. Buttmann, out of 403 pages (Thayer's translation), has only 74 not syntax. In Winer-Schmiedel syntax is reached on p. 145. Blass begins syntax on p. 72, out of 305 pages. Moulton in his Prolegomena starts syntax on p. 57 (232 in all). The present book has given the discussion of the forms more space at any rate. It is at least interesting to note that N. T. grammarians have reversed the example of the comparative philologists. Is it a case of rushing in where angels fear to tread?

One may plead in defence that the demands of exegesis are great and urgent, not to say more congenial. The distinctive character of the N. T. teaching is more closely allied to lexicography and syntax than to mere forms. That is very true, but many a theologian's syntax has run away with him and far from the sense of the writer, because he was weak on the mere forms. Knowledge of the forms is the first great step toward syntax. Deissmann even complains of Blass for assuming too much in his Syntax and not making enough comments "to rouse up energetically this easy-going deference of the youthful reader" (*Expositor*, Jan., 1908, p. 65).

Blass[5] urges, besides, that it is just in the sphere of syntax that

[1] See Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, pp. 436 ff.; Apr., 1904, p. 150; Exp., 1904, series on Charact. of N. T. Gk.; Prol., 1906.

[2] Pp. 159 [3] Synt. der griech. Pap., I, Der Art., 1903.

[4] Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 436. Debrunner (p. xi of his 4. Aufl. of Blass' Gramm. d. N. Griech., 1913, which he has kindly sent me as I reach this point in the galley proof) laments: "Par die Studien der hellenistischen (und der mittel- und neugriechischen) Syntax gilt leider noch das Wort πολὺς μὲν ὁ θερισμός, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι."

[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 72.

the N. T. variations from the ancient Greek can be best observed, in this and the change in the meaning of words. This is true, but just as much so of the κοινή in general. This is just the opposite of Winer's view,[1] who held that the N. T. peculiarities of syntax were very few. The explanation of the difference lies partly in the undeveloped state of syntax when Winer wrote, though he wrote voluminously enough himself, and partly in the wider conception of syntax that Blass[2] holds as being "the method of employing and combining the several word-forms and 'form-words' current in the language."

On the other hand attention must be called to the fact that the study of the forms is just the element, along with vocabulary, mainly relied on by Deissmann in his *Bible Studies* to show the practical identity of the vernacular κοινή in the papyri and in the N. T. Greek. Burton[3] puts it rightly when he says of the N. T. writers: "The divergence of their language from that of classical writers in respect to syntax is greater than in reference to forms of words, and less than in respect to the meaning of words, both the Jewish and the Christian influence affecting more deeply the meanings of words than either their form or their syntactical employment." Deissmann[4] readily admits that Christianity has a set of ideas peculiar to itself, as has every system of teaching which leads to a characteristic terminology.

But one is not to think of the N. T. as jargon or a dialect of the κοινή in syntax.[5] It is not less systematic and orderly than the rest of the vernacular κοινή, and the κοινή is as much a real language with its own laws as the Greek of Athens.[6] As remarked above, the κοινή showed more development in syntax than in forms, but it was not a lawless development. It was the growth of life and use, not the artificial imitation of the old language of Athens by the Atticists. Blass properly insists on the antithesis here between the artificial Atticist and "the plain narrator of facts or the letter-writer" such as we meet in the N. T. Deissmann (*Expositor*, Jan., 1908, p. 75) holds that Christianity in its classical epoch "has very little connection with official culture." "It rejects — this is the second result of our inquiry — it rejects, in this

[1] W.-M., p. 27.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 72; cf. p. 3 also.
[3] Notes on N. T. Gr., 1904, p. 22. [4] B. S., p. 65.
[5] Thumb, Die sprachgeschichtl. Steil. des bibl. Griech., Theol. nu., 1002, p. 97.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 3. [7] Ib., p. 72.

epoch, all the outward devices of rhetoric. In grammar, vocabulary, syntax and style it occupies a place in the midst of the people and draws from the inexhaustible soil of the popular element to which it was native a good share of its youthful strength." This is largely true. Men of passion charged with a great message do strike forth the best kind of rhetoric and style with simplicity, power, beauty. It is blind not to see charm in Luke, in John, in Paul, James and the writer of Hebrews, a charm that is the despair of mere "devices of rhetoric" or artificial rules of style and syntax.

It is not surprising to find variations in culture in the N. T. writers, men who had different antecedents (Jew or Greek), different environment (Palestine, Asia Minor and possibly Egypt), different natural gifts and educational advantages, as seen in Peter and Paul. These individual peculiarities show themselves easily and naturally in syntax and style. See chapter IV, The Place of the N. T. in the κοινή, for a larger discussion of this matter of the peculiarities of the N. T. writers. But even in 2 Peter and the Apocalypse one has no difficulty in understanding this simple vernacular κοινή, however far short these books come of the standard of Isocrates or Demosthenes. The study of N. T. syntax is a worthy subject and one entirely within the range of scientific historical treatment so far as that subject has advanced.

III. Recent Advance by Delbruck. Just as Brugmann is the great name in the accidence of comparative grammar, so Delbruck is the great name in syntax. Brugmann gladly recognises his own indebtedness to Delbruck. He has sought to follow Delbruck in the syntax of his *Griechische Grammatik*[1] and in the *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*.[2] It is not necessary here to recount the story of how Delbruck was finally associated with Brugmann in the *Grundriss*, and the *Syntax* by Delbruck brought to completion in 1900. Brugmann tells the story well in *Kurze vergl*. Gr. (pp. v ff.) and Delbruck in the *Grundriss* itself. It is a great achievement and much led up to it. Delbruck has recounted the progress of comparative grammar in his *Introduction to the Study of Language* (1882). In 1872 he had published *Die Resultate der vergleichenden Syntax*. In 1879 he brought out *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax* ("Syntaktische Forschungen,"

[1] P. vii.

[2] P. ix. He feels "als Schiller unseres Begrunders and Meisters der vergleichenden Syntax."

Bd. IV). That marked him as the man to do for syntax what Brugmann would do for forms. Delbruck does not claim all the credit. Bernhardy in 1829 had published *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache,* but Bopp, Schleicher and the rest had done much besides. The very progress in the knowledge of forms called for advance in syntax. In 1883 Hubner wrote *Grundriss zu Vorlesungenuaber die griechische Syntax*. It is not a treatment of syntax, but a systematized bibliography of the great works up to date on Greek syntax. It is still valuable for that purpose. One can follow Brugmann[1] and Delbruck, *Vergl. Syntax*, Dritter Teil, pp. xvi–xx, for later bibliography. As the founders of syntax Hubner[2] points back to Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius Dyscolus in the Alexandrian epoch. The older Greeks themselves felt little concern about syntax. They spoke correctly, but were not grammatical anatomists. They used the language instead of inspecting and dissecting it.

Delbruck (*Vergleichende Syntax,* Erster Teil, pp. 2-72) gives a lucid review of the history of syntactical study all the way from Dionysius Thrax to Paul's *Principles of the History of Language*. He makes many luminous remarks by the way also on the general subject of syntax. I cannot accent too strongly my own debt to Delbruck.

Syntax, especially that of the verb, has peculiar difficulties.[3] Not all the problems have been solved yet.[4] Indeed Schanz so fully appreciates the situation that he is publishing a series of excellent *Beitrage zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. He is gathering fresh material. Many of the American and European universities issue monographs by the new doctors of philosophy on various points of syntax, especially points in individual writers. Thus we learn more about the facts. But meanwhile we are grateful to Delbruck for his monumental work and for all the rest.

IV. The Province of Syntax.

(a) THE WORD SYNTAX (σύνταξις). It is from συντάσσω and means 'arrangement' (*constructio*).[5] It is the picture of the orderly marshalling of words to express ideas, not a mere medley of words. The word syntax is indeed too vague and general to express clearly all the uses in modern grammatical discussion, but it is

[1] Griech. Gr., p. 363.
[2] Grundr. zu Vorles., p. 3.
[3] Giles, Comp. Philob; pp. 404 f., 475.
[4] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 7.
[5] Farrar (Gk. Synt., p. 54) quotes Suetonius as saying that the first Gk. gr. brought to Rome was by Crates Mallotes after the Second Punic War.

too late to make a change now.[1] Gildersleeve (*Am. Jour. of Philol.,* 1908, p. 269) says that some syntacticians treat "syntax as a rag-bag for holding odds and ends of linguistic observations."

(b) SCOPE OF SYNTAX. But the difficulty is not all with the term, for the thing itself is not an absolutely distinct province. What the Germans call *Lautlehre* ('teaching about sounds') is indeed quite to itself. But when we come to define the exact line of demarcation between syntax or the relation of words on the one hand and single words on the other the task is not always so easy. Ries[2] indeed in his very able monograph makes the contrast between syntax (or construction) and single words. His scheme is this: Under *Wortlehre* ('science of words') he puts *Formenlehre* ('theory of forms') and *Bedeutungslehre* ('meaning of words').[3] He also subdivides syntax in the same way. Syntax thus treats of the binding of words together in all relations. Brugmann[4] follows Delbruck[5] in rejecting the special use of syntax by Ries. Brugmann[6] considers the breaking-up of the sentence by Ries into single words to be wilful and only conventional. It is indeed true that single words have a teaching both as to the word itself (form-word, as prepositions) and the form (inflection).[7] That is to say, two things call for consideration in the case of single words: the facts as to the words and the inflection on the one hand and the meaning of these facts on the other. Now Ries refuses to give the term syntax to the meaning of these facts (words, inflections, etc.), but confines syntax to the other field of word-relations. One is bound to go against Ries here and side with Delbruck and Brugmann.

(c) CONSTRUCTION OF WORDS AND CLAUSES. We use syntax, therefore, both for construction of the single word and for clauses. But one must admit the difficulty of the whole question and not conceive that the ancients ran a sharp line between the form and the meaning of the form. But, all in all, it is more scientific to gather the facts of usage first and then interpret these facts. This interpretation is scientific syntax, while the facts of usage are themselves syntax. Thus considered one may properly think of syntax in relation to the words themselves, the forms of the

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 364. [2] Was ist Syntax? 1894, p. 142.

[3] Ib., p. 142 f. Ries calls it a "naive misuse of the word syntax" not to take it in this sense. But he is not himself wholly consistent.

[4] Griech. Gr., p. 363 f.; Kurze vergl. Gr., III, p. vii.

[5] Grundr., V, pp. 1

[6] Kurze vergl. Gr., III, p. vii. [7] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 363.

words, the clauses and sentences, the general style. Clyde makes two divisions in his *Greek Syntax*, viz. Words (p. 126) and Sentences (p. 193). But this formal division is artificial. Here, as usual, Delbruck has perceived that syntax deals not only with words (both *Wortarten* and *Wortformen*), but also with the sentence as a whole and all its parts (*Vergl. Syntax*, Erster Teil, p. 83). How hard it is to keep syntactical remarks out of accidence may be seen in Thackeray's vol. I and in "Morphology" in Thumb's *Handbook* as well as in Accidence of this book.

(d) HISTORICAL SYNTAX. But this is not to fall into the old pitfall of the Stoic grammarians and apply logic to the phenomena of grammar, using the phenomena of various grammatical categories previously laid down. Plato indeed first applied logic to grammar.[1] The method of historical grammar and comparative grammar has had a long and a hard fight against the logical and philosophical method of syntax. But it has at last triumphed. "They sought among the facts of language for the illustration of theories," as Dr. Wheeler[2] so well puts it. We still need logic and philosophy in syntax, but we call these two agents into service after we have gathered the facts, not before, and after the historical and comparative methods have both been applied to these facts. Thus alone is it possible to have a really scientific syntax, one "definitely oriented" "as a social science" dealing with the total life of man.[3]

(e) IRREGULARITIES. We shall not therefore be surprised to find many so-called "irregularities" in the use of syntactical principles in various Greek writers. This is a point of the utmost importance in any rational study of syntax. The personal equation of the writer must always be taken into consideration. A certain amount of elasticity and play must be given to each writer if one is to understand human speech, for speech is merely a reflection of the mind's activities. If a tense brings one to a turn, perhaps it was meant to do so. This is not to say that there are no barbarisms or solecisms. Far from it. But it is unnatural to expect all speakers or writers in Greek to conform slavishly to our modern grammatical rules, of most of which, besides, they were in blissful ignorance. The fact is that language is life and responds to the peculiarities of the individual temper, and it is to be remembered that the mind itself is not a perfect instrument. The

[1] Sandys, Hist. of Cl. Scholarship, vol. I, p. 90.
[2] The Whence and Whither of the Mod. Sci. of Lang., p. 97.
[3] Ib., p. 107.

mind is not always clear nor logical. The ellipses, anacolutha, etc., of language represent[1] partially the imperfections of the mind. "It often depends on the writer which of the two tenses he will use," Winer[2] remarks about the aorist and the past perfect. It always depends on the writer which tense and which everything else he will use. Pray, on whom else can it depend? The writer happens to be doing the writing. He decides whether he will conform to the usual construction or will give added piquancy by a variation. This assumes, of course, that he is an educated writer. If he is not, he will often have the piquancy just the same without knowing it. "Syntactical irregularities are numerous in Greek," Clyde[3] observes, and, he might have added, in all other living languages. Greek is not, like "Esperanto," made to order by any one man. In point of fact what we call idioms are the very peculiarities (ἰδιώματα) which mark it off from other languages or at least characterize it. Some of these idioms spring out of the common intelligence of men and belong to many tongues, others mark the variations of certain minds which gain a following. Compare the rapid spread of "slang" to-day, if it happens to be a "taking phrase." Hence rules of syntax ought not to be arbitrary, though many of them are. Those that really express the life of language are in harmony with the facts. In general I would say that the fewer rules one gives the better for the student and for the facts.

V. The Method of this Grammar.

(a) PRINCIPLES, NOT RULES. As far as possible principles and not rules will be sought. The Greek grammarian is an interpreter of the facts, not a regulator of the facts. This point calls for special emphasis in syntax where the subjective element comes in so largely.

(b) THE ORIGINAL SIGNIFICANCE. The starting-point therefore in the explanation of any given idiom is to find the original significance. This is not always possible, but it generally is. Historical and comparative grammar lend strong help in this endeavour. Always the best place to begin is the beginning if you can find it.

(c) FORM AND FUNCTION. I would not insist that form and function always correspond. One does not know that the two did so correspond in the beginning in all instances. It is hard to prove a universal proposition. But certainly one is justified in beginning with one function for one form wherever he finds it to

[1] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 4 f. [2] W.-Th., p. 276. [3] Synt., p. 5.

be true. Burton[1] says: "It is by no means the case that each form has but one function, and that each function can be discharged by but one form." Certainly the same function can come to be discharged by various forms, as is the case with the locative and dative infinitive forms (λαβεῖν, ἀκοῦσαι). But that is not to say that originally the locative and dative verbal substantive were identical in idea. The Sanskrit completely disproves it. It may very well be true that each form had one function originally, whereas later the same function came to be expressed by various forms. As a starting-point, therefore, one may assume, till he learns otherwise, that form and function correspond. The necessity of getting at the ground-idea of an idiom is rightly emphasized by Delbruck (*Grundlagen*, p. 1). It may indeed come to pass as in the English "but," that the one form may be used for most of the parts of speech (Giles, *Man. of Comp. Philol.*, p. 237 f.). On the whole subject of the agreement of form and idea see Kuhner-Gerth, I, pp. 64-77.

(d) DEVELOPMENT. But the beginning is not the end. The actual development of a given idiom in the Greek language up to the N. T. time must be observed. Each idiom has a history. Now it cannot be expected that the space can be given to the actual working-out of each idiom in history as Jannaris has done in his *Historical Grammar*, or minute comparison at every point by means of comparative grammar. What is essential is that the grammarian shall have both these points in mind as he seeks to explain the development from the etymological basis. This is the only secure path to tread, if it can be found. Burton[2] indeed distinguishes sharply between historical and exegetical grammar and conceives his task to be that of the exegetical grammarian. For myself I regard exegetical grammar as the last stage in the process and not to be dissociated from the historical. Indeed how a Greek idiom is to be represented in English is a matter of little concern to the Greek grammarian till the work of translation is reached. The Greek point of view is to be observed all through the process till translation comes. It is Greek syntax, not English.

(e) CONTEXT. There is one more stage in the interpretation of the Greek idiom. That is the actual context in any given instance. The variation in the total result is often due to the difference in the local colour of the context. The same idiom with a given etymology may not have varied greatly in the long course of history save as it responds to the context. In a word, etymol-

[1] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 1. [2] Ib., p. 3.

ogy, history, context are the factors that mark the processes in the evolution of a Greek idiom in a given case. These are the things to keep constantly in mind as we approach the idioms of Greek syntax. We may not always succeed in finding the solution of every idiom, but most of them will yield to this process. The result is to put syntax on a firmer scientific basis and take it out of the realm of the speculative subjective sciences.

(f) TRANSLATION. This is the translation of the total result, not of the exact Greek idiom. Translation crisply reproduces the result of all the processes in harmony with the language into which the translation is made, often into an utterly different idiom. It is folly to reason backwards from the translation to the Greek idiom, for the English or German idiom is often foreign to the Greek and usually varies greatly from the original Greek. English is English and Greek is Greek. Syntax is not translation, though it is the only safe way to reach a correct translation. Exegesis is not syntax, but syntax comes before real exegesis. The importance of syntax is rightly appreciated by Gildersleeve.[1]

(g) LIMITS OF SYNTAX. After all is done, instances remain where syntax cannot say the last word, where theological bias will inevitably determine how one interprets the Greek idiom. Take ὕδατι in Ac. 1:5, for instance. In itself the word can be either locative or instrumental with βαπτίζω. So in Ac. 2:38 εἰς does not of itself express design (see Mt. 10:41), but it may be so used. When the grammarian has finished, the theologian steps in, and sometimes before the grammarian is through.

[1] Synt. of Class. Gk., p. iv. C. and S., Sel. fr. the LXX, p. 22, observe that the life of a language lies in the syntax and that it is impossible to translate syntax completely. The more literal a translation is, like the LXX, the more it fails

CHAPTER X

THE SENTENCE

I. **The Sentence and Syntax**. In point of fact syntax deals with the sentence in its parts and as a whole. And yet it is not tautology to have a chapter on the sentence, a thing few grammars do. It is important, to get a clear conception of the sentence as well as of syntax before one proceeds to the work of detailed criticism. The sentence is the thing in all its parts that syntax treats, but the two things are not synonymous. At bottom grammar is teaching about the sentence.[1]

II. The Sentence Defined.

(a) COMPLEX CONCEPTION. A sentence is the expression of the idea or ideas in the speaker's mind. It is an opinion (*sententia*) expressed (αὐτοτελὴς λόγος). This idea is in itself complex. It is this combination of "the small coin of language" into an intelligible whole that we call a sentence.[2] Just a mere word accidentally expressed is not a sentence. "The sentence is the symbol whereby the speaker denotes that two or more ideas have combined in his mind."[3]

(b) TWO ESSENTIAL PARTS. Only two parts are essential to this complex intelligible whole to form a sentence. These two parts are subject and predicate. A statement is made about something and thus an idea is expressed. These two parts are called substantive and verb, though the line of distinction between substantive and verb was originally very dim, as is now often seen in the English ("laugh," "touch," "work," etc.). Many modern linguists hold that the verb is nominal in origin,

[1] K.-G., I, p. 1. Cf. Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., III, p. 623; Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 1. Tl., pp. 73-85.

[2] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 235. Opposed to this idea of a sentence as due to synthesis is the modern psychological definition of Wundt who defines a sentence as "die Gliederung einer Gesamtvorstellung."

[3] Strong, Logeman and Wheeler, Intr. to the Study of the Hist. of Lang., 1891, p. 93. Cf. Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. iii; Sayce, Prin. of Comp. Philol., p. 136.

since some primitive languages know only nominal sentences. We do not know which is the oldest, subject or predicate.[1] In the Greek verb indeed subject and predicate are united in the one form, the original sentence.[2]

(c) ONE-MEMBERED SENTENCE. The sentence in form may be very brief, even one word in truth. Indeed the long sentence may not express as much as the short one. In moments of passion an exclamation may be charged with more meaning than a long rambling sentence.[3] We have plenty of examples of one-word sentences in the N. T., like ἀπέχει (Mk. 14:41), προφήτευσον (Mk. 14:65), προεχὲμεθα (Ro. 3:9), θέλω (Mt. 8:3), οὐχί (Lu. 1:60). Compare also προεύθητι, ἔρχου, ποίησον (Mt. 8:9).

(d) ELLIPTICAL SENTENCE. Indeed, as seen in the case of οὐχί (Lu. 1:60) the sentence does not absolutely require the expression of either subject or predicate, though both are implied by the word used. This shortening or condensation of speech is common to all the Indo-Germanic languages.[4] Other examples of such condensation are the vocative, as κύριε (Mt. 8:2), with which compare ὕπαγε, Σατανα (Mt. 4:10), the interjections like ἄγε (Jas. 5:1), ἔα (Lu. 4:34), ἰδού (Rev. 14:14), ἴδε (Jo. 1:29), οὐαί (Rev. 8:13). These interjections may be used alone, as ἔα (Lu. 4:34), or with other words, as οὐαί and ἴδε above. Cf. Martha's Ναί, Κύριε (Jo. 11:27), two sentences. Jo. 11:35 (ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς) is the shortest verse, but not the shortest sentence in the N. T.

(e) ONLY PREDICATE. The subject may be absent and the predicate will still constitute a sentence, i.e. express the complex idea intended. This follows naturally from the preceding paragraph. The predicate may imply the subject. The subject in Greek is involved in the verbal personal ending and often the context makes it clear what the subject really is. Indeed the Greek only expressed the personal subject as a rule where clearness, emphasis or contrast demanded it. The N. T., like the κοινή in general, uses the pronominal subject more frequently than the older Greek (cf. English). Often a glance at the context is

[1] Thompson, Gk. Synt., 1883, p. xv. Delbruck (Vergl. Synt., 1. Tl., p. 77) quotes Schleicher as saying that nouns either have or had case-forms, verbs either have or had pers. endings, and that all words were originally either nouns or verbs. But it is not quite so easy as that unless pronouns be included in nouns.

[2] K.-G., I, p. 2.

[3] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 236. On sentence-building see Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., III, pp. 623-774.

[4] Ib., p. 624 f. The mod. Gk. shows it (Thumb, Handb., p. 179). Sir W. R. Nicoll in Br. W. instances the Scotch "aweel."

all that is needed, as with καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο (Jo. 3: 23), ἔρχονται (Mk. 2:3), etc. Sometimes indeed close attention is required to notice a change of subject which is not indicated. So καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν, καὶ ἦραν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων (Mt. 14:20). For this change of subject with no indication see Lu. 8:29; Jo. 19:31; 2 Cor. 3:16; 1 Jo. 5:16.[1] Sometimes the subject is drawn out of the verb itself, as in σαλπίσει (1 Cor. 15 : 52), 'the trumpet shall trumpet.' So in οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται (Mt. 22:30) men have to be supplied with the first and women with the second verb. God is considered by some the unexpressed, but well-known subject, as with βρέχει (Mt. 5: 45), εἴρηκεν (Ac. 13:34), λέγει (Eph. 4:8), φησίν (Heb. 8:5).

Often what is said is a matter of common remark or usage and the subject is designedly concealed, indefinite subject. So when Paul uses φησίν (2 Cor. 10:10) of his opponent unless we follow B and read φασί. The plural is very common in this sense as ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς (Mt. 5:11), μήτι συλλέγουσιν; (Mt. 7:16), ὡς λεγουσιν, (Rev. 2:24) like German *man sagt,* French *on dit.* Cf. also, not to pile up examples, Mt. 8:16; Mk. 10:13; Lu. 17: 23; Jo. 15:6; 20:2; Ac. 3:2; Rev. 12:6. This general or rhetorical plural appears in προσφέρουσιν and δύνανται (Heb. 10:1) if the text is genuine. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 58) cites κλέπτοντες (Eurip. I. T., 1359). Sometimes the plural purposely conceals the identity of the person referred to, as when τεθνήκασιν (Mt. 2:20) is used of Herod the Great. The same principle applies to αἰτοῦσιν (Lu. 12:20). Then again the verb may imply the subject, as with ἔβρεξεν (Jas. 5:17), ἀπέχει (Mk. 14:41), ἄγει (Lu. 24:21), οὐ μέλει σοι (Mt. 22:16), εἰ τύχοι (1 Cor. 14:10). Cf. ὀψὲ ἐγένετο (Mk. 11:19). So the modern Greek still (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 179). Usually, then, such a verb in the N. T. is in the passive voice, so that the subject is involved in the action of the verb. Thus μετρηθήσεται (Mk. 4:24), δοθήσεται (Mk. 4:25), πιστεύεται and ὁμολογεῖται (Ro. 10:10), σπείρεται and ἐγείρεται (1 Cor. 15:42), etc. Sometimes indeed a verb appears to be without a subject, when really it is not. So ἔστω δέ (2 Cor. 12:16) has the previous sentence as the subject. In 1 Pet. 2:6 the subject of περιέχει is the following quotation. In Ac. 21:35 συνέβη has as its subject the infinitive βαστάζεσθαι. So in general whenever the infinitive is used as subject, the verb is not without a subject, as ἀνέβη ἐπισκέψασθαι. (Ac. 7:23). The examples are numerous, as ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν (Mt. 12:2), ἔδοξε γράψαι (Lu. 1:3), ἔδει

[1] See Viteau, Et. sur le Grec du N. T., Sujet, Compl. et Attr., p. 55 f.

διέρχεσθαι (Jo. 4:4), πρέπον ἐστὶν πληρῶσαι (Mt. 3:15), καθήκεν ζῆν (Ac. 22:22), ἐνδέχεται ἀπολέσθαι (Lu. 13:33), and even ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν (Lu. 17:1) and ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν (Ac. 10:25) where the genitive infinitive form has become fixed. **Ἐγένετο** does indeed present a problem by itself. It may have the simple infinitive as subject, as διαπορεύεσθαι (Lu. 6:1) and εἰσλθεῖν (Lu. 6:6). Cf. Mk. 2:15. But often **καὶ ἐγένετο** or **ἐγένετο δέ** is used with a finite verb as a practical, though not the technical, subject. So **καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐλάλουν** (Lu. 2:15), **ἐγένετο δέ, συνήτησεν** (Lu. 9:37). So also **καὶ ἔσται, ἐκχεῶ** (Ac. 2:17). One is strongly reminded of the similar usage in the LXX, not to say the Hebrew וַיְהִי. Moulton[1] prefers to think that that was a development from the **κοινή** (papyri) usage of the infinitive with **γίνομαι** as above, but I see no adequate reason for denying a Semitic influence on this point, especially as the LXX also parallels the other idiom, **καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ ἦν διδάσκων** (Lu. 5:17, cf. 5:1, 12, etc.), a construction so un-Greek and so like the Hebrew *vav*. Here **καί** almost equals **ὅτι** and makes the second **καί** clause practically the subject of **ἐγένετο.** The use of a **ὅτι** or **ἵνα** clause as subject is common either alone or in apposition with a pronoun. Cf. Mt. 10:25 (**ἵνα**); 1 Jo. 5:9 (**ὅτι**); Jo. 15:12 (**ἵνα**). In a case like **ἀρκεῖ** (Jo. 14:8), **ἀνῆκεν** (Col. 3:18), **ἐλογίσθη** (Ro. 4:3) the subject comes easily out of the context. So also the subject is really implied when the partitive genitive is used without the expression of **τινές** or **πολλοί** as **συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν** (Ac. 21:16) and **εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν** (Jo. 16:17), a clear case of the ablative with **ἐκ**. The conclusion of the whole matter is that the subject is either expressed or implied by various linguistic devices. The strictly impersonal verbs in the old Greek arose from the conception of **θεός** as doing the thing.[2]

(f) ONLY SUBJECT. Likewise the predicate may be absent and only implied in the subject. Yet naturally the examples of this nature are far fewer than those when the predicate implies the subject. Sometimes indeed the predicate merely has to be mentally supplied from the preceding clause, as with **θλιβόμεθα** (2 Cor. 1:6), **ἀγαπήσει** (Lu. 7:42), **ἔχει** (Lu. 20:24), **λαμβάνει**, (Heb. 5:4). Cf. Eph. 5:22. It may be that the verb would be

[1] Prol., p. 17.

[2] On the whole matter of subjectless sentences see Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 3. Tl., pp. 23-37. Cf. Gildersleeve, Gk. Synt., pp. 35-41, for classical illustrations of the absence of the subject. Cf. also Moulton, Rev., 1901, p. 436, for exx. in the pap. of the absence of the subject in standing formulas.

slightly changed in form, if expressed, as σκανδαλισθήσομαι (Mk. 14:29), ὑποτασσέσθωσαν (Eph. 5:24), τίθεμεν (2 Cor. 3:13), etc. Sometimes again the affirmative is to be inferred from a negative as in 1 Cor. 7:19; 10:24. In Mk. 12:5 the principal verb has to be drawn from the idea of the two participles δέροντες and ἀποκτεννύντες. In particular with εἰδὲ μή (or μή γε) the verb is always absent (as Mt. 6:1), so that the idiom becomes a set phrase (Lu. 10:6; 13:9). In Ro. 5:3 with **οὐ μόνον δέ, καυχώμεθα**, is to be supplied, and in 5:11 σωθησόμεθα. In Ro. 9:10 the verb has to come from verse 9 or 12. In Ro. 4:9 probably λέγεται (cf. verse 6) is to be supplied. Often εἶπεν is not expressed, as in Ac. 25:22. In Ro. 5:18 Winer[1] supplies ἀπέβη in the first clause and ἀποβησεται in the second. In 2 Cor. 9:7 he likewise is right in suggesting δότω from the context, as in Gal. 2:9 after ἵνα ,we must mentally insert **εὐαγγελιζώμεθα, εὐαγγελίζωνται**. In epistolary salutations it is not difficult to supply λέγει or λέγει χαίρειν as in Jas. 1:1; Ph. 1:1; Rev. 1:4. These are all examples of very simple ellipsis, as in 2 Pet. 2:22 in the proverb. Cf. also 1 Cor. 4:21; 2 Cor. 5:13; Gal. 3:5.

(g) VERB NOT THE ONLY PREDICATE. But the predicate is not quite so simple a matter as the subject. The verb indeed is the usual way of expressing it, but not the only way. The verb **εἰμί**, especially ἐστί and εἰσίν, may be merely a "form-word" like a preposition and not be the predicate. Sometimes it does express existence as a predicate like any other verb, as in ἐγὼ **εἰμί** (Jo. 8:58) and ἡ θάλασσα **οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι** (Rev. 21:1). Cf. Mt. 23:30. But more commonly the real predicate is another word and **εἰμί** merely serves as a connective or copula. Thus the predicate may be complex. With this use of **εἰμί** as copula ("form-word") the predicate may be another substantive, as **ὁ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος** (Mt. 13:38); an adjective, as **τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ** βαθύ (Jo. 4:11); a prepositional phrase, as ἐγγύς **σου τὸ ῥῆμα ἐστιν** (Ro. 10:8); and especially the participle, as **ἦν** διδάσκων (Mt. 7:29). Other verbs, besides **εἰμί** may be used as a mere copula, as **γίνομαι** (Jo. 1:14), **καθίσταμαι** (Ro. 5:19), ἕστηκα (Jas. 5:9), and in particular **φαίνομαι** (2 Cor. 13:7), **ὑπάρχω** (Ac. 16:3).[2] Predicative amplifica-

[1] W.-Th., p. 587. Cf. also Gildersleeve, Gk. Synt., pp. 41-44, for class. exx. of the omission of the pred. The ellipsis of the pred. is common in the Attic inscr. Cf. Meisterh., p. 196.

[2] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 3. Tl., p. 12, for the origin of the copula, and pp. 15-22 for the adj., adv., subst. (oblique cases as well as nom. as pred.). Cf. also Gildersleeve, Gk. Synt., pp. 30-35.

tions belong to apposition and will be so treated as an expansion of the predicate. The subject also has amplifications.

(h) COPULA NOT NECESSARY. Naturally this copula is not always considered necessary. It can be readily dispensed with when both subject and the real predicate are present. This indeed is the most frequent ellipsis of all in all stages of the language, especially the form ἐστί. But strictly speaking, the absence of the copula is not ellipsis, but a remnant of a primitive idiom, since some primitive tongues could do without the copula. Still, as Blass[1] observes, the ellipsis never became a fixed usage save in a few phrases like δῆλον ὅτι (1 Cor. 15:27) or ὅτι . . . δῆλον (Gal. 3:11). In ἵνα τί (Mt. 9:4), γένηται has dropped out. There are many idiomatic uses of τί without the copula. So τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί (Mk. 1:24), τί πρὸς σέ (Jo. 21:22), οὗτος δὲ τί (Jo. 21:21), τί ὄφελος (Jas. 2:14), τί οὖν and τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια (Ro. 3:1), τί γάρ (Ro. 3:3), etc. Exclamations, as well as questions, show the absence of the copula. Thus ὡς ὡραῖοι (Ro. 10:15), ὡς ἀνεξεραύνητα (Ro. 11:33), μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων (Ac. 19:28). As a matter of fact the copula may be absent from any kind of sentence which is free from ambiguity, as μακάριοι οἱ καθαροί (Mt. 5:8), Ἰησοῦς Χριστός . . . ὁ αὐτός (Heb. 13:8), ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης (Mt. 10:10), ἔτι μικρον (Jo. 14:19), ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον (Heb. 10:37), πᾶς . . . ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης (Heb. 5:13), ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί (Mt. 6:16). Cf. Ro. 11:15 f. for several further examples, which could be easily multiplied not only for ἐστί and εἰσί, but for other forms as well, though the examples for the absence of εἰμί and εἶ are not very numerous. Forms of the imp., fut., imper., subj., opt., inf. and part. (often) are absent also. For εἰμί see 2 Cor. 11:6. For εἶ see Jo. 17:21; Gal. 4:7 *bis*. Observe λογίζομαι and ἰδιώτης in 2 Cor. 11:5 f., but the participle ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ φανερώσαντες ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς goes over to the literary plural, about which see further in this chapter. Compare also 2 Cor. 8:23. In Mk. 12:26 εἰμί is absent, though ἐγώ is used. For further examples of the absence of ἐσμέν see Ro. 8:17; Ph. 3:15. For εἶ see Rev. 15:4 (ὅτι μόνος ὅσιος). In Jo. 14:11 both εἰμι and ἐστίν are absent, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί. The imperfect ἦν may also be absent as with ᾧ ὄνομα (Lu. 2:25), ὄνομα αὐτῷ (Jo. 3:1), καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς (Lu. 1: 5). In 1 Pet. 4:17 we find wanting ἐστίν ἔσται. Cf. also 1 Cor. 15:21 for ἦν and ἔσται. The other moods, besides indicative, show occasional lapses of this copula. Thus the subjunctive ᾖ after ὅπως (2 Cor. 8:11) and after ἵνα (2 Cor. 8:13). The op-

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 73. Cf. Gildersleeve, Gk. Synt., pp. 41-43,

tative εἴη more frequently drops out in wishes, as χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη (Ro. 1:7), ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἰρήνης μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν (Ro. 15:41), ἵλεώς σοι (Mt. 16:22). As Blass[1] observes, in the doxologies like εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός (2 Cor. 1:3; Eph. 1:3) one may supply either ἐστίν or εἴη or even ἔστω, though Winer[2] strongly insists that εἴη is necessary because of the LXX examples. But Blass very properly points to Ro. 1:25, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Cf. also 1 Pet. 4:11, where A drops ἐστίν. The imperative shows a few examples of the dropping of ἔστε as with the participles in Ro. 12:9, though, of course, only the context can decide between the indicative and imperative. Winer[3] is right against Meyer in refusing to supply ἐστέ the second ἐν ᾧ (simply resumptive) in the Eph. 1:13. But some clear instances of the absence of ἔστω appear, as in Col. 4:6 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, Mt. 27:19 μηδὲν σοί, 2 Cor. 8:16 χάρις τῷ θεῷ, Heb. 13:4 τίμιος ὁ γάμος. The infinitive εἶναι is present in Ph. 3:8, but absent in Ph. 3:7. The participle shows a similar ellipsis as in Jo. 1:50 εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, Lu. 4:1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης. The other verbs used as copula may also be absent if not needed, as with γίνομαι (Mt. 6:10; Ac. 10:15).

The absence of the copula with ἰδού is indeed like the construction after the Heb. הִנֵּה as Blass[4] points out, but it is also in harmony with the κοινή as Moulton[5] shows. But it is especially frequent in the parts of the N. T. most allied to the 0. T. Like other interjections ἰδού does not need a verbal predicate, though it may have one. As examples see Mt. 17:5; Lu. 5:18; Rev. 4:1. In the last example both εἶδον, and ἰδού occur and the construction follows, now one now the other, as is seen in verse 4.

(i) THE TWO RADIATING FOCI OF THE SENTENCE. Thus, as we have seen, the subject and predicate are the two foci of the sentence regarded as an ellipse. Around these two foci all the other parts of the sentence radiate, if there are any other parts. The sentence may go all the way from one abrupt word to a period a couple of pages long, as in Demosthenes or Isocrates. Schoolboys will recall a sentence in Thucydides so long that he forgot to finish it. Giles[6] speaks of the sentence as a kingdom with many provinces or a house with many stories. That is true potentially. But the sentence is elastic and may have only the two foci (subject and predicate) and indeed one of them may exist only by im-

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 74.
[2] W.-Th., p. 586,
[3] Ib,
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 74.
[5] Prol., p. 11.
[6] Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 236.

plication. The context can generally be relied on to supply the other focus in the mind of the speaker or writer. Thus by the context, by look and by gesture, words can be filled to the full and even run over with meanings that of themselves they would not carry. Emotion can make itself understood with few words. The matters here outlined about the Greek sentence apply to Greek as a whole and so to the N. T. Greek.

(j) VARIETIES OF THE SIMPLE SENTENCE. It is immaterial whether the simple sentence, which is the oldest sentence, be declarative, interrogative or imperative. That affects in no way the essential idea. All three varieties occur in great abundance in the N. T. and need not be illustrated. So likewise the simple sentence may be affirmative or negative. That is beside the mark in getting at the foundation of the sentence. All these matters (and also abstract and concrete) are mere accidents that give colour and form, but do not alter the organic structure. For an extensive discussion of the various kinds of independent seritences in the N. T. (declarative, interrogative, hortatory, wish, command) see Viteau, *Syntaxe des Propositions*, pp. 17-40. The matter will be discussed at length in the chapter on Modes.

III. The Expansion of the Subject.

(a) IDEA-WORDS AND FORM-WORDS. There are indeed, as already seen, two sorts of words in general in the sentence, idea-words and form-words, as the comparative grammars teach us.[1] The idea-words (called by Aristotle **φωναὶ σημαντικαί** have an inner content in themselves (word-stuff), while the form-words (**φωναὶ ἄσημαι**) express rather relations[2] between words. Substantive, verb, adjective, adverb are idea-words, and pronouns, prepositions, some adverbs (place, time, etc.), the copula are form-words. In reality the form-words may have been originally idea-words (cf. **εἰμί**, for instance, and the prepositions). The distinction is a real one, but more logical than practical. The form-words, when prepositions, really help out the meanings of the cases.

(b) CONCORD AND GOVERNMENT. Clyde[3] offers another distinction, that between concord and government, which has something in it if it is not pushed too far. "In concord, the substantive is, as it were, a syntactical chief, and all his followers wear the same badge as himself; in government, the substantive appears, as it were, in various conditions of service, and is dressed each time according to the particular function he discharges."

[1] Cf. Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., III, p. 631.
[2] K.-G., I, p. 7. [3] Gk. Synt., p. 126.

He uses concord where the substantive is king and government where the verb rules. There is something in this distinction between the two parts of the sentence, only at bottom the verb has concord too as well as the substantive, as can be shown, and as Clyde really admits by the term congruity for the case-relations with the verb. This distinction is not one between subject and predicate, but between substantive and verb.

(c) THE GROUP AROUND THE SUBJECT. This may be formed in various ways, as, for instance, by another substantive, by an adjective, by the article, by a pronoun, by an adverb, by a prepositional phrase (adjunct), by subordinate clause.[1] Each of these calls for illustration and discussion. They may be explained in inverse order for practical reasons.

1. For Subordinate Clause take Lu. 1:43.

2. *With the Article.* In Ro. 7:10 we have ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν. Here the article shows that this prepositional phrase or adjunct is under the wing of the substantive ἐντολή. In the chapter on the Article this matter will call for more elaborate discussion. For the article and pronoun take οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Ac. 1:11).

3. *The Adverb*. As examples of adverbs with substantives take τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ (Gal. 4:25) and ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴν (verse 26).

4. *The Adjective.* The origin of the adjective and its close relation to the substantive was discussed under Declensions (chapter VII) and will be further shown in the chapter on Adjectives in Syntax. Take as an example ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς (Jo. 10: 11).

5. *The Substantive*. The earliest and always a common way of expanding the subject was by the addition of another substantive. It was done in either of two ways.

(a) *By an oblique case*, usually the genitive. Even the dative may occur. The ablative is seen in ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν (Eph. 2:12). But the genitive, the case of genus or kind, is the case usually employed to express this subordinate relation of one word to another. This whole matter will be discussed under the genitive case and here only one example will be mentioned, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης (Eph. 1:17), as illustrating the point.

(β) Apposition. This was the earliest method. Apposition is common to both subject and predicate. Sometimes indeed the

[1] As a matter of fact any substantive, whatever its place in the sentence, may be the nucleus of a similar grouping. But this is a further subdivision to be noticed later. On the grouping of words around the subst. see Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 3. Tl., pp. 200-221. For various ways of grouping words around the subj. in a Gk. sentence see K.-G., I, p. 52.

genitive is used where really the substantive is in apposition, as περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ (Jo. 2:21), a predicate example where "temple" and "body" are meant to be identical. So with ἡ οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους (2 Cor. 5:1) and many other examples. But in general the two substantives are in the same case, and with the subject, of course, in the nominative. As a matter of fact apposition can be employed with any case. The use of ἀνήρ, ἄνθρωπος, γυνή with words in apposition seems superfluous, though it is perfectly intelligible. The word in apposition conveys the main idea, as ἀνὴρ προφήτης (Lu. 24:19), ἄνθρωπος οἰκοδεσπότης (Mt. 21:33). Cf. ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί (Ac. 1:16) and ἄνδρα φονέα (Ac. 3:14). So also ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται (Ac. 2:22), ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι (Ac. 17:22), an idiom common in the Attic orators. Such apposition, of course, is not confined to the subject, but is used in any case in every sort of phrase. So πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν (Lu. 4:26), ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ (Mt. 13:52, but note also 21:33), Σίμωνος Βυρσέως (Ac. 10:32). Sometimes the word in apposition precedes the other, though not usually. Thus ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀκικίας, ἡ γλῶσσα (Jas. 3:6); καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη, Χριστός (1 Cor. 5:7). But this is largely a matter of definition. The pronoun, of course, may be the subject, as ἐγὼ Ἰησους (Rev. 22:16). So ἐγὼ Παῦλος (Gal. 5:2). Cf. νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (Lu. 11:39). The word in apposition may vary greatly in the precise result of the apposition, a matter determined wholly by the word itself and the context. Thus in Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατριάρχης (Heb. 7:4) a descriptive title is given. Cf. also εἰ ἐγὼ ἔνιψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος (Jo. 13:14). Partitive or distributive apposition is common, when the words in apposition do not correspond to the whole, as οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀργρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ (Mt. 22:5). Often the word in apposition is merely epexegetic, as ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἡ σκηνοπηγία (Jo. 7:2). Αὐτός is sometimes used in emphatic apposition, as ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος (Eph. 5:23). The phrase τοῦτ' ἔστιν is used in epexegetical apposition with the subject, as ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί (1 Pet. 3:20). But the phrase is a mere expletive and has no effect on number (as seen above) or case. It can be used indifferently with any case as the locative (Ro. 7:18), the instrumental (Mk. 7:2), the accusative (Ac. 19:4; Heb. 13:15; Phil. 12), the genitive (Heb. 9:11; 11:16). Any number of words or phrases may be in apposition, as in ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις, ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁκαλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σαταῦς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην (Rev. 12:9).

An infinitive may be in apposition with the subject, as **οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου** (Jo. 4:13). Cf. 1 Th. 4:3; 1 Pet. 2:15. Once more, a clause with **ὅτι** or **ἵνα** may be in apposition with the subject (or predicate either), as **αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα τὰς θεὸς ἡμῖν** (1 Hi, 5:11) and **αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν** (1 Jo. 5: 3). Cf. Jo. 6:29, 39, 40. For many more or less interesting details of apposition in the N. T. and the LXX see Viteau, *Sujet, Complement et Attribut* (1896), pp. 220-236. On apposition in John see Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, pp. 36 ff. On the general subject of apposition see Delbruck, *Vergl. Syntax*, Dritter Teil, pp. 195-199; Kuhner-Gerth, I, pp. 281-290.

IV. The Expansion of the Predicate.

(a) PREDICATE IN WIDER SENSE. Here predicate must be taken in its full sense and not merely the verb, but also the other ways of making a predicate with the copula. One cannot do better here than follow Brugmann,[1] though he makes the verb, not the predicate, the centre of this group. It is simpler just to take the predicate as the other focus answering to the subject. The predicate can be expanded by other verbs, by substantives, by pronouns, by adjectives, by adverbs, by prepositions, by particles, by subordinate clauses.

(b) THE INFINITIVE AND THE PARTICIPLE. These are the common ways of supplementing a verb by another verb directly. They will both call for special treatment later and can only be mentioned here. Cf. **ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν** (Mk. 6:48) and **ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες** (Heb. 13:2). But sometimes two verbs are used together directly without any connective, as **ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν** (Mt. 26:17). See discussion of asyndeton in this chapter (xii, Connection in Sentences).

(c) THE RELATION BETWEEN THE PREDICATE AND SUBSTANTIVES. This matter receives full treatment under the head of Cases, and a word of illustration suffices here. It is not the accusative case alone that occurs, but any oblique case of the substantive or pronoun may be used to express this relation, as **προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς** (Lu. 21:34). In the case of a copula this case will be the nominative and forms the predicate, as **αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία** (1 Jo. 2:25).

(d) THE PRONOUN. It is sometimes the expanded object, as **τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν** (Jo. 4:23).

[1] Kurze vergl. Gr., III, p. 634 f. Cf. K.-G., I, pp. 77-82; Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., pp. 154-181.

(e) ADJECTIVES. They are common with predicates and as predicates. So ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγιής (Mt. 12:13). Cf. ἦλθεν πρῶτος (Jo. 20:4), ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην) (Heb. 7:24). The article and the participle often form the predicate, as Mt. 10:20.

(f) THE ADVERB. The use of the adverb with the predicate is so normal as to call for no remark. So ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον (1 Tim. 3:16). Cf. οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται (2 Pet. 1:11).

(g) PREPOSITIONS. Let one example serve for prepositions: ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ (Eph. 3:19).

(h) NEGATIVE PARTICLES **οὐ** AND **μή.** These are not confined to the predicate, but there find their commonest illustrations. Cf. **οὐ** γὰρ τολμῶμεν (2 Cor. 10:12) and **μὴ** γένοιτο (Gal. 6:14).

(i) SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. Most commonly, though by no means always, they are expansions of the predicate. The adverbial clauses are mainly so, as ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἵνα εἰδῆτε (1 Jo. 5:13), and most object (substantival) clauses, as the ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον in the same sentence. But adjective clauses likewise often link themselves on to a word in the predicate, as ἐν **Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** ὃν προέθετο (Ro. 3:24).

(j) APPOSITION WITH THE PREDICATE AND LOOSER AMPLIFICATIONS. It is common also, but calls for little additional remark. Predicative amplifications, as Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 527) calls them, are common. So εἰς ὃ ἐγὼ ἐτέθην κήρυξ (1 Tim. 2:7), ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον (Ro. 3:25). The participle with ὡς is frequent, as ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας (2 Cor. 10:2). Cf. 1 Pet. 2:5. Note also εἰς as εἰς υἱόν (Ac. 7:21), a Greek idiom parallel to the Hebrew and very abundant in the LXX. A common construction is to have a clause in apposition with τοῦτο in an oblique case. So we see the accusative as τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (Lu. 10:11), ablative as in μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδὲς ἔχει ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ (Jo. 15:13), locative ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν (1 Jo. 4:13). Cf. λέγω τοῦτο ὅτι ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει (1 Cor. 1:12). Likewise the infinitive may be in apposition with τοῦτο, as ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν (2 Cor. 2:1). Cf. also Lu. 22:37 where τό καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη is in apposition with τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί. For an extended predicate with numerous classes see Rev. 13:16, ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχούς, καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δούλους.

V. *Subordinate Centres in the Sentence.* Each of the words or phrases that the subject or predicate groups around itself may form a fresh nucleus for new combinations. Thus the long sentences with many subordinate clauses resemble the cell multiplication in life. The N. T. indeed does not show so many complications in the sentence as the more rhetorical writers of Athens. In Mt. 7:19 the subject δένδρον has the participle ποιοῦν, which in turn has its own clause with μή as negative and καρπὸν καλόν as object. In Jo. 5:36 the predicate μείζω has μαρτυρίαν as object, which has the predicate adjective μείζω, which in turn is followed by the ablative τοῦ Ἰωάνου. This is all too simple to need further illustration. Even adverbs may have expansive appositives as in ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου (Lu. 4:23). Cf. Delbuick, *Vergl. Syntax*, pp. 222-227, for discussion of the adjective and its connection, and p. 228 for the adverb.

VI. Concord in Person. The concord between subject and predicate as to person is so uniform as to call for little remark. In Greek the person was originally expressed in the ending. In the later Greek the pronoun was increasingly used in addition (see chapter on Pronouns). But only ignorance would allow one to mix his persons in the use of the verb. The only problem occurs when the subject comprises two or even all three persons. Then, of course, the first prevails over both the second and the third. So ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (Jo. 10:30). Cf. Mt. 9:14; Lu. 2:48; 1 Cor. 9:6. But in Gal. 1:8 (ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσηται) the reverse is true either because Paul follows the nearest in both person and number or (Winer-Thayer, p. 518) because he acknowledges thus the superior exaltation of the angel. Then again in cases like Ac. 11:14 (σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκος σου) the speaker merely uses the person and number of the first and most important member of the group. Cf. Ac. 16:31. The subject of person thus easily runs into that of number, for the same ending expresses both. Sometimes indeed the first and second persons are used without any direct reference to the speaker or the person addressed. Paul in particular is fond of arguing with an imaginary antagonist. In Ro. 2:1 he calls him ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων. So also 2:3. In Ro. 9:20 Paul is very earnest, μενοῦνγε σὺ τίς εἶ; cf. also 11:17; 14:4. In 1 Cor. 10:30 the first person may be used in this representative way. The same may be true of Gal. 2:18, but not of 2:19. Ro. 7:7-25 is not so clear. The vehemence of passion argues for Paul's own experience, but note σε in 8:2. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*,

p. 317. On the whole subject of agreement in person see Delbruck, *Vergl. Synt.*, p. 229 f.; Kuhner-Gerth, I, p. 82. For change in person see 2 Jo. 8; 1 Cor. 10:7-10.

VII. Concord in Number. Here we have a double concord, that between subject and predicate (both verb and adjective if copula is used) and that between substantive and adjective in general. It is simpler, however, to follow another division.

(a) SUBJECT AND PREDICATE.

1. *Two Conflicting Principles*. One follows the grammatical number, the other the sense (κατὰ σύνεσιν). The formal grammatical rule is, of course, usually observed, a singular subject having a singular verb, a plural subject having a plural verb. This is the obvious principle in all languages of the Indo-Germanic group. It was once true of the dual also, though never to the same extent. Moulton[1] aptly says: "Many Greek dialects, Ionic conspicuously, had discarded this hoary luxury long before the common Greek was born." The Attic gave it a temporary lease of life, "but it never invaded Hellenistic, not even when a Hebrew dual might have been exactly rendered by its aid." I doubt, however, as previously shown (ch. VII, 1,3), Moulton's explanation that the dual probably arose in prehistoric days when men could count only two. That was indeed a prehistoric time! Probably the dual was rather the effort to accent the fact that only two were meant, not more, as in pairs, etc. Hence the dual verb even in Attic was not always used, and it was an extra burden to carry a special inflection for just this idea. No wonder that it vanished utterly in the κοινή.

2. *Neuter Plural and Singular Verb.* But the κοινή fails to respond to the Attic rule that a neuter plural inanimate subject takes a singular verb. Homer indeed was not so insistent and the "modern Greek has gone back completely and exclusively to the use of the plural verb in this instance as in others."[2] The N. T., like the κοινή in general, has broken away from the Attic rule and responds more to the sense, and also more often regards a neuter plural as really plural. It never was a binding rule, though more so in Attic than in Homer. In the vernacular κοινή the people treated the neuter plural like other plurals. (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 96.) Usually a neuter plural in the N. T. that has a personal or collective meaning has a plural verb.[3] So ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα (Mt. 10:21),

[1] Prol., p. 57. [2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 78.

[3] Ib. On the whole subject of concord in number see K.-G., I, pp. 82-88; Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 3. Tl., pp. 230-239; Gildersleeve, Gk. Synt., pp. 52-55.

τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν (Jas. 2:19), ἔθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν (Mt. 6:32), τὰ πνεύματα προσέπιπτον (Mk. 3:11). But the only rule on the matter that is true for N. T. Greek is the rule of liberty. The papyri show the same variety of usage.[1] So does the LXX. In the examples given above the MSS. often vary sharply and examples of the singular verb occur with all of them, δαιμόνια more frequently with the singular verb, as εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλά (Lu. 8:30), but παρεκάλουν in next verse. So in Lu. 4:41 we have δαιμόνια ἐξήρχετο and a little further on ὅτι ᾔδεισαν. In Jo. 10:4 we see a similar change in the same sentence, τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ ὅτι οἴδασιν. The same indifference to the Attic rule appears about things as about persons. Thus ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ (Jo. 9:3) and ἐφάνησαν τὰ ῥήματα (Lu. 24:11). In Rev. 1:19 we find ἃ εἰσὶν καὶ ἃ μέλλει γενέσθαι. The predicate adjective will, of course, be plural, even if the verb is singular, as φανερά ἐστιν τὰ τέκνα (1 Jo. 3:10). Cf. Gal. 5:19. Winer[2] and (to some extent) Blass[3] feel called on to explain in detail these variations, but one has to confess that the success is not brilliant. It is better to regard this indifference to congruity as chiefly an historical movement characteristic of the κοινή as shown above. Even the Attic did not insist on a singular verb with a neuter plural of animate objects when the number of individuals was in mind. The neuter plural was in origin a collective singular. In 1 Cor. 10: 11 the MSS. differ much between συνέβαινεν and —ον.

3. *Collective Substantives*. These show a similar double usage. Thus we have ἐκαθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος (Mk. 3:32) and so more commonly with these collective substantives like ὄχλος, πλῆθος, οἰκία, λαός. But plenty of examples of construction according to sense occur. So ὁ δὲ πλεῖστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν (Mt. 21:8). Sometimes we have both together, as ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς, ὅτι ἐθεώρουν (Jo. 6:2). Where there was such liberty each writer or speaker followed his bent or the humour of the moment. The same variation is to be noticed with the participle. Thus ὁ ὄχλος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν (Jo. 7:49). Here the predicate is plural with the verb. Cf. also Lu. 23:1. But in Ac. 5:16 the participle φέροντες is plural, though the verb συνήρχετο is singular like πλῆθος. Cf. also Ac. 21:36; 25:24; Lu. 2:13. It is not, of course, necessary that a predicate substantive should agree in number with the subject. So ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 3:3).

4. *The Pindaric Construction*. Another complication is possible

[1] Moulton, Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 436.
[2] W.-Th., p. 514 f. [3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 78.

when several subjects are united. If the predicate follows this compound subject, it is put in the plural nearly always. But the "Pindaric construction" (**σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν**) puts the verb in the singular. Blass says German cannot do this, and he ignores the N. T. examples.[1] In Jas. 5:2 f. we have a striking example: **Ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν σέσηπεν, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν σητόβρωτα γέγονεν, ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος κατίωται**. Here **κατίωται** is natural like the English translation, 'is cankered ' (A.V.). Note also Mt. 6:19, **ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει** ('where moth and rust doth corrupt,' A.V.). Other examples are Mk. 4:41, **καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ**; 1 Cor. 15:50, **ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύναται**. Here the principle of anacoluthon suggested by Moulton[2] will hardly apply. It is rather the totality that is emphasized by the singular verb as in the English examples. But when the predicate comes first and is followed by several subjects, anacoluthon may very well be the explanation, as in the Shakespearean examples given by Moulton. The simplest explanation (see under 5) is that the first subject is alone in mind. Thus in 1 Cor. 13:13 **νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα** (cf. English 'and now abideth faith, hope, love, these three,' like the Greek). Cf. also 1 Tim. 6:4. However, in Mt. 5:18, **ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ** it seems rather the totality that is emphasized as above. See Jo. 12:22. In Rev. 9:12, **ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται ἔτι δύο οὐαὶ μετὰ ταῦτα**, probably the neuter conception of the interjection prevails, though just before we have **ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ μία**. In Lu. 2: 33, **ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες**, the copula follows one plan and the participle another. So also **ἦν καθήμεναι** (Mt. 27:61). Just so **ὤφθη Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας συνλαλοῦντες** (Mt. 17:3). Cf. Eph. 4:17 f. In Rev. 21:16, **τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὸ πλάτος καὶ τὸ ὕψος αὐτῆς ἴσα ἐστίν**, the neuter plural adjective and singular copula are regular.

5. *Singular Verb with First Subject*. It is very common indeed for the verb to have the singular with the first of the subjects. Cf. Jo. 2:2, 12; 3:22; 18:15; Ac. 11:14. But on the other hand we have **προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάνης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου** (Mk. 10:35). Cf. also Lu. 23:12; Jo. 21:2; Ac. 5:24. In Ac. 25:23 one participle is singular and the other plural. So in Ac. 5:29 we meet **ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶπαν**. With **ἤ**

[1] Ib., p. 79.

[2] Prol., p. 58. Sometimes Shakespeare used a singular verb for the sake of metre (Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 65), at other times more like our mod. Eng.: "It is now a hundred years since," etc. Cf. Gk. **ἔστιν οἵ**, etc. Cf. also Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 18; Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., pp. 263-268.

the verb is usually in the singular in the N. T. So Mt. 12:25 **πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται**. Cf. also Mt. 5:18; 18:8; Eph. 5:5. In Gal. 1:8 Blass[1] thinks it would be impossible to have **εὐαγγελιζώμεθα** with **ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος**. But the impossible happens in Jas. 2:15, **ἐαν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν**. We have a similar difficulty in English in the use of the disjunctive and other pronouns. One will loosely say: "If any one has left their books, they can come and get them."

6. *The Literary Plural*. We have already mentioned the use of the plural in a kind of impersonal way to conceal one's identity, as **τεθνήκασιν** (Mt. 2:20), **αἰτοῦσιν** (Lu. 12:20) and the general indefinite plural like **ὡς λέγουσιν**, (Rev. 2:24). The critics disagree sharply about it (the literary plural). Blass[2] flatly denies that we have any right to claim this literary plural in Paul's Epistles because he associates others with himself in his letters. Winer[3] insists that Paul often speaks in his apostolic character when he uses the plural and hence does not always include others. Moulton[4] considers the matter settled in favour of the epistolary plural in the **κοινή**. He cites from the papyri several examples. So Tb.P. 26 (ii/B.C.) **ὅντι μοι ἐν Πτολεμαίδει — προσέπεσεν ἡμῖν**, B.U. 449 iii/A.D.) **ἀκούσας ὅτι νωθρεύῃ ἀγωνιοῦμεν** J.H.S. xix 92 (ii/A.D.) **χαῖρέ μοι, μῆτερ γλυκυτάτη, καὶ φροντίζετε ἡμῶν**. Dick[5] has made an exhaustive study of the whole subject and produces parallels from late Greek that show how easily **ἐγώ** and **ἡμεῖς** were exchanged. The matter can be clarified, I think. To begin with, there is no reason in the nature of things why Paul should not use the literary plural if he wished to do so. He was a man of culture and used to books even if he used the vernacular **κοινή** in the main. The late Greek writers did; the papyri show examples of it. G. Milligan (Thess., p. 132) cites Tb. P. 58 (ii/B.C.) **εὑρήκαμεν — εὗρον — βεβουλεύμεθα**; P. Hib. 44 (iii/B.c.) **ἐγράψαμεν —ὁρῶντες — ὠίμην**; P. Heid. 6 (iv/A.D.) **πιστεύομεν—γράφω καὶ φλυαρήσω**; and an inscription, possibly a rescript of Hadrian, 0. G. I. S 484, **λοῦμεν — [μετεπεμ--]ψάμην —βουληθείς—ἔδοξεν ἡμεῖν--ἐδοκιμάσαμεν--ἐπίστευον--ἡγησάμην --νομίζω**. Besides, Blass[6] admits that we have it in 1 Jo. 1:4, where **γράφομεν** does not differ in reality from **γράφω** of 2:1. But in Jo. 21:24 **οἴδαμεν** probably is in contrast to John, who uses **οἶμαι** just

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 80.
[2] Ib., p. 166.
[3] W.-Th., p. 517.
[4] Prol., p. 86.
[5] Der schriftstell. Plu. bei Paulus (1900), p. 18.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166.

below. In Jo. 1:14, as certainly in 1:16, others are associated with the writer. The author of Hebrews also uses the singular or plural according to the humour of the moment. Thus **πειθόμεθα—ἔχομεν** (13:18) and the next verse **παρακαλῶ—ἀποκατασταθῶ.** Cf. also 6:1, 3, 9, 11, with 13:22 f. Now as to Paul. In Ro. 1:5 he has **δι᾽ οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν**. Surely he is talking of no one else when he mentions **ἀποστολήν**. Blass[1] overlooks this word and calls attention to **χάριν** as applicable to all. Then again in Col. 4:3 **ἡμῖν** is followed in the same verse by **δέδεμαι**. It is clear also in 1 Th. 2:18, **ἠθελήσαμεν—ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος**. But what really settles the whole matter[2] is 2 Cor. 10:1-11:6. Paul is here defending his own apostolic authority where the whole point turns on his own personality. But he uses first the singular, then the plural. Thus **παρακαλῶ** (10:1), **θαρρῶ, λογίζομαι** (10:2), **στρατευόμεθα** (10:3), **ἡμεῖς** (10:7), **καυχήσωμαι, αἰσχυνθήσομαι** (10:8), **δόξω** (10:9), **ἐσμέν** (10:11), **καυχησόμεθα** (10:13), etc. It is not credible that here Paul has in mind any one else than himself. Cf. also 2 Cor. 2:14-7:16 for a similar change from singular to plural. The use of the literary plural by Paul sometimes does not, of course, mean that he always uses it when he has a plural. Each case rests on its own merits. Jesus seems to use it also in Jo. 3:11, **ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν**. In Mk. 4:30 (**πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ;**) Christ associates others with him in a very natural manner.

(b) SUBSTANTIVE AND ADJECTIVE. The concord between adjective and substantive is just as close as that between subject and verb. This applies to both predicate and attributive adjectives. Here again number is confined to the singular and the plural, for the dual is gone. Cf. in lieu of the dual the curious **καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἥμισυ καιροῦ** (Rev. 12:14). When adjectives and participles deviate from this accord in number or gender (Eph. 4:17 f.; 1 Cor. 12:2; Rev. 19:14), it is due to the sense instead of mere grammar, **κατὰ σύνεσιν**. Thus in Mk. 9:15 we have **ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες**, Ac. 3:11 **συνέδραμεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἔκθαμβοι**, Lu. 2:13 **στρατιᾶς αἰνούντων**, Mk. 8:1 **ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων**, (note both), Ac. 21:36 **πλῆθος κράζοντες**, etc. Cf. **ὁ ὄχλος ἐπάρατοι** (Jo. 7:49). In Ph. 2:6 **τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ** the plural adjective differs little from **ἴσον** in adverbial sense. Cf. **ταῦτα τί ἐστιν εἰς τοσούτους** (Jo. 6:9), **τί ἂν εἴη ταῦτα** (Lu. 15:26).

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166.

[2] Dick, Der schriftstell. Plu. bei Paulus, 1900, p. 53. Milligan, St. Paul's Epist. to the Thess., 1908, p. 131 f. agrees with Dick.

(C) REPRESENTATIVE SINGULAR. But other points come up also about the number of the substantives. One is the use of the singular with the article to signify the whole class. The examples are frequent, such as **ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος** (Mt. 12:35), **σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου** (2 Cor. 12:12), **ὁ ἐργάτης** (Lu. 10:7), **τοῦ Ἰουδαίου** (Ro. 3:1), **τὸν πτωχόν** (Jas. 2:6). This discussion about the number of nouns could more properly be treated under syntax of nouns, but I have no such chapter. Cf. Cases.

(d) IDIOMATIC PLURAL IN NOUNS. Abstract substantives occur in the plural in the N. T. as in the older Greek, an idiom foreign to English. Thus **πλεονεξίαι** (Mk. 7:22), **προσωπολημψίαις** (Jas. 2:1). Cf. also **φόνοι** Mt. 15:19; **πὰς πορνείας** 1 Cor. 7:2. In 2 Cor. 12:20 and 1 Pet. 2:1 both the singular and the plural occur in contrast. This use of the plural of abstract substantives does indeed lay stress on the separate acts. Some words were used almost exclusively in the plural, or at any rate the plural was felt to be more appropriate. So **αἰῶνες** in the sense of 'world' (Heb. 1:2) or 'eternity,' as **εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων** (Gal. 1:5), or with singular and plural, as **τοῦ αἰνος τῶν αἰώνων** (Eph. 3:21). Cf. also **τὰ ἅγια** for 'the sanctuary' (Heb. 8:2) and **ἅγια ἁγίων** for 'the most Holy Place' (Heb. 9:3). The word **οὐρανός** is used in the singular often enough, and always so in the Gospel of John, as 1:32, but the plural is common also. Cf. Paul's allusion to "third heaven" (2 Cor. 12:2), an apparent reflection of the Jewish idea of seven heavens. In English we use "the heavens" usually for the canopy of sky above us, but **ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν** uniformly in the N. T., as Mt. 3:2. The Hebrew שָׁמַיִם is partly responsible for **οὐρανοί**. The so-called "plural of majesty" has an element of truth in it. For further details see Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 83. A number of other words have this idiomatic plural, such as **ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἐξ ἀριστερῶν, ἐξ εὐωνύμων** (Mt. 25:33), **εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη** (Jo. 21:6), **ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς** (Mk. 16:5), **ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν** (Mt. 2:1), **ἀπο δυσμῶν** (Mt. 8:11), **θύραι** (Ac. 5:19), **πύλαι** (Mt. 16:18), **κόλποι** (Lu. 16:23). But the singular of some of them is also found, as **ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ** (Mt. 2:9), **ἐν δεξιᾷ** (Eph. 1:20), **πρὸ τῆς θύρας** (Ac. 12:6). The plural of **ἱμάτιον** seems to mean only **ἱμάτιον** (not **χιτών** also) in Jo. 19:23 (cf. 19:2). For the plural **αἵματα** note Jo. 1:13. The names of feasts are often plural, such as **τὰ ἐγκαίνια** (Jo. 10:22), **τὰ γενέσια** (Mk. 6:21), **τὰ ἄζυμα** (Mk. 14:1), **γάμοι** (Mt. 22:2), **σάββατα** (Ac. 17:2). So also some cities have plural names, as **Ἱεροσόλυμα** (Mt. 2:1), **Ἀθῆναι** (Ac. 17:16), **Κολοσσαί** (Col. 1:2). Different are **ἐπιστολαί** (1 Cor.

16:3), τὰ ἀργύρια (Mt. 27:5), τὰ ὀψώνια (Lu. 3:14), διαθῆκαι (Ro. 9:4).

(e) IDIOMATIC SINGULAR IN NOUNS. On the other hand the singular appears where one would naturally look for a plural. A neuter singular as an abstract expression may sum up the whole mass. Thus πᾶν ὅ in Jo. 6:37 refers to believers. Cf. also Jo. 17:2. The same collective, use of the neuter singular is found in τὸ ἔλαττον (Heb. 7:7). So not τὸ γεννώμενον (Lu. 1:35) but πᾶν τὸ γεγεννημένον (1 Jo. 5:4). The same concealment of the person is seen in τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε (2 Th. 2:6). The neuter plural indeed is very common in this sense, as τὰ μωρά, τὰ ἀσθενῆ, etc. (1 Cor. 1:27 f.). Then again the singular is used where the substantive belongs to more than one subject. So πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν (Mk. 8:17), ἔθεντο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν (Lu. 1:66), ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν (Mt. 17:6), περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν (Eph. 6:14), ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς στολὴ λευκή (Rev. 6:11), ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν πατέρων (Ac. 7:45), σιὰ στόματος πάντων (Ac. 3:18), ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν (Jo. 10:39). In 1 Cor. 6:5, ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, the difficulty lies not in μέσον, but in the singular ἀδελφοῦ. The fuller form would have been the plural or the repetition of the word, ἀδελφοῦ καὶ ἀδελφοῦ. In all these variations in number the N. T. writers merely follow in the beaten track of Greek usage with proper freedom and individuality. For copious illustrations from the ancient Greek see Gildersleeve, *Greek Syntax,* pp. 17-59.[1]

(f) SPECIAL INSTANCES. TWO or three other passages of a more special nature call for comment. In Mt. 21:7 (ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν) it is probable that αὐτῶν refers to τὰ ἱμάτια, not to τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον. In Mt. 24:26 ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ and ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις are in contrast. In Mt. 27:44 οἱ λῃσταί is not to be taken as plural for the singular. Probably both reproached Jesus at first and afterwards one grew sorry and turned on the other, as Lu. 23:39 has it. In Mt. 22:1 and Mk. 12:17 εἶπεν ἐν παραβολαῖς is followed by only one parable, but there were doubtless others not recorded. In Mt. 9:8, ἐδόξασαν τον θεὸν τὸν δόντα, ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, we have a double sense in δόντα, for Jesus had the ἐξουσίαν in a sense not true of ἀνθρώποις who got the benefit of it. So in Ac. 13:40 τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις is merely equivalent to ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν (Ac. 7:42). On these special matters see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 251. Cf. χερουβείν (Aramaic dual) and καρασκιάζοντα (Heb. 9:5).

[1] Cf. also Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 1. Tl., pp. 133-172, 3. Tl., pp. 240-248; K.-G., Bd. I, pp. 271 ff.; Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 369-373.

VIII. Concord in Gender. Here we deal only with nouns, for verbs have no gender. But gender plays an important part in the agreement of substantive and adjective.

(a) FLUCTUATIONS IN GENDER. The whole matter is difficult, for substantives have two sorts of gender, natural and grammatical. The two do not always agree. The apparent violations of the rules of gender can generally be explained by the conflict in these two points of view with the additional observation that the grammatical gender of some words changed or was never firmly settled. All the constructions according to sense are due to analogy (Middleton in *Syntax*, p. 39). For further general remarks on gender see chapter on Declensions. In Ac. 11:28 Luke has λιμὸν μεγάλην, not μέγαν. In Rev. 14:19 two genders are found with the same word, ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν. Cf. Lu. 4:25 and 15:14. The papyri vary also in the gender of this word (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 60). The common gender of θεός (Ac. 19:37, cf. θεά. 19:27) and similar words is discussed in the chapter on Declensions. In Rev. 11:4 αἱ ἑστῶτες skips over λυχνίαι curiously[1] and goes back (the participle, not the article) to οὗτοι (οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι καὶ αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς ἑστῶτες) . But more about the Apocalypse later. In Mk. 12:28, ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων, Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 178) thinks that πασῶν would be beside the point as it is rather the general idea of *omnium*. Is it not just construction κατὰ σύνεσιν? In Ph. 2:1 εἴ τις σπλάχνα is difficult after εἴ τι παραμύθιον and εἴ τις κοινωνία. Blass[2] cuts the knot boldly by suggesting εἴ τι in all the examples here which Moulton[3] accepts with the sense of *si quid valet,* but he cites papyri examples like ἐπί τι μίαν τῶν . . . οἰκιῶν, Par. P. 15 (ii/B.C.); εἰ δέ τι περισσὰ γράμματα B.U. 326 (ii/A.D.). See also ἐὰν δέ τι ἄλλα ἀπαιτηθῶμεν, Amh. Pap. II, 85, 11, and ἐὰν δέ τι ἄβροχος γένηται, *ib*., 15. Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 184. Perhaps after all this correction may be right or the text may be corrupt. The scribe could easily have written τις for τινα because of the preceding examples. A nodding scribe may even have thought σπλάχνα feminine singular. But what is one to say of oval in Rev. 9:12; 11:14? Shall we think[4] of θλίψις or ταλαιπωρία? In Mt. 21:42 (Mk. 12:11), παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστιν'

[1] But Moulton (Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904, p. 151) cites from the pap. numerous false gender concords like τὴν πεπτωκότα, etc. Cf. Reinhold, De Graec. etc., p. 57; Krumbacher, Prob. d. neugr. Schriftspr., p. 50.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 8 1 .

[3] Prol., p. 59.

[4] W.-Sch., p. 255.

θαυμαστή, we may have a translation of the Hebrew זֹאת (Ps. (117) 118:23), for οὗτος is used just before in reference to λίθον. Τοῦτο would be the Greek idiom for αὕτη. It is even possible that αὕτη may refer to κεφαλὴν γωνίας. So also τῇ βάαλ in Ro. 11:4 comes from the LXX (Jer. 2:8; 2:28; 7:9; Hos. 2:8). Cf. τῇ **Β**άαλ τῇ δαμάλει in Tobit 1:5 B. See Declensions for further remarks.

(b) THE NEUTER SINGULAR. This is not always to be regarded as a breach of gender. Often the neuter conveys a different conception. So in the question of Pilate, **τί** ἐστιν ἀλήθεια (Jo. 18:38). Cf. also **τί** οὖν ὁ νόμος; (Gal. 3:19), **τί** ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος; (Heb. 2:6), **τι** ἂν εἴη ταῦτα; (Lu. 15:26), εἰ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι μηδὲν ὤν; (Gal. 6:3). But on the other handy note εἶναι τινα (Ac. 5:36), αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη ἐντολή (Mt. 22:3), τίς ἡ πρόσλημψις; (Ro. 11:15), τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπίς; (Eph. 1:18). In particular observe **τί** ὁ **Π**έτρος ἐγένετο (Ac. 12:18) and **οὗτος** δὲ **τί** (Jo. 21:21). Cf. also **τοῦτο** χάρις (twice) in 1 Pet. 2:19 f., where **τοῦτο** is predicate and really refers to εἰ ὑποφέρει τις and εἰ ὑπομενεῖτε. Cf. also ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς (Lu. 12:23). Indeed ταῦτα may be the predicate with persons, as ταῦτά τινες ἦτε (1 Cor. 6:11). The neuter adjective in the predicate is perfectly normal in cases like ἱκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἡ ἐπιτιμία αὕτη 2 Cor 2:6). So also ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς (Mt. 6:34). Cf. also the reading of D ἀρεστὸν in Ac. 12:3. Blass[1] treats ἀρκετόν above and ἱκανόν ἐστιν, in Lu. 22:38 as like the Latin *satis*. The neuter singular in the collective or general sense to represent persons is not peculiar to the N. T. So τὸ κατέχον (2 Th. 2:6), πᾶν ὅ (Jo. 17:2), τὸ ἀπολωλός (Lu. 19:10), etc. So the neuter plural also as τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου , τὰ ἀσθενῆ (1 Cor. 1:27). The neuter article τὸ **Ἄ**γαρ (Gal. 4:25) deals with the *word* Hagar, not the gender of the person. In Jas. 4:4 μοιχαλίδες in W. H. stands without μοιχαλοὶ καί, but none the less may be regarded as comprehensive.[2] Cf. γενεὰ μοιχαλίς (Mt. 12:39) and Hos. 2: 4, 23. In 1 Cor. 15:10 note εἰμὶ ὅ εἰμι, not ὅς, a different idea.

(C) EXPLANATORY ὅ ἐστιν AND τοῦ᾽ ἔστιν. A special idiom is the relative ὅ as an explanation (ὅ ἐστιν) and the demonstrative τοῦτ᾽ ἔστι, which are both used without much regard to the gender (not to say number) of antecedent or predicate. Thus in Mk. 3:17 ὄνομα **Β**οανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς; 12:42 λεπτὰ δύο ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης; 15:16 τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον; 15:22 **Γ**ολγοθὰν τόπον, ὅ ἐστιν κρανίου τόπος (cf. Mt. 27:33); ῥαββεί, ὃ λέγεται (Jo. 1: 38): 1:42 **Μ**εσίαν ὅ ἐστιν; Col. 3:14 τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος;

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 76. [2] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 254.

Eph. 6:17 **μάχαιραν, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεου**. Blass[1] observes that it is only in the Apocalypse that this explanatory relative is assimilated to the antecedent or predicate, as **λαμπάδες, ἅ εἰσιν τὰ πνεύματα** (Rev. 4:5), but **ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτά, οἵ εἰσιν τὰ πνεύματα** (5:6). But it is otherwise with the ordinary relative, as **ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς** (1 Cor. 3:17) **Φιλίππους, ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτη πόλις** (Ac. 16 : 12); **ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, ἥτις ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας** (Ph. 1:28); **ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν** (Eph. 3:13). The use of **τοῦτ' ἔστιν** is a common idiom in the later Greek (less so in the older) and is exactly equivalent to the Latin *id est* and has no regard to case, number or gender. So **Ἐλωί--τοῦτ' ἔστιν θεέ μου** (Mt. 27:46); **τοῦτ' ἔστιν τοὺς ἀδελφούς** (Heb. 7:5). Cf. Heb. 2: 14; 9:11, etc. See further p. 399, and ch. XV, VII, (d), 10.

(d) THE PARTICIPLE. It often has the construction **κατὰ σύνεσιν**, as in Mk. 9:26, **κράξας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας** referring to **τὸ πνεῦμα**. Cf. Lu. 2:13 **στρατιᾶς αἰνούντων; πλῆθος κράζοντες** (Ac. 21:36); **βοῶντες** (25:24). But on the other hand note **ἀναστὰν πλῆθος** (Lu. 23: 1). So also in 1 Cor. 12:2 **ἔθνη ἀπαγόμενοι**; Eph. 4:17 f. **ἔθνη ἐσκοτωμένοι**; Rev. 4:8 **ζῷα, ἓν καθ' ἓν ἔχων λέγοντες**; 11:15 **φωναὶ μεγάλαι λέγοντες** (cf. **φωνὴν λέγοντα**, Rev. 9:14); 19:14 **στρατεύματα ἐνδεδυμένοι**. Cf. **θηρίον γέμοντα** (Rev. 17:3). Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 526) takes **ἐσκοτωμένοι** in Eph. 4:18 with **ὑμᾶς**: Cf. also **πλῆθος φέροντες** (Ac. 5:16). Cf. Lu. 19:37. So (**αἱ ἐκκλησίαι**) **ἀκούοντες** (Gal. 1:22 f.). But in Rev. 21:14 **τὸ τεῖχος ἔχων**, seems a mere slip. But **ζῷον—ἔχων** (Rev. 4:7) may be mere confusion in sound of **ἔχον** and **ἔχων**. See also **φωνὴ--λέγων** (4:1), **φωναὶ--λέγοντες** (11:15), **λυχνίαι—ἑστῶτες** (11:4). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 87) cites **ζῷον—ἀστράπτων** from *Apocalypsis Anastasiae* (pp. 6, 13).

(e) ADJECTIVES. The question of an adjective's using one form for more than one gender has been already discussed at length in the chapter on Declensions. Thus **στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου** (Lu. 2:13) is not a breach of concord, for **οὐρανίου** is feminine. If masculine and feminine are used together and the plural adjective or participle occurs, the masculine, of course, prevails over the feminine when persons are considered. Thus **ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες** (Lu. 2:33). So also **Ἀγρίππας κὰ Βερνίκη ἀσπασάμενοι** (Ac. 25:13) and even with the disjunctive **ἤ**, as **ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοί** (Jas. 2:15). In Rev. 8:7 the neuter plural is used of two nouns (one feminine and one neuter), **χάλαζα καὶ πῦρ μεμιγμένα**. Cf. **φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ** (1 Pet. 1 : 18), same gender. So **ποικίλαις νόσοις καὶ βασάνοις** (Mt. 4:24), **πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 77.

ἐξουσίας (Eph. 1:21), etc. Thus we may note πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα (Mt. 12:25), the same gender. But when different genders occur, the adjective is usually repeated, as in ποτατποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί (Mk. 13:1), πᾶσα δόσις καὶ πᾶν δώρημα (Jas. 1: 17), οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινὴν (Rev. 21:1), etc. There is emphasis also in the repetition. But one adjective with the gender of one of the substantives is by no means uncommon. Thus in Heb. 9:9, δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι μὴ δυνάμεναι, the last substantive is followed, while in Heb. 3:6, ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, the first rules in gender.[1] *Per contra* note υἱὸν ἄρσεν Rev. 12:5. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 86) cites φίλε τέκνον from the Iliad, XXII, 84.

IX. Concord in Case. This is not the place for the syntax of the cases. That matter belongs to a special chapter.

(a) ADJECTIVES. They concur in the case of the substantive with which they are used. The variations are either indeclinable forms like πλήρης[2] in Jo. 1:14 (agreeing with αὐτοῦ or δόξαν) or are due to anacoluthon, as Jas. 3:8 τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων· ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ (so W. H. punctuate).

(b) PARTICIPLES. They lend themselves readily to anacoluthon in case. Thus ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, γράψαντες (Ac. 15:22 f.). See Mk. 7:19 καθαρίζων. Mk. 6:9 has ὑποδεδεμένους, whereas before we have αὐτοῖς and αἴρωσιν, but W. H. read ἐνδύσασθαι (Nestle, ἐνδύσησθε). In Mk. 12:40, οἱ κατέσθοντες καὶ προσευχόμενοι we have a nominative in apposition with the ablative ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων. In Ph. 3:18 f. τοὺς ἐχ-ρούς is in agreement with the case of οὕς, while of οἱ φρονοῦντες below skips back to πολλοί. Sometimes, as in ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια (Ro. 3:2), the substantive will make sense as subject or object of the verb. In Heb. 9:10 δικαιώματα—ἐπικείμενα in apposition with θυσίαι skips over the parenthetical clause between. Cf. also perhaps ἀρξάμενοι (Lu. 24:47), ἀρξάμενος (Ac. 1:22. Cf. Lu. 23:5), ἀρξάμενος (Ac. 10:37). Note this idiom in Luke's writings.

(c) THE BOOK OF REVELATION. It is full of variations (solecisms) from case-concord, especially in appositional clauses. Thus in Rev. 7: 9 after εἶδον, καὶ ἰδού we first have the nomina-

[1] On the subject of gender see Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 1. Tl., pp. 89-133; Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 365-369.

[2] The exx. of this indecl. use of πλήρης are abundant in MSS. of the N. T., occurring in most passages of the N. T. See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 81. The pap. confirm the N. T. MSS. See Moulton, Prol., p. 50. See ch. VII, 2, (f), of this book, for details.

tive with ἰδού and then the accusative with εἶδον. Thus ὁ μάρτυς (Rev. 1:5) retains the nominative rather than the ablative ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, whereas in 11:18 τοὺς μικρούς is in apposition with the dative τοῖς δούλοις, κτλ. Cf. 20:2 where ὁ ὄφις (text, marg. acc.) is in apposition with the accusative τὸν δράκοντα. The papyri show the idiom. Cf. τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ—ὁ διάτοχος — (=διαδ.) in Letr. 149 (ii/A.D.), Ἀντιφίλου Ἕλλην—ἱππάρχης in B.G.U. 1002 (i/B.C.). Cf. Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 60. The Apocalypse is thus by no means alone. See also παρὰ το[ῦ Προστ]ούμου τὸν εὑρόντα B.G.U. 846 (ii/A.D.), ἤκουσα Τοθῆς λέγων P. Par. 51 (B.C. 160), ἐμὲ λέλυκας πολιὰς ἔχων, *ib*. In particular the participle is common in the nominative in the Apocalypse. In the case of ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος the nominative is evidently intentional to accent the unchangeableness of God (1:4). Cf. this formula in 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 16:5. Ὁ νικῶν occurs as a set phrase, the case being expressed by αὐτός which follows. So in 2:26 αὐτῷ (τηρῶν also); 3:12 αὐτόν, 21 αὐτῷ. But in τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ 2:7, 17, the case is regularly in the dative without anacoluthon. The wrong case appears with ἔχων in 1:16 (almost separate sentence) if it is meant to refer to αὐτοῦ or gender if φωνή; 9:14 (ὁ ἔχων, in apposition with ἀγγέλῳ); 10:2 ἔχων (sort of parenthesis, cf. 1:16); 14:14 ἔχων (loosely appended); 19:12 (loose connection of ἔχων). In 5:6 and 17:3 ἔχων has wrong gender and case. This participle seems to be strung on loosely generally, but in 21:11 f. the proper case and gender occur. Cf. also ἡ λέγουσα (2:20) and λέγων (14:7). In 14:12 οἱ τηροῦντες is a loose addition like ἡ καταβαίνουσα (3:12). More difficult seems ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένης (1:15), margin πεπυρωμένοι. In 19:20 τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς καιομένης the participle agrees in gender with λίμνην and in case with πυρὸς. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 86) cites ἀπέχω παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὸν ὁμολογοῦντα (Amh. Pap. II, in to 113, where regularly the accusative of a participle is in apposition with a genitive or ablative). He gives also Oxy. P. I N 120, 25, οὐ δέδοκται γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔχειν τι δυστυχοῦντες; Flinders-Pet. Pap. III 42 C (3) 3, ἀδικούμεθα ὑπὸ Ἀπολλωνίου ἐμβάλλων. Dittenberger (Or. inscr. 611) gives Σεβαστοῦ and υἱός in apposition. But the point of difficulty in the Revelation of John is not any one isolated discord in case or gender. It is rather the great number of such violations of concord that attracts attention. As shown above, other books of the N. T. show such phenomena. Observe especially Luke, who is a careful writer of education. Note also Paul in Ph. 1:30 where ἔχοντες (cf. this word in Rev.) is used with ὑμῖν,

and 2 Cor. 7:5 ἡμῶν—θλιβόμενοι. Similar discords occur in the LXX, as in Jer. 14:13; Dan. 10:5-7; 1 Macc. 13:16; 1 Macc. 15:28; and indeed occasionally in the very best of Greek writers. The example in 1 Macc. 13:16 (λαὸν λέγοντες) is worth singling out for its bearing on both case and number. Nestle (*Einf. in das griech*. N. T., p. 90 f.) notes the indeclinable use of λέγων and λέγοντες in the LXX, like לֵאמֹר. Cf. Nestle, *Phil. Sacra*., p. 7. See also Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 23. One Must not be a slavish martinet in such matters at the expense of vigour and directness. The occasion of anacoluthon in a sentence is just the necessity of breaking off and making a new start. But the Apocalypse demands more than these general remarks. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 534) calls attention to the fact that these irregularities occur chiefly in the description of the visions where there would naturally be some excitement. Moulton[1] argues from the fact that the papyri of uneducated writers show frequent discord in case that John was somewhat backward in his Greek. He speaks of "the curious Greek of Revelation," "the imperfect Greek culture of this book." He notes the fact that most of the examples in both the papyri and Revelation are in apposition and the writer's "grammatical sense is satisfied when the governing word has affected the case of one object."[2] Moulton[3] cites in illustration Shakespeare's use of "between you and I." This point indeed justifies John. But one must observe the comparative absence of these syntactical discords in the Gospel of John and the Epistles of John. In Ac. 4:13 both Peter and John are called ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται. This need not be pushed too far, and yet it is noteworthy that 2 Peter and Revelation are just the two books of the N. T. whose Greek jars most upon the cultured mind and which show most kinship to the κοινή in somewhat illiterate papyri. One of the theories about the relation between 1 Peter and 2 Peter is that Silvanus (1 Pet. 5:12) was Peter's scribe in writing the first Epistle, and that thus the Greek is smooth and flowing, while in 2 Peter we have Peter's own somewhat uncouth, unrevised Greek. This theory rests on the assumption of the genuineness of 2 Peter, which is much disputed. So also in Acts Luke refines Peter's Greek in the reports

[1] Exp., Jan., 1904, p. 71; Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904, p. 151; Prol., pp. 9, 60.

[2] Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904, p. 151; Prol., p. 9.

[3] Ib. Merch. of Venice, iii, 2. Cf. also Harrison, Prol. to the Study of Gk. Rel., p. 168. In the Attic inscr. the noun is found in apposition with the abl., the loc. and in absolute expressions. Cf. Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 203 f.

of his addresses. Now in Jo. 21:24 we seem to have the comment of a brother (or several) on the Gospel of John which he has read and approved. Moulton[1] naturally suggests the hypothesis that the Gospel and Epistles of John had the smoothing hand of this brother of culture (perhaps in Ephesus), while in the Apocalypse we have John's own rather uncultured Greek. One may add to this the idea of Winer about possible excitement and passion due to the great ideas of the book. In the Isle of Patmos John, if still there, would have little opportunity for scholarly help and the book may have gone out unrevised. There are other theories, but this matter of authorship is not the grammarians' task.

(d) OTHER PECULIARITIES IN APPOSITION. Further examples of apposition call for illustration. Thus in 1 Jo. 2:25, **αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν, τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον** we have **τῆν ζωὴν** in the case of the relative (because nearer) and not in that of the antecedent. Then again in Jo. 1:38 **ῥαββεί** is explained as **διδάσκαλε**, vocative in the predicate (cf. also 20:16), while in 1:41 **Μεσσίαν** is naturally interpreted as **Χριστός**. In Jo. 13:13 **ὁ διδάσκαλος** is in apposition with **με** where we would use quotation-marks. But this passage needs to be borne in mind in connection with Revelation. In 1 Cor. 16:21, **τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου**, note the genitive in apposition with the possessive pronoun **ἐμῇ** according to the sense of the possessive, not its case. Once more the common use of the genitive of one substantive in practical apposition has already been noted in this chapter, III, (e), 5, Apposition. Thus **ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων** (Lu. 22:1). The use of **τοῦτ' ἔστιν** with any case has already been alluded to under Gender. Note Mk. 7:2; Ac. 19:4; Ro. 7:18; Phil. 12; 1 Pet. 3:20; Heb. 9:11; 11:16, etc. In **αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος** (Eph. 5:23) **αὐτός** gives emphasis to the apposition. Inverse attraction of antecedent to case of the relative (see Pronouns) is really apposition.

(e) THE ABSOLUTE USE OF THE CASES (*nominative, genitive, ablative and accusative*). These will receive treatment in the chapter on Cases. Some of the peculiar nominatives noted in Revelation are the *nominativus pendens*, a common anacoluthon. Cf. **ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε** (Lu. 21:6), **ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν** (Rev. 2:26). The parenthetic nominative is seen in Jo. 1:6, **ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάνης**, where **Ἰωάνης** might have been dative. But here merely the mention of the fact of the absolute use of the cases is all that is called for.[2]

[1] Prol., p. 9. See also Zahn's Intr., § 74.

[2] Cf. Gildersleeve, Gk. Spit., p. 3; Brag., Griech, Gr., pp. 373-376.

X. Position of Words in the Sentence.

(a) FREEDOM FROM RULES. The freedom of the Greek from artificial rules and its response to the play of the mind is never seen better than in the order of words in the sentence. In English, since it has lost its inflections, the order of the words in the sentence largely determines the sense. Whether a substantive is subject or object can usually be seen in English only thus, or whether a given word is verb or substantive, substantive or adjective. Even the Latin, which is an inflectional tongue, has much less liberty than the Greek. We are thinking, of course, of Greek prose, not of poetry, where metre so largely regulates the position of words. The N. T. indeed enjoys the same freedom[1] that the older Greek did with perhaps some additional independence from the vernacular **κοινή** as contrasted with the older literary language. The modern Greek vernacular has maintained the Greek freedom in this respect (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 200). The Semitic tongues also have much liberty in this matter. In English it is common to see words in the wrong place that make absurd bungles, as this, for instance: "The man rode a horse with a black hat." In Greek one may say **φιλεῖ ὁ πατὴρ τὸν υἱόν, ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱόν**, or **φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν ὁ πατὴρ**, according to the stress in the mind of the speaker.[2]

(b) PREDICATE OFTEN FIRST. In Greek prose, where the rhetorical element has less play, the predicate very commonly comes first, simply because, as a rule, the predicate is the most important thing in the sentence. Thus **μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι** (Mt. 5:3), **εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν** (Lu. 1:42), **ἐγένετο δέ** (Lu. 2:1), **καὶ ἐπορεύοντο** (2:3), **ἀνέβη δέ** (2:4), etc. But this is true so often, not because of any rule, but simply because the predicate is most frequently the main point in the clause. Blass[3] even undertakes to suggest a tentative scheme thus: predicate, subject, object, complementary participle, etc. But Winer[4] rightly remarks that he would be an empirical expositor who would insist on any unalterable rule in the Greek sentence save that of spontaneity.

(c) EMPHASIS. This is one of the ruling ideas in the order of words. This emphasis may be at the end as well as at the beginning of the sentence, or even in the middle in case of antithesis. The emphasis consists in removing a word from its usual position to an unusual one. So **ἁλυκὸν γλυκὺ ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ** (Jas. 3:12). Thus

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 287.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk, Gr., p. 312.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 287.
[4] W,-Th., p. 551,

in Lu. 1:12 we have καὶ φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, but in Ac. 19:17 καὶ ἐπέπεσεν φόβος ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς. Sometimes the words in contrast are brought sharply together, as in Jo. 17:4, ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα, and 17:5, νῦν δόξασόν με σύ. So ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ Lu. 10:16. Note also the intentional position of ὁ πατριάρχης in Heb. 7:4 ᾧ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων, ὁ πατριάρχης. So also in 1 Pet. 2: 7, ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, note the beginning and the end of the sentence. This rhetorical emphasis is more common in the Epistles (Paul's in particular) than in the Gospels and Acts for obvious reasons. Thus observe the position of au in Ro. 11:17 and of κἀκεῖνοι in verse 23. In Heb. 6:19 ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν do not come in immediate contact with ἄγκυραν as adjectives usually do. Observe also the emphatic climax in τετελειωμένον at the end of the sentence in Heb. 7:28. Cf. ἤδη — κεῖται in Mt. 3:10. Note the sharpness given to οὐ in 1 Cor. 1:17 by putting it first. So 10:5. In 1 Cor. 2:7 θεοῦ σοφίαν throws proper emphasis upon θεοῦ. The position of the subordinate clause varies greatly. It often comes first, as in Lu. 1:1-4.

(d) THE MINOR WORDS IN A SENTENCE. In general they come close to the word to which they belong in sense. Thus the adj. is near the subst. and after it. So ὕδωρ ζῶν (Jo. 4:10), διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ (Mk. 10:17), ζωὴν αἰώνιον (ib.). But observe ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ (Jo. 7:23), both adjs. So also note δι᾽ ἀνύδρων τόπων, (Mt. 12:43), καλὸν σπέρμα (Mt. 13:27), ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος (Mt. 13: 28), where the adj. gives the main idea. With the repeated article the adj. has increased emphasis in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς (Jo. 10: 11). With πνεῦμα ἅγιον this is the usual order (as Mt. 3:11), but also τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα (Ac. 1:8) or τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (Jo. 14:26). In Ac. 1:5 the verb comes in between the substantive and adjective (ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ) to give unity to the clause. So in Mt. 1:20, ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου. Cf. ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον (1 Jo. 5:13). In Ac. 26:24 note σε thus, τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει. So also in 1 Cor. 10:4 ἔπιον comes between τό and πόμα. The position of the genitive varies greatly, but the same general principle applies. The genitive follows as in τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος (Lu. 4:22), unless emphatic as in τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τὴν φωνήν (Jo. 10:5). There is sharp emphasis in τῶν ἵππων in Jas. 3 : 3. A genitive may be on each side of the substantive as in ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους (2 Cor. 5:1). Sharp contrast may be expressed by proximity of two genitives, as in τὸν συνστρατιώτην μου, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον (Ph. 2:25). There may be some contrast also in σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας (Jo. 13:6). But the personal enclitic

pronouns have a tendency to come early in the sentence without emphasis, as πῶς ἠνεῴχθησάν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (Jo. 9:10). Cf. ἵνα σου προσκυνήσω τὴν χ῏εραν B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 90) notes great freedom in the position of the genitive in the Attic authors and in the inscriptions. In the case of ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος and οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος one must not look for any fine-spun distinction, though the same general principle of emphasis exists. In the matter of ταῦτα πάντα (Lu. 12:30) and πάντα ταῦτα (Mt. 6:32) the first word carries the emphasis just as in πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος and ὁ ὄχλος πᾶς. Cf. πάντα τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος (1 Cor. 12:12) and οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες (1 Cor. 10:1) with ὁ πᾶς νόμος (Gal. 5:14). Note the common Greek σὺ τίς εἶ (Jo. 8:25). The vocative is often at the beginning of the sentence, as πατὴρ δίκαιε (Jo. 17:25), but not always, as in παρακλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί (1 Cor. 1:10). In Jo. 14:9 οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με, Φίλιππε the vocative naturally comes after the pronoun. It comes within the sentence, as ὦ θεόφιλε (Ac. 1:1), or at either end according as occasion requires. Some set phrases come in formal order, as ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες (Ac. 7:2), like our "brethren and sisters," "ladies and gentlemen," etc. Other conventional phrases are ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες (Ac. 8:3), χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων (Mt. 14:21), νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν (Ac. 20:31), σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα (Mt. 16:17), βρῶσις καὶ πόσις (Ro. 14:17), ζώτων καὶ νεκρῶν (Ac. 10:42); τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (Ac. 4:24), ἡλίῳ καὶ λόγῳ (Lu. 21:25), τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς (Mt. 11:25), ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ (Lu. 24:19), Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας (Ro. 3:9), δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος (Gal. 3:28). The adverb generally has second place, as ὑψηλὸν λίαν (Mt. 4:8), but not always, as λίαν γὰρ ἀνέστη (2 Tim. 4:15). Blass[1] notes that Matthew often puts the adverb after imperatives, as καταβάτω νῦν (Mt. 27:42), but before indicatives, as ἔτι ὑστερῶ (Mt. 19:20), a refinement somewhat unconscious, one may suppose. In general the words go together that make sense, and the interpretation is sometimes left to the reader's insight. In Eph. 2:3, ἤμεθα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, note the position of φύσει between τέκνα and ὀργῆς. In Ro. 8:3, κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, the adjunct ἐν τῇ σαρκί goes in sense with κατέκρινε, not ἁμαρτίαν. But this matter comes up again under the Article. In Mt. 2:2, εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, probably ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ belongs in sense to the subject ('we being in the east,' etc.).[2]

(e) EUPHONY AND RHYTHM. It will not do to say that em-

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 289.

[2] Porphyrios Logothetes as quoted by Agnes Lewis Smith in Exp. Times, Feb., 1908, p. 237.

phasis alone explains every unusual order of words in a Greek sentence. Take Jo. 9:6, for instance, **ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς**. Here **αὐτοῦ** is entirely removed from **ὀφθαλμούς** and is without particular emphasis. It was probably felt that the genitive of the pronouns made a weak close of a sentence. Observe also Jo. 9:10, **σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί** (cf. 9:11). Thus also 9:17, 26, 30. Note **ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας** (Jo. 11:32) and **οὐκ ἄν μου ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός** (ib.). So **σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας** (Jo. 13:6) where some emphasis by contrast may exist in spite of the enclitic form **μου.** Cf. **ὑμῖν ἐμοί** in Ph. 3:1. But on the other hand we have **ὁ ἀδελφός μου** in Jo. 11:21 (cf. 11:23 **σου**) and **τοῦ πατρός μου** (Jo. 10:18). The tendency to draw the pronouns toward the first part of the sentence may account for some of this transposition, as in **τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει** (Ac. 26:24), but the matter goes much beyond the personal pronouns, as in **ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ** (Ac. 1:5), **μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν** (Rev. 3:8), etc. But a large amount of personal liberty was exercised in such trajection of words.[1] Is there any such thing as *ryhthm* in the N. T.? Deissmann[2] scouts the idea. If one thinks of the carefully balanced sentences of the Attic orators like Isocrates, Lysias and Demosthenes, Deissmann is correct, for there is nothing that at all approaches such artificial rhythm in the N. T., not even in Luke, Paul or Hebrews. Blass[3] insists that Paul shows rhythm in 1 Cor. and that the book is full of art. He compares[4] Paul with Cicero, Seneca, Q. Curtius, Apuleius, and finds rhythm also in Hebrews which "not unfrequently has a really oratorical and choice order of words."[5] He cites in Heb. 1:4 **τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ᾽ αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα**; 1:5; 11:32; 12:1, 8, etc. In Greek in general he suggests that lively and animated discourse gives rise to dislocations of words. Now one would think Blass ought to know something of Greek style. But Deissmann will have none of it. He refers Blass to Schramm, who wrote in 1710 of *De stupenda eruditione Pauli apostoli* and thinks that Blass is wilful and arbitrary in his

[1] Boldt, De lib. Ling. Grac. et Lat. Colloc. Verb. Capita Sel., p. 186.

[2] Theol. Literaturzeit., 1906, p. 434; Exp., Jan., 1908, p. 74.

[3] Die Rhythmen der asian. and rim. Kunstprosa, 1905, pp. 43, 53.

[4] Ib., pp. 73 f., 77. Cf. Hadley, On Anc. Gk. Rhythm and Metre in Ess. Phil. and Crit., pp. 81 ff.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 288. Cf. Zarncke, Die Entstehung der griech. Literatursprachen, p. 5 f., for good remarks about rhythm. See also Dewing, The Orig. of the Accentual Prose Rhythm in Gk., Am. Jour, of Philol., 1910, pp. 313-328.

use and proof of rhythm. On the other hand Sir W. M. Ramsay[1] contends that Paul was a better Hellenist in point of culture than some suppose, and knew Greek philosophy and used it. It is after all partly a dispute about terms. If by rhythm one means grace and charm of diction that naturally belong to the expression of elevated ideas under the stress of chastened passion, surely one would be hypercritical to deny it to 1 Cor. 13 and 15, Ac. 17, Ro. 8 and 12, Eph. 3, Jo. 14-47, Heb. 2 and 11, not to mention many beautiful passages that seem perfect like pearls. At white heat nature often strikes off what is better than anything mere art can do even as to beauty of form and expression. Luke[2] may even have known Thucydides, and yet one has no right to expect the "niceties of language[3] in the vernacular which contribute so much to the charm of Plato." Intonation and gesture in spoken language take the place of these linguistic refinements to a very large extent. It is true that Paul's "Greek has to do with no school, with no model, but streams unhindered with overflowing bubbling direct out of the heart," but "yet is real Greek," as Wilamowitz-Mollendorff[4] remarks. Wilamowitz-Mollendorff does indeed hold that Paul knew little Greek outside of the Greek Bible, but he thinks that his letters are unique in Greek literature. On Paul's Hellenism see chapter IV, and also G. Milligan, *Epistles to the Thess.*, p. lv. On p. lvi Milligan takes the writer's view that the "well-ordered passages" and "splendid outbursts" in Paul's writings are due to natural emotion and instinctive feeling rather than studied art. Bultmann (*Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt and die Kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, 1910) finds that Paul had the essential elements of the Stoic Diatribe in his argumentative style (question and answer, antithesis, parallelism, etc.). Paul's art is indeed like that of the Cynic-Stoic Diatribe as described by Wendland,[5] but he does not have their refinement or overpunctiliousness.[6] It is not surprising to find that occasionally N. T. writers show unintentional metre, as is common with speakers and writets of any language. In the Textus Receptus of Heb. 12:13 there is a good hexameter, και τροχι| ας ορ|θας ποι|ησατε |τοις ποσιν|

[1] The Cities of Paul, 1908, pp. 6, 10, 34. Cf. Hicks, St. Paul and Hellen.

[2] J. H. Smith, Short Stud. on the Gk. Text of the Acts of the Apost., Pref.

[3] J. H. Moulton, Intr. to the Study of N. T. Gk., p. 7.

[4] Die griech. Lit. des Altert., p. 159. Tl. I, Abt. 8, Die Kultur der Gegenw., 1907. W. H. P. Hatch, J.B.L., 1909, p. 149 f., suggests τ᾽ ἀγ. in Jas. 1:17.

[5] Beitr. zur Gesch. der Gk. Phil. and Rel., 1905, p. 3 f.
J. Weiss, Beitr. zur Paulin. Rhet., 1897, p. 167 f.

υμων, but the critical text spoils it all by reading ποιεῖτε. So also one may find two trimeters in Heb. 12:14 f. (οὗ--ἀπό) one in Jo. 4:35 (τετράμηνός—ἔρχεται), one in Ac. 23:5 (ἄρχοντα--κακῶς). Green (*Handbook to the Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 356) cites the accidental English anapaestic line "To preach the acceptable year of the Lord," the hexameter "Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them," and the iambic couplet "Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace." But surely no one would call these writers poets because occasional metre is found in their writings. There is an unconscious harmony of soul between matter and form. Paul does indeed quote the Greek poets three times, once an iambic trimeter acataleptus from the comic poet Menander (1 Cor. 15:33) φθειρου| σιν η |θη χρη |στα ομι| λιαι| κακαι, though one anapaest occurs (some MSS. have χρησθ᾽), once half an hexameter from Aratus (Ac. 17:28) τοῦ γαρ| και γενος |εσμεν, and a full hexameter from Epimenides of Crete (Tit. 1:12) κρητες α| ει ψευ| σται κακα| θηρια |γαστερεσ| αργαι. How much more Paul knew of Greek poetry we do not know, but he was not ignorant of the philosophy of the Stoics and Epicureans in Athens. Blass[1] indeed thinks that the author of Hebrews studied in the schools of rhetoric where prose rhythm was taught, such as the careful balancing of ending with ending, beginning with beginning, or ending with beginning. He thinks he sees proof of it in Heb. 1:1 f., 3, 4 f.; 12:14 f., 24. But here again one is inclined to think that we have rather the natural correspondence of form with thought than studied rhetorical imitation of the schools of Atticism or even of Asianism. We cannot now follow the lead of the old writers who saw many fanciful artistic turns of phrase.' Antitheses and parallelisms could be treated here as expressions of rhythm, but they can be handled better in the chapter on Figures of Speech. As a specimen of an early Christian hymn note 1 Tim. 3:16. Harnack (*The Independent,* Dec. 28, 1912) takes this as a Christmas hymn. Elizabeth (Lu. 1: 42-45), Mary (1:46-55) and Zacharias (1:67-79) break forth into poetic strains with something of Hebrew spirit and form. In Eph. 5:14 we have another possible fragment of a Christian hymn. The Lord's Prayer in Mt. 6: 9-13 is given in metrical arrangement by W. H. Cf. Hort, *Intr. to N. T. in Gk.*, p. 319 f. In general on N. T. parallelism see Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 297 f.

[2] Cf., for instance, Gersdorf, Beitr. zur Sprachcharakt. d. Schriftst. d. N.T., 1816, pp. 90, 502.

and *Messiah of the Apostles*. In 1 Cor. 13 one can see the beauty and melody of a harmonious arrangement of words. See also the latter part of 1 Cor. 15.

(f) PROLEPSIS is not uncommon where either the substantive is placed out of its right place before the conjunction in a subordinate clause like **τὴν ἀγάπην ἵνα γνῶτε** (2 Cor. 2:4) and **βιωτικὰ κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε** (1 Cor. 6:4), or the subject of the subordinate clause even becomes the object of the previous verb like **ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστιν** (Lu. 19:3). Cf. Ac. 13:32. But this betokens no studied art. Cf. Mk. 8:24; Lu. 10:26; Ro. 9:19, 20; 14:, 10; 1 Cor. 15:36. So **ἡμῖν** in Ac. 3:12.

(g) HYSTERON PROTERON. We occasionally meet also an example of **ὕστερον πρότερον** like **ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντος** (Jo. 1:51), a natural inversion from our point of view. But Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 553) does not admit this figure in the N. T. Certainly not all the apparent examples are real. The order of **πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν** (Jo. 6:69) is just as true as that of **ἔγνωσαν καὶ ἐπίστευσαν** (Jo. 17:8). Cf. also **περιπατῶν καὶ ἁλλόμενος** (Ac. 3:8) and **ἥλατο καὶ περιεπάτει** (Ac. 14:10) where each order suits the special case. Cf. 1 Tim. 2:4 and 2 Pet. 1:9 for alleged examples that disappear on close examination.

(h) HYPERBATON. Adverbs sometimes appear to be in the wrong place, a phenomenon common in all Greek prose writers. In 1 Cor. 14:7 **ὅμως** would come in more smoothly just before etv, but it is perfectly intelligible where it is. Cf. also Gal. 3:15 for similar use of **ὅμως**. Cf. distance of **ἤδη** from **κεῖται** (Mt. 3:10). In Ro. 3:9 **οὐ πάντως** is our 'not at all,' while in 1 Cor. 16:12 **πάντως οὐκ** 'wholly not,' just as in 1 Cor. 15:51 **πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα** means 'all of us shall not sleep,' not 'none of us shall sleep.' Cf. also **οὐ πάντως** in 1 Cor. 5:9 f., an explanation of the negative **μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι** just before, 'not wholly.' In the case of **οὐ μόνον** in Ro. 4:12, 16, the words **οὐ μόνον** are separated and in 4:12 the repetition of the article **τοῖς** makes **οὐ μόνον** seem quite misplaced. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 555) is certainly right in insisting that **οὐχ ὅτι** (2 Cor. 3:5) is not to be treated as **ὅτι οὐκ**. Cf. **οὐχ ἵνα—ἀλλ' ἵνα** (2 Cor. 13:7). A more difficult passage is found in Heb. 11:3, **εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι**, where **μή** is the negative of the phrase **ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι**. In general the negative comes before the word or words that are negatived. Hence **οὐκ εἴων** (Ac.19:30), **οὐκ ἔστιν** (Gal. 3:20). But note **μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε** (Jas. 3:1). Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 257) notes the possible am-

biguity in Ac. 7:48 because of the use of **οὐχ** before **ὁ ὕψιστος** instead of before **κατοικεῖ**. Observe in strong contrasts how ot; stands over against **ἀλλά** (Ro. 2:13). Blass[1] has little sympathy with the grammatical device of hyperbaton to help out exegesis. The construction, found in **ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε** (Jo. 11:18) has been supposed to be a Latinism when compared with Lu. 24:13. So also with **πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα** (Jo. 12:1) was formerly considered a Latinism. But Moulton[2] shows conclusively that it is Doric and Ionic before the possibility of Latin influence, and besides is common in the **κοινή** papyri, a mere coincidence with the Latin. See also ch. XIII, VII, (m), 5.

(i) POSTPOSITIVES. A number of words are always postpositive in Greek. In the N. T. **ἄν, γάρ, γέ, δέ, μέν, μέντοι, οὖν, τε** never begin a sentence, in harmony with ancient Greek usage. These words commonly in the N. T. come in the second place, always so with **μέντοι** (Jo. 4:27, etc.). In the case of **μέν**, the third place is occasionally found as 1 Pet. 2:4, the fourth as 2 Cor. 10:1, the fifth in Eph. 4:11; Jo. 16:22, or even the sixth in Jas. 3:17. It occupies the seventh place in Herm. Sim. viii, 5:1 (Mr. H. Scott has noted). In general these words vary in position according to the point to be made in relation to other words. So also **οὖν** is more commonly in the second, but varies to the third (Jo. 16:22) and fourth (1 Cor. 8:4). The same remark applies to **γάρ**, for which see Mk. 1:38; 2 Cor. 1:19. As to **δέ,** may not only go to the fourth place (Jo. 8:16), but even appears in the fifth (1 Jo. 2:2), **οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δέ.** It stands in the sixth place in Test. XII. Patr. Judah, 9:1 (Mr. H. Scott reports). In the case of **γε** it follows naturally the word with which it belongs as in Ro. 8:32 **(ὅς γε)**, even in the case of **ἀλλά γε** (Lu. 24:21) which is always separated in the older Greek. Cf. also **εἴ γε** Eph. 3:2. **Ἄν** in the apodosis (not= **ἐάν**) or with relatives or conjunctives, never begins a clause in Greek. It is usually the second word in the apodosis, either after the verb, as **εἶπον ἄν** (Jo. 14:2), or after **οὐκ,** as **οὐκ ἄν** (Mk. 13:20), or the interrogative, as **τίς ἄν** (Lu. 9:46). With the relative **ἄν** follows directly or as the third word, as **ὃς ἄν** and **ὃς δ' ἄν** (Mt. 23:16). **Τε** usually follows the word directly, as in **πονηρούς τε** (Mt. 22:10), even after a preposition, as **σύν τε χιλίαρχοις** (Ac. 25:23); but note **τῶν ἐθνῶν τε** (Ac. 14:5).

(j) FLUCTUATING WORDS. There is another group of words that vary in the matter, now postpositive, now not. Thus **ἄρα**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 290.
[2] Prol., pp. 100 ff. Cf. also LXX, as Amos 1:1; 4:7, etc.

may be first in the clause (Mt. 12:28), contrary to older Greek custom. So also ἄραγε (Mt. 7:20) and ἄρα οὖν (Ro. 7:3). Except in a few instances like Ro. 8:1 the examples where ἄρα is post-positive in the N. T. are in questions after the interrogative or after a conjunction. Once (Ro. 10:18) μενοῦνγε begins the sentence. **Τοίνυν** occurs only three times and twice begins the sentence (Lu. 20:25; Heb. 13:13) as τοιγαροῦν does (Heb. 12:1). The indefinite τὶς sometimes comes first in the sentence, as τινὲς δέ (Lu. 6:2). Enclitics can therefore stand at the beginning, though not commonly so. In the case of ἕνεκεν its position is usually before the word except with the interrogative, as τίνος ἕνεκεν (Ac. 19:32), or a relative, as οὗ εἵνεκεν (Lu. 4:18). But χάριν follows its case save in χάριν τίνος (1 Jo. 3:12). **Χ**ωρίς precedes the word, but note οὗ χωρίς (Heb. 12:14). The N. T. therefore shows rather more freedom with these words.

(k) THE ORDER OF CLAUSES IN COMPOUND SENTENCES. Blass[1] considers this a matter of style rather than of grammar. When the whole sentence is composed of a principal clause, with one or more subordinate clauses, the order of these clauses is largely dependent on the flow of thought in the speaker's mind. In the case of conditional as Mt. 17:4, final as in Mt. 17:27, and relative clauses as in Mt. 16:25, the dependent by rule precedes the principal clause. There is usually a logical basis for this order. But in Jo. 19:28 the final clause somewhat interrupts the flow of the sentence. Cf. also Ro. 9:11. In 2 Cor. 8:10, οἵτινες οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι, there is no violent change of order. Logically the willing preceded the doing and makes the natural climax. Blass[2] is undoubtedly right in refusing to take τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην as dependent on εἰ κατέχετε (1 Cor. 15:2). In Jo. 10:36 we meet a somewhat tangled sentence because the antecedent of ὅν is not expressed. Here λέγετε is the principal verb, the apodosis of the condition, and has two objects (the relative clause and the ὅτι clause) with a causal clause added. So in Jo. 10:38 we have a good example of the complex sentence with two conditions, a final clause, an object-clause, besides the principal clause.[3]

XI. Compound Sentences.

(a) TWO KINDS OF SENTENCES. The sentence is either simple or compound. The compound is nothing but two simple sentences

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 291. [2] Ib.

[3] On the whole subject of the position of words in the sentence see K.-G., Bd. II, pp. 592-604.

put together. All that is true of one part of this compound sentence may be true of the other as to subject and predicate. The same linguistic laws apply to both. But in actual usage each part of the compound sentence has its own special development. The two parts have a definite relation to each other. Originally men used only simple sentences. Cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 552.

(b) TWO KINDS OF COMPOUND SENTENCES (*Paratactic and Hypotactic*). In parataxis (παράταξις) we have co-ordination of two parallel clauses. Take Mk. 14:37 as an example, **καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ**. In hypotaxis (ὑπόταξις) one clause is subordinated to the other, as in **οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε** (Mk. 10:38) where **τί αἰτεῖσθε** is in the accusative case, the object of **οἴδατε**. Parataxis is the rule in the speech of children, primitive men, unlettered men and also of Homer. Cf. Sterrett, *Homer's Iliad,* N. 49.

On the two kinds of sentences see Paul, *Principles of Language,* p. 139 f. See also Delbruck, *Vergl. Syntax,* 3. Tl., pp. 259-286; Brugmann, *Griech. Gr*., pp. 551 ff.; Kuhner-Gerth, Bd. II, p. 351.

(c) PARATACTIC SENTENCES. They are very common in the Sanskrit and in Homer (cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr*., p. 555) and in the Hebrew. In truth in the vernacular generally and the earlier stages of language parataxis prevails. It is more common with some writers than with others, John, for instance, using it much more frequently than Paul or even Luke. In John **καί** sometimes is strained to mean 'and yet,' as in 3:19; 4:20, etc.[1] The **κοινή** shows a decided fondness for the paratactic construction which in the modern Greek is still stronger (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 184). As in the modern Greek, so in the N. T. **καί**, according to logical sequence of thought, carries the notion of 'but,' 'that,' besides 'and yet,' introducing quasi-subordinate clauses. For details concerning paratactic conjunctions see chapter on Particles. In the use of **καί** (cf. Heb.7) after **ἐγένετο** the paratactic **καί** borders very close on to the hypotactic **ὅτι**. Thus **ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ --αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν** (Lu. 9:51).

(d) HYPOTACTIC SENTENCES. They are introduced either by relative pronouns or conjunctions, many of which are relatives in origin and others adverbs. The subject of conjunctions will demand special and extended treatment later on (chapters on Modes and on Particles), and so will relative clauses. On the use of the relative thus see Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.,* p. 553. The propensity of the later Greek for parataxis led to an impoverishment of particles.

[1] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 135,

Hypotactic sentences, once more, are either substantival, adjectival or adverbial, in their relation to the principal or another subordinate clause. Thus in Lu. 22:2 **τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν** is the substantive object of **ἐζήτουν**, as **τὸ τίς εἴη** is of **συνζητεῖν** in Lu. 22:23. As a sample of the subject-clause in the nominative take **οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα** (Mk. 4:38). In Mt. 7:12 **ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε** is an adjective sentence and describes **πάντα**. In Mt. 6:16 **ὅταν νηστεύητε** is an adverb in its relation to **γίνεσθε**.

In the beginning the hypotactic sentence corresponded closely to the principal sentence. Cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 554. On the whole subject of substantive, adjective and adverb sentences see Kuhner-Gerth, Bd. II, pp. 354-465. The matter has further discussion under Modes (Subordinate Clauses).

XII. Connection in Sentences.

(a) SINGLE WORDS. These have connectives in a very natural[1] way, as **δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν—δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους** (Lu. 9:1). But common also is **καί--καί** (Jo. 2:14), **τε—καί** (2:15), and rarely **τε — τε** (Ac. 26:16). This tendency to break up into pairs is well shown in Ac.. 2:9-11. For see Mt. 5:17, **ἀλλά** 2 Cor. 7:11, **οὐδέ** Rev. 5:3. In enumerations the repetition of **καί** gives a kind of solemn dignity and is called polysyndeton. Cf. Rev. 7:12 **ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ.** Cf. also Rev. 4:11; 5:12; Ro. 9:4. Note also a similar repetition of **οὔτε** Ro. 8:38 f. For **μήτε** see Jas. 5:12. So with in Mk. 10:29. Perhaps, as Blass suggests,[2] polysyndeton is sometimes necessary and devoid of any particular rhetorical effect, as in Lu. 14:21. But asyndeton is frequent also. It often gives emphasis. See Mt. 15:19; Jo. 5:3; 1 Cor. 14:24; 15:1 f. For a striking example of asyndeton see Ro. 1:29-31, where some variety is gained by change in construction (case) and the use of adjective instead of substantive, **πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ, μεστοὺς φθόνου φόνου ἔριδος δόλου κακοηθίας, ψιθυριστάς, καταλάλους, θεοστυγεῖς, ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνας, ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀνελεήμονας.** Cf. also 1 Cor. 3:12. Sometimes the connective is used with part of the list (pairs) and not with the rest, for the sake of variety, as in 1 Tim. 1:9 f. An example like **εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως** is compared by Blass[3] to *nolens volens.*

[1] On the whole subject of connection in sentences see Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., 3. TI., pp. 406-437; Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 551-566; K.-G., Bd. 11, pp. 224-515. On asyndeton in general see Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., pp. 342-358.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 277. [3] Ib.

(b) CLAUSES. But connection is by no means uniform between sentences. This remark applies to both the paratactic and the hypotactic sentences. Asyndeton in sentences and clauses is on the whole repugnant to the Greek language in the opinion of Blass.[1] Hence compound sentences in the N. T. usually have connectives, but not always.

1. *Paratactic Sentences*. The co-ordinating conjunctions form the most frequent means of connecting clauses into one paratactic sentence. These conjunctions will receive special treatment in the chapter on Particles and here only some illustrations can be given. **Καί, τε, δέ οὐδέ μηδέ, μέν** and **δέ, οὔτε,** ἀλλά are the most frequent particles used for this purpose. They are more common indeed in historical writings, as in the Gospels and Acts. But in the Gospels the use of **καί** varies a good deal. Mark, for instance, has it more than 400 times, while John contains it only 100.[2] Deissmann calls this use of **καί** primitive popular Greek. The presence of dialogue in John hardly explains all the difference, and even in John the first chapter uses it much more frequently than the last. As a good example of the use of **καί** turn to Mt. 4:23-25. Cf. Lu. 6:13--17 and Mk. 9:2. **Τε** is common chiefly in the Acts, as 14:11-13. Sometimes the use of **καί** between clauses amounted to polysyndeton, as in Jo. 10:3, 9, 12. **Δε** is perhaps less common in clauses (Jo. 4:6) except with **μέν** (Mt. 3:11). For **δὲ καί** see Jo. 2:2. **Οὐδέ** is illustrated by Mt. 5:15, ἀλλά 5:17, are by Ac. 28:21. But asyndeton appears also, as in Lu. 6:27 f., **ἀγαπᾶτε, ποιεῖτε, εὐλογεῖτε, προσέχεσθε**, even if it be to a limited extent. Cf. Gal. 5:22. Blass[3] points out that that is not a case of asyndeton where a demonstrative pronoun is used which reflects the connection. Cf. thus the use of **τοῦτον**, in Ac. 16:3; Jo. 5:6. Winer[4] finds asyndeton frequent in cases of a climax in impassioned discourse, as in 1 Cor. 4:8, **ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ· ἤδη ἐπλουτήσταε, χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε**. The absence of the connective gives life and movement, as in **σιώπα, πεφίμωσο** (Mk. 4:39). Observe also **ὕπαγε πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι** (Mt. 5:24), **ὕπαγε ἔλεγξον** (18:15), **ἔγειρε ἆρον** (Mk. 2:11), **ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν** (Mt. 26:46), **ἄγε, κλαύσατε** (Jas. 5:1). This use of **ἄγε** is common in the old Greek (Gildersleeve, *Greek Syntax,* p. 29). But in Jo. 1:46 we have **ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε**. In 1 Tim. 3:16 the fragment of an early hymn is neatly balanced in Hebrew parallelism.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gr., p. 276.

[2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 134. On the subject of asyndeton in John see Abbott, pp. 69 ff, [3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 276. [4] W.-Th., p. 538.

Ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί,
ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι,
ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις,
ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν,
ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ
ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.

Here the connective would be quite out of place.

In contrast the connective may also be absent, as in **ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε, ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἴδαμεν** (Jo. 4:22). So Ac. 25:12. Cf. in particular 1 Cor. 15:42 ff., **σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ· σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ· σπείρεται ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δυνάμει· σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν**. Here the solemn repetition of the verbs is like the tolling of a bell. Cf. also Jas. 1:19, **ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν**. John is rather fond of repetition with asyndeton in his report of Jesus' words, as **ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν παρέρα εἰ μή δι ἐμοῦ** (14:6). Cf. 10:11; 15:13, etc. But this sort of asyndeton occurs elsewhere also, as in 1 Cor. 7:15, **οὐ δεδούλωται ὁ ἀδελφός**. Cf. also 7:23; Rev. 22:13. A common asyndeton in Luke occurs after **καὶ ἐγένετο** without another **καί**, as **εἶπέν τις** (11:1).

2. *Hypotactic Sentences.* In the nature of the case they usually have connectives. The subordinating conjunctions are more necessary to the expression of the exact shade of thought than in paratactic clauses. The closeness of connection varies greatly in various kinds of subordinate clauses and often in clauses of the same kind. The use of the correlative accents this point, as **οἷος ὁ ἐπουράνιος, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ ἐπουράνιοι** (1 Cor. 15:48); **ὥσπερ—οὕτως** (Mt. 12:40). But real antithesis may exist without the correlative, as in Mt. 5:48; 6:2. In relative clauses the bond is very close and is sometimes made closer by agreement of the relative and antecedent not only in number and gender but even in case, as **οἷς** (Lu. 2:20) and **τὸν ἄρτον ὅν** (1 Cor. 10:16). There may be several relative clauses either co-ordinate (Ac. 3:2 f.) or subordinate to another (Ac. 13:31; 25:15 f.). So also the use of **εἶτα, τότε, ἄρα, καί, ἀλλά, δέ** in the apodosis accents the logical connection of thought. Cf. Mt. 12:28; Mk. 13:14; Jo. 7:10; 20:21; 1 Cor. 15:54; 2 Cor. 7:12, etc. But much closer than with temporal, comparative, conditional, or even some relative clauses is the tie between the principal clause and the subordinate objective, consecutive, final and causal clauses. These are directly de-

pendent on the leading clause. Interrogative sentences when in indirect discourse really become object-clauses, like **τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη** (Lu. 22:23), object of **συνζητεῖν**. The **ὅτι, ἵνα, ὅπως** (and **ὡς** rarely) clauses are closely knit to the principal clause as subject, object (direct or indirect) of the verb. There is a natural interblending between object and causal sentences, as shown by the use of **ὅτι** for both and **διότι**, in late Greek in the sense of 'that,' objective **ὅτι**. Cf. *quod* and *quia* in late Latin, and English the "reason that" and colloquial the "reason why." In Greek **ὅτι** even interchanges with **εἰ** (cf. English "wonder if" and "wonder that"). So **ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν** (Mk. 15:44). Cf. Ac. 8:22; 26:8. Clauses with the consecutive idea usually have the infinitive in the N. T. Hypotactic sentences cannot be here discussed in detail, but only as illustrating the point of connection between sentences. Winer[1] is hardly right in describing as asyndeton Jas. 5:13, **κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν· προσευχέσθω**, where **εἰ** is not used, and the structure is paratactic. He cites also **δοῦλος ἐκλήθης; μή σοι μελέτω** (1 Cor. 7:21). The questions in Jas. 2:19 f. are also paratactic. But more certain examples exist than these, where either a conjunction has dropped out or, as is more likely, we have original parataxis. Thus **ἄφες ἐκβάλω** (Mt. 7:4), **ἄφες ἴδωμεν** (Mt. 27:49) can be compared with **δεῦτε ἴδετε** (Mt. 28:6), **δεῦρο ἀποστείλω** (Ac. 7:34), **δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν** (Mk. 12:7) and the common Greek idiom with **ἄγε, φέρε**. Jas. 5:1. In Mk. 15:36 note **ἄφετε ἴδωμεν**. One verb really supplements the other much as the infinitive or participle. Cf. English "let us see." In the modern Greek as (abbreviation of **ἄφες**) is used uniformly as the English and almost like a particle. Of a similar nature is the asyndeton with **θέλεις συλλέξωμεν** (Mt. 13:28) and **βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω** (Jo. 18:39). Cf. **θέλετε ποιήσω** (Mk. 10:36). Cf. also **ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν** (Mt. 26:46) above. These are all paratactic in origin, though hypotaetic in logical sequence. But see chapter on Modes for further details. In the case of **ὅρα, ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε**, we can find examples of both the conjunctional use of **μή** and clear cases of asyndeton with some on the border line. Thus clearly conjunctional **μή** is found in **βλεπέτω μὴ πέσῃ** (1 Cor. 10:12), **βλέπετε μὴ ἐπέλθῃ** (Ac. 13:40), **βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε** (Heb. 12:25). Asyndeton is undoubtedly in **ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς** (Mk. 1:44) with which compare **ὕπαγε δεῖξον** in the same verse. Cf. also Mt. 8:4. Thus again **ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω** (Mt. 9:30) where note two imperatives as in **ὁρᾶτε, μὴ θροεῖσθε** (Mt. 24:6). But in **βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ** (Mt. 24:4) and

[1] W.-Th., p. 541.

ὁρᾶτε μή τις ἀποδῷ (1 Th. 5:15) the asyndeton is more doubtful, since μή can be regarded as a conjunction. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:20.

3. *The Infinitive and Participle as Connectives*. A very common connection is made between clauses by means of the infinitive or the participle, sometimes with particles like ὥστε and πρίν with the infinitive or ὡς, ὥσπερ, καίπερ, with the participle, but usually without a particle. The **infinitive** often is used with the article and a preposition, as ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν (Lu. 9:34). Usually the infinitive is brought into the closest connection with the verb as subject (τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι, Ro. 7:18) or object (βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι ἄνδρας, 1 Tim. 2:8), or in a remoter relation, as ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι (Mk. 4:3). The **participle** sometimes is an essential part of the predicate, as ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν (Lu. 5:4), or again it may be a mere addendum or preliminary or even an independent statement. Thus observe εἰσελθών, διαλεγόμενος καὶ πείθων in Ac. 19:8. As further examples of participles somewhat loosely strung together without a connective in more or less close relation to each other and the principal sentence see Ac. 12:25; 16:27; 23:27. The genitive absolute is common in such accessory participles. The only point to consider concerning the infinitive and participle here is the frequency with which they are used in the structure of the Greek sentence. Thus long sentences are easily constructed and sometimes the connection is not clear. Frequent examples of anacoluthon come from the free use of the participle, as will be shown later. See χειροτονηθείς and στελλόμενοι as instances in 2 Cor. 8:19 f. By means of the infinitive and participle the Greek enjoyed much elasticity and freedom which the modern Greek has lost. In modern Greek conjunctions and finite verbs have very largely displaced the infinitive and the participle. Even in the N. T. a tendency in that direction is discernible, as is seen in the use of ἵνα with θέλω (Mk. 6:25), ἀφίημι (Mk. 11:16). One is inclined to think that Viteau[1] overstates it when he says that the N. T. writers have a natural and general inability to combine and subordinate the elements of thought and so express them separately and make an abnormal use of asyndeton. I would rather say that there is a great simplicity and directness due partly to the colloquial style and the earnestness of the writers. They are men with a message rather than philosophical ramblers. But part of this absence of subordination may be due to the Hebrew temper as in John, and part to the general spirit of the time as less concerned, save in the

[1] Le Verbe, Synt. des Prop., p. 9.

case of the Atticists, with the niceties of style. Clearness and force were the main things with these N. T. writers. They use connectives or not as best suits their purposes. But the infinitive construction and the conjunction construction must not be regarded as identical even in the N. T. Note καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη (Mk. 14:21), ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι (1 Jo. 5:2), βουλὴ ἐγένετο ἵνα (Ac. 27:42).

(c) TWO KINDS OF STYLE. There are indeed two kinds of style in this matter, the running (εἰρομένη) and the periodic (ἐν περιόδοις) or compact (κατεστραμμένη), to use Aristotle's terminology.[1] In the words of Blass[2] the running or continuous style is characteristic of the oldest prose as well as unsophisticated, unconventional prose like the vernacular κοινή and hence is the usual form in the N. T. The periodic style, on the other hand, belongs to "artistically developed prose" like that of Demosthenes and Thucydides. As a matter of fact the 0. T. narrative is also in the running style, while the prophets sometimes use the periodic. The longer N. T. sentences are usually connected by καί or use asyndeton as shown above. But occasionally something approaching a real period appears somewhat like that of the great Greek writers, but by no means so frequently. Interesting examples of some length may be found in Lu. 1:1-4; Ac. 15:24-26; 26:10-14, 16-18; Ro. 1:1-7; 1 Pet. 3:18-22; 2 Pet. 1:2-7; Heb. 2:2-4. In Lu. 1:1-4 Blass[2] notes that the protasis has three clauses and the apodosis two, while in Heb. 1:1-3 he finds some ten divisions of the sentence which is not so neatly balanced as the passage in Luke. It is noticeable that Luke uses this classic idiom nowhere else in his Gospel, while the Epistle to the Hebrews has a fluent oratorical style of no little beauty. Chapter 11 finds a splendid peroration in 12:1 f., which should belong to chapter 11 as the closing period in the discussion about the promises. Cf. a similar peroration, though not in one sentence, in Ro. 11:33-36. So also Ro. 8:31-39, where verses 38 and 39 form a really eloquent period. Blass[3] indeed gives a rather free interpretation to the term period and applies it to sentences of only two parts like a conditional sentence when the condition comes first, sentences with antithesis with μέν — δέ, disjunctive clauses with ἤ or parallelisms with τε—καί. He even finds a period in a case of asyndeton like 1 Cor. 7:27. But this is to make nearly all complex sentences periods. Blass'

[1] Arist. Rhet., iii. 9. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 275, who amplifies this point.

[2] Ib.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 280.

opinion on this point is to be borne in mind when he argues for literary rhythm on a considerable scale in the N. T. Paul indeed has some noble periods like Eph. 1:3-14; 2:14-18; 3:14-19. He would show many more than he does but for the fact that he seems to grow impatient with the fetters of a long sentence and breaks away in anacoluthon which mars the fulness and symmetry of the sentence as a period. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:18-21; Ro. 12: 6-8; Col. 1:9-23. In Ro. 3:7 f. the καθώς and ὅτι clauses make a not very strong culmination. The ground element in Paul's speech is the short sentence. Only occasionally does he combine these into a period.[1] But Paul does use antithetic and comparative particles and apposition. One other reason for the absence of rhetorical periods is the avoidance of prolonged passages of indirect discourse. In truth none of that nature occurs at all, so that we do not have in the N. T. passages of much length in indirect discourse such as one meets in Xenophon or Thucydides (cf. Caesar). But the quotations are usually direct either with recitative ὅτι (Mt. 9:18) or without (Mt. 9:22). Winer[2] well remarks that what the style thus loses in periodic compactness, it gains in animation and vividness. But the use of the participle in giving periodic compactness is to be noticed, as in Ac. 23:27. The attraction of the relative to the case of its antecedent, as already observed, adds another bond of union to the compactness of the relative sentence as in Lu. 5:9.

(d) THE PARENTHESIS (παρένθεσις). Such a clause, inserted in the midst of the sentence without proper syntactical connection, is quite common in the N. T.[3] Once the editors used too many parentheses in the N. T., but the number is still considerable. The term is somewhat loosely applied to clauses that really do not interrupt the flow of the thought. Thus it is not necessary to find a parenthesis in Jo. 7:39. The γάρ clause is merely explanatory. The same thing is true of Jo. 9:30 and Ac. 13:8. Certainly not every explanatory remark is to be regarded as parenthetical. On the other hand even a relative clause may be regarded as parenthetical where it is purely by the way as the interpretation of **Ῥαββεί** (Jo. 1:38 ὅ λέγεται) and of **Μεσσίαν** (ὅ ἐστιν, etc., Jo. 1:41). But see Mk. 7:11. Editors indeed will

[1] J. Weiss, Beitr. zur Paulin. Rhet., Theol. Stud., 1897, p. 167.

[2] W.-Th., p. 545.

[3] For the Joh. use of parenthesis see Abbott, Joh. Gr., pp. 470-480. John is fond of the resumptive ay after a parenthesis, as in 2:18; 3:25; 4:28. On the parenthesis in general see K.-G., Bd. II, pp. 353, 602.

differ as to what constitutes a parenthesis as in the case of Mk. 3:16 where W. H. use the marks of parenthesis while Nestle does not consider this a parenthesis. In Jo. 1:15 W. H. print a double parenthesis, using the dash inside the parenthetical marks. Here again Nestle has the colon instead of the clash and the full stop in lieu of the parenthetical marks. W. H. are not uniform in the indication of the parenthesis. They do it by the curved lines ( ) as in Mk. 3:16, or the dash as in Jo. 7:22; 10:12, or merely the comma as in the short phrases like **φησίν** (2 Cor. 10:10), or again with no punctuation at all as in the case of **δοκεῖτε** (Heb. 10:29). The insertion of one or two words in the midst of the sentence is the simplest form of the parenthesis, like **πολλοί, λέγω ἡμῖν, ζητήσουσιν** (Lu. 13:24) and **ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν, μαρτυρῶ, καί** (2 Cor. 8:3). Cf. **φησίν** (Mt. 14:8), **ἔφη** (Ac. 23:35), **οὐ ψεύδομαι** (Ro. 9:1), **ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω** (2 Cor. 11:21), etc. But the insertion of **φησίν** and **ἔφη** between words is rare in the N. T. Cf. Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 200. A very interesting parenthesis is the insertion in the speech of Jesus to the paralytic, of **λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ** (Mk. 2:10). Mt. (9:6) adds **τότε**. Lu. (5:24) has **εἶπεν τῷ παραλελυμένῳ**. The Synoptists all had the same source here. These phrases, common also to the ancient Greek, do not need marks of parenthesis, and the comma is sufficient. A little more extended parenthesis is found in a clause like, **ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάνης** (Jo. 1:6), **Νικόδημος ὄνομα αὐτῷ** (Jo. 3:1), though this again may be considered merely a form of apposition. A more distinct parenthesis still is the insertion of a note of time like **ἦσαν δὲ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων** (Ac. 12:3). Thackeray (*Gr.*, p. 149 note) notes a tendency in the LXX to put numeral statements in parenthesis. Note also the explanatory parenthesis in Ac. 1:15 introduced by **τε**. Cf. also **ὥσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ** in Lu. 9:28, which can be explained oherwise. In Mt. 24:15 the parenthetical command of Matthew or of Jesus, **ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω**, is indicated by W. H. only with the comma. In general the historical books have fewer parentheses than the Epistles, and naturally so. In Paul it is sometimes hard to draw the line between the mere parenthesis and anacoluthon. Cf. 1 Cor. 16:5; Ro. 5:12 (18); 9:11; 15:23-28. **Οὖν** may look back beyond the parenthesis as in Jo. 4:7 ff. (Abbott, Johannine Grammar, p. 470). See Jo. 10:35 **καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή**. Cf. the sharp interruption in Jo. 4:1-3. In Gal. 2:5 f. we have two parentheses right together marked by the dash in W. H.'s text, besides anacoluthon. Cf. Lu. 23:51, Col. 1:21 f. for parenthesis of some length. But see 2 Pet. 2:8 for a still longer

one, not to mention 2 Cor. 9:12; Heb. 7:20 f.; Lu. 6:4. See Viteau, *Etude*, 1896, p. 11. As illustrating once more the wide difference of opinion concerning the parenthesis, Blass[1] comments on the harshness of the parenthesis in Ac. 5:14, while W. H. do not consider that there is a parenthesis in the sentence at all. At bottom the parenthesis in the text is a matter of exegesis. Thus if in Jo. 13:1 ff. εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς be regarded as a parenthesis and verses 1-5 be considered one sentence (note repetition of εἰδώς) a much simpler construction is the result.[2] Instead of a parenthesis a writer switches off to one aspect of a subject and then comes back in another sentence as Paul does in 1 Cor. 8:1-4. He resumes by the repetition of περὶ--εἰδωλοθύτων οἴδαμεν. Cf. also a similar resumption in Eph. 3:14 τούτου χάριν after the long digression in verses 1-13. This construction is not, however, a technical parenthesis.

(e) ANACOLUTHON. But a more violent break in the connection of sentences than the parenthesis is anacoluthon. This is merely the failure to complete a sentence as intended when it was begun (ἀνακόλουθον). The completion does not follow grammatically from the beginning. The N. T. writers are not peculiar in this matter, since even in an artistic orator like Isocrates such grammatical blemishes, if they be so considered, are found.[3] And a careful historian like Thucydides will have ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς—ἐπικαλοῦντες (iii. 36. 2). It is just in writers of the greatest mental activity and vehemence of spirit that we meet most instances of anacoluthon. Hence a man with the passion of Paul naturally breaks away from formal rules in the structure of the sentence when he is greatly stirred, as in Gal. and 2 Cor. Such violent changes in the sentence are common in conversation and public addresses. The dialogues of Plato have many examples. The anacoluthon may be therefore either intentional or unintentional. The writer may be led off by a fresh idea or by a parenthesis, or he may think of a better way of finishing his sentence, one that will be more effective. The very jolt that is given by the anacoluthon is often successful in making more emphasis. The attention is drawn anew to the sentence to see what is the matter. Some of the anacolutha belong to other languages with equal pertinence, others are peculiar to the Greek genius. The participle in particular is a very common occasion

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 279.

[2] S. M. Provence, Rev. and Exp., 1905, p. 96.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 282. On the anacoluthon see K.-G., Bd. II, pp. 588-592.

for anacoluthon. The Apocalypse, as already shown, has many examples of anacoluthon. The more important N. T. illustrations of anacoluthon will now be given. It is difficult to make a clear grouping of the examples of anacoluthon in the N. T. on any scientific principle. But the following will answer.

1. *The Suspended Subject*. What Abbott[1] calls the suspended subject finds illustration elsewhere than in John, though he does have his share. It may be looked at indeed as suspended object as well sometimes. The point is that the substantive, pronoun or participle is left by the wayside and the sentence is completed some other way. Thus in **πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργὸν ὃ λαλήσουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀποδώσουσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ**, (Mt. 12:36) observe how **πᾶν ῥῆμα** is dropped in the construction and **περὶ αὐτοῦ** used. In **πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσει—ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ** (Mt. 10:32) the same principle holds in regard to **πᾶς** and **ἐν αὐτῷ**. But in the same verse the regular construction obtains in **ὅστις ἀρνήσηται—ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτόν**. In Lu. 6:47 **πᾶς ὁ ερχόμενος κτλ., ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι ἐστὶν ὅμοιος** we see a similar anacoluthon unless **πᾶς ὁ ἐρχ.** be regarded as a rather violent prolepsis of the subject, which is not so likely in this instance. In Lu. 11:11 the anacoluthon is not quite so simple, though **τίνα** is after all left to itself (**τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύν, μη ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει**;). If instead of **τίνα** the sentence read **εἰ** or **ἐάν**, all would go smoothly except that **ἐξ ὑμῶν** would be slightly awkward. Observe that **αἰτήσει** has two accusatives without **τίνα**. The apodosis is introduced by and as an interrogative clause expects the answer "no." But in spite of the grammatical hopelessness of the sentence it has great power. In Lu. 12:48 the matter is simpler (**παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ**). Here two things are true. We not only have the stranded subject (cf. **παρ᾽ αυτοῦ**), but it has been attracted into the case of the relative (inverse attraction), **παντί**, not **πᾶς**. With this compare **πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ—ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ** (Lu. 12:10). In 2 Cor. 12: 17 we merely have the anacoluthon without any attraction, **τινα** expecting a verb governing the accusative **(μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι᾽ αὐτοῦ" ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς;).** Here indeed **ὧν** is attracted into the case of **τοῦων** unexpressed. A simpler instance is **ὁ Μωυσῆς οὗτος—οἴδαμεν τί ἐγένετο αὐτῷ** (Ac. 7:40; Ex. 32:1). Blass[2] finds anacoluthon in Mk. 9:20 (**ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα συνεσπάραξεν αὐτόν**), but surely this is merely treating **πνεῦμα** as masculine (natural gender). But in Ac. 19:34 (**ἐπιγνόντες δὲ ὅτι ᾽Ιουδαῖίος ἐστιν φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων**) there is a clear case of anacoluthon in

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 32. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 283.

the change to ἐκ πάντων. The writings of John show similar illustrations. There is no anacoluthon in Jo. 6:22 in the text of W. H., which reads εἶδον ὅτι instead of ἰδὼν ὅτι—ὅτε (margin of W. H.). But in 6:39 there is real anacoluthon (πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ) in the change from πᾶν to ἐξ αὐτοῦ. It is possible to regard πᾶν μή here[1] as equivalent to οὐδείς and not like πᾶς—μή in Jo. 3:16. In 7:38 another suspended subject is found in ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ (cf. αὐτοῦ further on). But 10:36 is hardly anacoluthon,[2] since one has merely to supply the demonstrative ἐκείνῳ or the personal pronoun αὐτῷ with λέγετε to make the sentence run smoothly. In 15:2 πᾶν κλῆμα—αὐτό we have very slight anacoluthon, if any, since both may be in the same case (cf. resumptive use of οὗτος). But in 15:5 the matter is complicated by the insertion of κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ (ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ οὗτος φέρει). In 17:2 (πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσει αὐτοῖς) we have the more usual anacoluthon. In 1 Jo. 2:24 (ὑμεῖς ὃ ἠκούσατε ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἐν ὑμῖν μενέτω) ὑμεῖς may be merely prolepsis, but this seems less likely in verse 27 (ὑμεῖς τὸ χρίσμα ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ μένει ἐν ὑμῖν), where note the position of ὑμεῖς and ἐν ὑμῖν. In Rev. 2:26 the anacoluthon (ὁ νικῶν-δώσω αὐτῷ) does not differ from some of those above.[3] So also as to Rev. 3:12, 21, but in 2:7, 17 (τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ) the case is the same and may be compared with Jo. 15:2, 5. Cf. the probable reading (W. H. bracket αὐτῷ) in Rev. 6:4 as well as Mt. 4:16 (LXX); 5: 40 (τῷ θέλοντι—αὐτῷ), where there is no real anacoluthon, but a resumptive use of αὐτῷ. Cf. also ὑμᾶς repeated after parenthesis in Col. 1:22. The LXX has other similar examples like Josh. 9:12; Ps. 103:15. A similar resumptive use of 4) occurs in the text (not marg. in W. H.) of Ro. 16:27. In a similar way a relative clause may be left as a suspended subject or object, as in Lu. 9:5, ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς—ἀποτινάσσετε ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς. Cf. Mt. 10:14; Lu. 10:8, 10. Cf. this with the very common use of resumptive oirros after the article and the participle, like ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται, (Mt. 10:22).

2. *Digression*. A somewhat more complicated kind of anacoluthon is where a digression is caused by an intervening sentence or explanatory clause. Those naturally occur mainly in the Epistles of Paul where his energy of thought and passion of soul overleap all trammels. In Jo. 5:44 the participle is dropped for the indicative ζητεῖτε. In Jo. 21:12 (οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν Σὺ τίς εἶ; εἰδότες) the question breaks the smooth flow and εἰδότες

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 283. [2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 33.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 283, calls it a "very awkward instance."

agrees in case with **οὐδείς** and number with **μαθητῶν**. With this compare the change from **ἵνα μὴ αἴρωσιν** in Mk. 6:8 to the infinitive **μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι** in verse 9. Nestle has, however, **ἐνδύσησθε**. In Mk. 7:19 (**καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα**) the participle can be connected in thought, as Mark probably did, with **λέγει** in verse 18, but the intervening quotation makes Mark's explanatory addendum a real anacoluthon. The example in Jo. 1:15 Abbott[1] calls "impressionism" due to the writer's desire to make his impression first and then to add the explanatory correction. He compares 4:1 with 3:22. In 1:15 **οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον** is taken by Abbott as a part of the Baptist's statement, but W. H. read **οὗτος ἦν ὁ εἰπών** as a parenthetical remark of the writer. So in Jo. 20:18 **καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ** does not fit in exactly after **ὅτι Ἑώρακα τὸν κύριον**. The added clause is the comment of John, not of Mary. The margin of Ac. 10:36 (W. H.) with **ὃν** is a case of anacoluthon, but the text itself is without **ὅν**. In Ac. 24:6 the repetition of **ὃν καί** leaves **εὑρόντες** cut off from **ἐκρατήσαμεν**. In Ac. 27:10 (**θεωρῶ ὅτι—μέλλειν**) the **ὅτι** clause is changed to the infinitive, a phenomenon noted by Winer[2] in Plato, Gorg. 453 b. The anacoluthon in Gal. 2:6 (**ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι—ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει—πρόσωπον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει—ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο**) is noteworthy for the complete change of construction as shown by the repetition of the **οἱ δοκοῦντες** in the nominative and followed by the middle instead of the passive voice. Observe the two parentheses that led to the variation. It is easier in such a case to make a new start, as Paul does here. In Gal. 2:5 Blass[3] follows D in omitting **οἷς** in order to get rid of the anacoluthon, as he does also in Ro. 16:27 (**ᾧ**), but it is more than likely that the difficulty of the anacoluthon with **οἷς** led to the omission in D. One of the most striking anacolutha in Paul's Epistles is found at the end of Ro. 5:12 where the apodosis to the **ὥσπερ** clause is wanting. The next sentence (**ἄχρι γάρ**) takes up the subordinate clause **ἐφ᾽ ᾧ ἥμαρτον** and the comparison is never completed. In verse 18 a new comparison is drawn in complete form. The sentence in Ro. 9:22-24 is without the apodosis and verse 25 goes on with the comparative **ὡς**. 2 Pet. 1:17 shows a clear anacoluthon, for the participle **λαβών** is left stranded utterly in the change to **καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν.** Winer[4] seems to be wrong in finding an anacoluthon in the long sentence in 2 Pet. 2:4-10. The apodosis is really **οἶδεν** in verse 9 (verse 8 being a long parenthesis as W. H. rightly punc-

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 34.
[2] W.-Th., p. 573.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 284.
[4] W.-Th., p. 569.

tuate). However, Winer[1] is justified in refusing to see anacoluthon in many passages formerly so regarded and that call for no discussion now. See further Mt. 7: 9; 12:36; Mk. 2:28; 7:3 f.; Lu. 11:11 f.; 12:8, 10; 21:6; Jo. 6:39; 17:18; Ac. 15:22 ff.; 19:34; 24:20; 26:3; Ro. 16:25-27; 1 Cor. 9:15; Col. 2:2; 4:6; Eph. 3: 8; 2 Cor. 7: 5; 1 Th. 4:1; Heb. 3:15; 10:15 f.; 1 Tim. 1:3-5; Ju. 16. It is very common in the Apocalypse as in 2 Corinthians and Galatians.

3. *The Participle in Anacolutha*. It calls for a word of its own in the matter of anacoluthon, although, as a matter of fact, it occurs in both the kinds of anacoluthon already noticed. The reason is, the free use of the participle in long sentences (cf. Paul) renders it peculiarly subject to anacoluthon. The point with the participle is not that it is a special kind of anacoluthon in any other sense. Gal. 6 1, καταρτίζετε, σκοπῶν σεαυτόν, μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς may be regarded as anacoluthon in the change of number, but it is a natural singling-out of the individual in the application. In 2 Cor. 5:12 the ellipsis of γράφομεν ταῦτα with διδόντες is so harsh as to amount to anacoluthon. Cf. also θλιβόμενοι in 2 Cor. 7:5. It is less certain about στελλόμενοι in 2 Cor. 8:20, for, skipping the long parenthesis,in verse 19, we have συνεπέμψαμεν. But in the parenthesis itself χειροτονηθείς is an example of anacoluthon, for regularly ἐχειροτονήθη would be the form. In 2 Cor. 9:11, 13, the participles πλουτιζόμενοι and δοξάζοντες have no formal connection with a principal verb and are separated by a long parenthesis in verse 12. But these participles may be after all tantamount to the indicative and not mere anacoluthon. Just as *sequimini* (sec. pl. mid. ind.) = ἑπόμενοι, so other Greek participles may correspond to the indicative or imperative.[2] Moulton[3] cites numerous examples from the papyri which make this possible for the κοινή. But Moulton[4] sees a sharp difference between the "hanging nominative" like ἔχων ὁ νόμος in Heb. 10:1 (if δύναται be accepted, W. H. δύναται marg.) and ἔχοντες in Ph. 1:30, where, however, W. H. make a long parenthesis and seek to connect ἔχοντες with στήκετε (verse 27). These are indeed mere anacolutha, but one wonders if the connection between these and Ro. 12:6 (ἔχοντες) is so very distant after all. Participles are scattered along in this chapter in an "unending series"[5] mingled with infinitives and imperatives. Thus in 12:9-13 we have participles, verse 14 the

[1] Ib., p. 571.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 223. [3] Ib. [4] Ib., p. 225.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 285.

imperative, verse 15 infinitive, verse 16 a participles, 16b imperative, 17 participles. Here the participle does seem to be practically equivalent to the imperative (cf. inf. also). See Participle (Verbal Nouns) for discussion of this point. In 2 Cor. 6:3 the participles skip over verse 2 and carry on the construction of verse 1, and it is resumed in verse 9. For a group of participles with the imperative see Eph. 5:15-22. Cf. also Col. 3:16. The point is that these various gradations in the use of the participle are not always clearly defined. As regards the nominative participle rather than the genitive absolute, Winer[1] remarks that thus the participle gains greater prominence in the sentence. In Eph. 4:2 **ἀνεχόμενοι** may not be anacoluthon, but may be in accord with **ἧς ἐκλήθητε**. Col. 1:26 is the case of the indicative rather than a participle (**ἐφανερώθη**, not **πεφανερωμένον**). See 1 Cor. 7:37 where **ἔχων** is succeeded by **ἔχει,** but (W. H.) **ἐγείρας καὶ καθίσας** (Eph. 1:20). Cf. Rev. 2:2, 9. As to Heb. 8:10 (10:16) **διδούς** is explained by Winer[2] as referring to **διαθήσομαι** without anacoluthon, while Moulton[3] considers it equal to an indicative and parallel to **ἐπιγράψω**. I am inclined to agree with Winer on this point. In 2 Cor. 5:6 Paul, after using **θαρροῦντες**, repeats it in the form of **θαρροῦμεν** because of the intermediate clauses before he expresses **εὐδοκοῦμεν** the main verb.[4] Finally compare **ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν** (Jo. 1:33) with **τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν** (verse 32), where the last clause is the comment of the Baptist to give special emphasis to that point, more than the participle would.

4. *Asyndeton Due to Absence of δέ and ἀλλά.* Winer[5] considers the absence of δέ or ἀλλά to correspond with **μέν** as a species of anacoluthon, and Blass[6] shares the same idea. As a matter of fact (see chapter on Particles) **μέν** does not require δέ either by etymology or usage. It is rather gratuitous to call such absence an instance of anacoluthon. The examples will be discussed later, such as Ac. 1:1; 13:4; Ro. 11:13, etc.

(f) ORATIO VARIATA.

1. *Distinction from Anacoluthon*. Sometimes indeed the line between anacoluthon and *oratio variata* is not very clearly drawn. Thus in Lu. 17:31 (**ὅς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ**) the second clause cannot repeat the relative **ὅς**, but has to use **αὐτοῦ**. Cf. 1 Cor. 8:6 (**ἐξ οὗ--καὶ εἰς αὐτόν**), 2 Pet. 2:3 (**οἷς — καὶ αὐτῶν**). So also in 1 Cor. 7:13 **αὐτῆς** repeats **ἥτις.** Cf. Rev.

[1] W.-Th., p. 572.
[2] Ib., p. 573.
[3] Prol., p. 224.
[4] W.-Th., p. 573.
[5] Ib.
[6] *Op. cit*., p. 286.

17:2. In Ro. 2:6 ff. after the relative clause ὅς ἀποδώσει there is a subdivision of the object, on the one hand (τοῖς μὲν –ζητοῦσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον), on the other (τοῖς δὲ --ἀδικίᾳ ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός) where the nominative changes the construction and ὅς cannot here be repeated. In Ro. 11:22 indeed both of the phrases that extend the accusatives χρηστότητα καί ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ are put in the nominative (ἀποτομία, χρηστότης). In Gal. 4:6 f. Paul changes from ἐστέ to εἶ. This is all *oratio variata* in reality and is in accord with the ancient Greek idiom. Blass[1] considers Tit. 1:2 f. an instance of *oratio variata*, but τὸν λόγον in all probability is to be regarded as in apposition with which is the object both of ἐπηγγείλατο and ἐφανέρωσεν. Thus W. H., but Nestle agrees with Blass.

2. *Heterogeneous Structure*. That is what *oratio variata* really is and it can be illustrated by a number of passages other than the relative and with less element of obscurity about them. In Rev. 2:18 ὁ ἔχων is followed by καὶ αὐτοῦ just like the relative sentences above. Thus also 2 Jo. 2. In Rev. 7:9 after εἶδον καὶ ἰδού we find a mixed construction, ὄχλος ἑστῶτες (constr. κατὰ σύνεσιν) with ἰδού, περιβεβλημένους with εἶδον. Winer[2] rightly distinguishes the variation in case in Rev. 18:12 f. (gen., acc., gen., acc.) and the similar phenomenon in Rev. 2:17 where there is a real distinction between the use of the genitive and the accusative. The use of ὑποδεδεμένους in Mk. 6:8 is probably due to the ellipse of πορεύεσθαι, for the correct text has μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι just after. For similar ellipse and *oratio variata* see 2 Cor. 8:23. In Mk. 12:38 after θελόντων περιπατεῖν it looks like a sudden change to find ἀσπασμούς, but after all both are in the accusative with θελόντων. The irregularity in Mk. 3:16 is met in the text of W. H. by a parenthesis, but it could have been cleared up also by ᾧ (referring to **Πέτρον**, instead of καί as Winer[3] suggests). In Jo. 8:53 the continuity of the interrogative form of sentence is abruptly broken by the short clause καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον, a very effective interruption, however. The case of 1 Jo. 2:2 is simple where instead of περὶ τῶν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου (to be parallel with οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων) John has merely περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, a somewhat different conception. A similar example is found in Ac. 20:34 as between ταῖς χρείαις μου and τοῖς οὖσι μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ. Heb. 9:7 furnishes the same point in inverse order (ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων). A lack of parallel is shown also in Ph. 2:22 between πατρὶ τέκνον and σὺν ἐμοί where Paul purposely puts in σύν to break a too literal carrying out of the figure. In Rev. 1:6 the correct text in the parenthesis has

[1] Gr. of N. T. p. 286. [2] W.-Th., p. 579. [3] Ib.

ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ, a different conception from βασιλεῖς. See further Ac. 16:16 f.

3. *Participles in Oratio Variata.* These offer a frequent occasion for *oratio variata*, since they can so often be used parallel with subordinate clauses of various kinds. Thus in Jo. 5:44 λαμβάνοντες would naturally be followed by ζητοῦντες, but we have ζητεῖτε. So, on the other hand, in 1 Cor. 7:13 καὶ συνευδοκεῖ, does not fit in as smoothly with ἄπιστον as καὶ συνευδοκοῦντα would. The same lack of parallel in the use of the participle is seen in Jo. 15:5 (ὁ μένων κἀγώ) and in Lu. 17:31 where the relative and the participle are paired off. So also Ph. 1:23 and 1 Jo. 3:24. Cf. the Participle in Anacolutha. In Ro. 12:6 f. participles and substantives are placed in antithesis, as in 2 Cor. 6:3 f. we have participles, in 4-7[a] ἐν, in 7b f. διά, in 9 f. adjectives and participles. Cf. 2 Cor. 11:23 ff. Where adverbs, adjuncts and verbs are in antithesis.

4. *Exchange of Direct and Indirect Discourse*. But the most striking instance of *oratio variata* is that between direct and indirect discourse. It is either from the indirect to the direct or from the direct to the indirect. As Blass[1] justly observes, the N. T. writers, like all popular narrators, deal very little in indirect discourse. The accusative and the infinitive is not common in the old sense nor is ὅτι always the sign of indirect quotation. Frequently it is merely recitative ὅτι and corresponds to our quotation-marks, as in Mk. 14:14, εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅτι Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει. So also ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς (Jo. 10:36). This reversion to one form of discourse from another is not unknown to the ancient Greek. But it is peculiarly in harmony with the N. T. vernacular and essentially vivid narrative style. In Lu. 5:14 we have a typical instance of the change from indirect to direct discourse (παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτόν). Exactly parallel with this is Ac. 1:4 ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου where observe μου. Cf. also Ac. 17:3 where after διελέξατο ὅτι—ὁ Ἰησοῦς Luke concludes with the direct words of Paul ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. In Jo. 13:29 we have the reverse process where the writer drops from the direct to the indirect statement (ἀγόρασον ὧν χρείαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, ἢ τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἵνα τι δῷ). So also we see the same thing in Ac. 23:23 f. (ἑτοιμάσατε—τῆς νυκτός, κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι ἵνα –διασώσωσιν). But in Ac. 23:22 the other change occurs, as παραγγείλας μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς ἐμέ. In W. H.'s text of Ro. 12:

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 286.

1f. we have παρκαλῶ ὑμᾶς παραστῆσαι· καὶ μὴ συνσχηματίζεσθε (not --σθαι). In Mk. 11:32 the writer proceeds with his own remarks (ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον) after the question rather' in the nature of anacoluthon, though in Mt. 21:26 φοβούμεθα is read as indeed a few MSS. do in Mark. So also Mt. 9:6, where the writer injects into the words of Jesus τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, we probably have anacoluthon rather than *oratio variata* (see (d) , Parenthesis).

(g) CONNECTION BETWEEN SEPARATE SENTENCES. So far we have been considering the matter of connection between the various parts of the same sentence, whether simple or compound, and the various complications that arise. But this is not all. The Greeks, especially in the literary style, felt the propriety of indieating the inner relation of the various independent sentences that composed a paragraph. This was not merely an artistic device, but a logical expression of coherence of thought. Particles like καί, δέ, ἀλλά, γάρ, οὖν, δή, etc., were very common in this connection. Demonstrative pronouns, adverbs, and even relative pronouns were also used for this purpose. I happen to open at Mt. 24:32-51 a paragraph of some length. The first sentence begins with δέ. The sentences in verses 33 and 34 have asyndeton and so are without a connective. In verse 36 δέ reappears, while the two sentences in verses 37 and 38 both have γάρ. Verse 40 begins with τότε, a common word in this usage in Matthew, as ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, is in Luke. Verse 42 begins with οὖν as its connective, while 43 drops back to δέ. In 44 διὰ τοῦτο answers as a link of union while 45 uses ἄρα. Verses 46 f. have asyndeton while 48 has δέ. This long sentence completes the paragraph save the short sentence in verse 51 introduced by ἐκεῖ. I think this paragraph a fair sample of the didactic portion of the Gospels. Asyndeton occurs, but it is not the rule. In the Gospel of John οὖν is a much more frequent connective between sentences than καί, as any chapter (11 for instance) will show. The Beatitudes (Mt. 5:3-12) have no connectives at all, and are all the more effective because of the asyndeton. Winer[1] finds this didactic asyndeton common also in James, the Gospel of John (cf. 14-17) and 1 John. But asyndeton is sometimes noticeable also in the non-didactic portions of John, as 20:14-18. No formal rules on the subject can be made, as the individual speaker or writer follows his mood of the moment in the matter. The point is to observe that, while asyndeton often occurs, in general Greek writers even in the N. T. use connectives between separate sentences.

[1] W.-Th., p. 536.

(h) CONNECTION BETWEEN PARAGRAPHS. It is only natural to carry the matter one step further and unite paragraph with paragraph. For a discussion of the origin of the paragraph see the chapter on Orthography and Phonetics. The paragraphs in our printed Greek texts are partly the work of the modern editors, yet not wholly so. But even in real or original paragraphs the connection varies greatly. In some there will be none at all, but an entirely new theme will be presented, whereas with others we merely have a new aspect of the same subject. I happen to turn to the sixth chapter of John. The chapter opens with **μετὰ ταῦτα,** a real connective that refers to the incidents in chapter 5, which may have been a full year before. The next paragraph in W. H. begins at verse 14 and has **οὖν**. At verse 22 there is no connective except **τῷ ἐπαύριον** which may be compared with the **τότε** of Matthew. The paragraph at verse 41 has **οὖν** again, which is very common in John in this connection, as can be seen illustrated also in verses 52 and 60. At verse 66 the paragraph begins with **–ἐκ τούτου** a real connective. If we go into chapter 7 we find **καί** in verse 1, **δέ** in verse 10, **δέ** again in verse 14, **οὖν** in verse 25, no connective in verse 32, **δέ** in verse 37, **οὖν** in verse 45. Asyndeton on the whole is rather more frequent in the Gospel of John than in the Synoptic Gospels.[1] Abbott[2] gives a detailed discussion of the kinds of asyndeton in John. In Paul's Epistles one would expect little asyndeton between the paragraphs especially in the argumentative portions. In general this is true, and yet occasionally even in Ro. asyndeton is met as in 9:1; 13:1. But in chapter 8 every paragraph has its connective particle. Note also **οὖν** in 12:1 at the beginning of the hortatory portion after the long preceding argument. As between sentences, there is freedom in the individual expression on the subject. For Hort's theory of the paragraph see *Intr. to N. T. in Gr.*, p. 319. By means of spaces he has a system of sub-paragraphs, as is plain in, the text of W. H.

XIII. Forecast. There are other things to be considered in the construction of the sentence, but enough has been treated in this chapter. What remains in syntax is the minute examination of the relations of words (cases, prepositions, pronouns, verbs in mood and voice and tense, infinitives and participles), the relations of clause with clause in the use of subordinating conjunctions, the particles, figures of speech (aposiopesis, ellipsis, paronomasia, zeugma, etc.). There is a natural order in the development of these matters which will be followed as far as possible in the dis-

[1] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 70 f. [2] Ib. Cf. W.-Th., p. 537.

cussion of syntax. The individual words come before the relation of sentences or clauses. In the discussion of words either nouns or verbs could be taken up first, but, as verbs are connected more closely with conjunctions than nouns they are best treated just before conjunctional clauses. Prepositions are properly discussed after cases. The article is a variation of the demonstrative pronoun. But at best no treatment of syntax can handle every aspect and phase of language. The most that can be achieved is a presentation of the essential principles of N. T. syntax so that the student will be able to interpret his Greek N. T. according to correct grammatical principles derived from living language of the time.

CHAPTER XI

THE CASES (**ΠΤΩΣΕΙΣ**)

I. **History of the Interpretation of the Greek Cases.**

(a) CONFUSION. Perhaps nowhere has confusion been worse confounded than in the study of the Greek cases. The tendency has been usually to reason backwards and to explain past phenomena by present conditions. The merely logical method of syntax has turned the pyramid on its apex and has brought untold error into grammar.[1] The Stoics took interest in grammar for philosophical purposes and gave the logical bent to it in lieu of the historical. Dionysius Thrax and Apollonius Dyscolus went off on the wrong trail in the matter of the Greek cases.

(b) BOPP'S CONTRIBUTION. Bopp brought daylight out of darkness by comparative grammar. Hubschmann[2] gives an admirable history of the matter. He illustrates the eight cases copiously from the Sanskrit, Zend and Persian. Thanks now to such workers as Schleicher, Brugmann, Delbruck, the eight Indo-Germanic cases are well wrought out and generally acknowledged. Cf. brief discussion of the forms of the Greek cases in chapter VII (Declensions). Greek grammarians still differ, however, in the terminology applied to the cases. In 1911 the Oxford and Cambridge scholars issued a tract "On Terminology in Grammar," but confusion still reigns. See also W. Havers, *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indog. Sprachen*. When the Stoic grammarians wrote, the genitive and ablative had the same forms, and the locative, instrumental and dative likewise. There were occasional survivals of distinction like **οἴκοι** and **οἴκῳ**, Cypriotic instrumental ἀρᾶ and dative ἀραῖ, etc. But in general the work of syncretism was complete in the respects just mentioned, though

[1] Hubschmann, Zur Casuslehre, p. v.

[2] Ib. Cf. Dewischeit, Zur Theorie der Casus (1857); Rumpel, Die Casuslehre (1875). Hadley (Essays Phil. and Crit., Gk. Gen. as Abl., p. 46) speaks of "the Beckerite tendency, too frequently apparent in Kuhner, to impose a meaning on language rather than educe the meaning out of it."

in Arcadian the genitive and the locative took the same form[1] (cf. Latin *Romae, domi*). But the grammarians, ignorant of the history of the language, sought to explain the genitive and ablative ideas from a common source. Thus Winer[2] boldly calls the genitive the "whence-case" and undertakes to explain every usage of the genitive from that standpoint, a hopeless exercise in grammatical gymnastics. The same sinuosities have been resorted to in the effort to find the true dative idea in the locative and instrumental uses of the forms called dative by the grammars.

(c) MODERN USAGE. Some modern grammarians[3] help matters a good deal by saying true genitive, ablatival genitive, true dative, locatival dative, instrumental dative. This custom recognines the real case-distinctions and the historical outcome. But some confusion still remains because the locative and the dative never mean exactly the same thing and are not the same thing in fact. It partly depends on whether one is to apply the term "case" to the ending or to the relation expressed by the ending. As a matter of fact the term is used both ways. **᾽Ονομα** is called indiscriminately nominative, vocative or accusative, according to the facts in the context, not nominatival accusative or accusatival nominative. So with **βασιλεῖς** or **πόλεις**. We are used to this in the grammars, but it seems a shock to say that **πόλεως** may be either genitive or ablative, that **ἐμοί** may be either locative, instrumental or dative. But why more of an absurdity than in the case of **ὄνομα** and **πόλεις**? The only difference is that in the gen.-abl. the syncretism of form applies to all Greek words. For various examples of syncretism in the forms of the Greek cases with fragments of distinctive endings also see Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 375 f.; Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Gr.*, II, p. 420 f.; and chapter VII (Declensions).

(d) GREEN'S CLASSIFICATION. I agree with B. Green,[4] whom I shall here quote at some length: "I shall classify the uses of the cases under the heads of the Aryan Cases, as in every instance the true method of explanation of any particular idiom is to trace its connection to the general meaning of the original Aryan case, to which the case in Greek or Latin corresponds, and not arbitrarily to distinguish the uses of any case in Greek or Latin by terms which cannot be properly applied to that case; e. g., the term dative of manner is no explanation. Manner cannot be expressed

[1] Hoffmann, Griech. Dial., Bd. I, p. 303. [2] W.-Th., p. 184 f.
[3] Cf. Babbitt, A Gr. of Attic and Ionic Gk., 1902.
[4] Notes on Gk. and Lat. Synt., 1897, p. 11.

by the true dative case. The correct explanation is that the use is instrumental, but the instrumental case in Greek has coalesced in form with the dative. This method of explanation has the advantage of demanding fewer set terms, while at the same time it requires a logical connection to be made between the particular use in question and the fundamental meaning of the case involved. Such an explanation is the better the simpler the words used in it are." This is wonderfully well said and has the advantage of being true, which is not always said of grammatical comments. It is the method of history, of science, of life. It is the method pursued in the etymology and history of a word. It is the only way to get at the truth about the significance of the Greek cases.

(e) SYNCRETISM OF THE CASES. This method of interpretation does not ignore the syncretism of the cases. On the other hand it accents sharply the blending of the forms while insisting on the integrity of the case-ideas. There are indeed some instances where either of the blended cases will make sense, like **τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς** (Ac. 2:33), which may be locative 'exalted at,' instrumental 'exalted by,' or dative 'exalted to' (a rare idiom and in the older Greek), 'the right hand of God.' Cf. also **τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν** (Ro. 8:24). So in Heb. 12:11 **χαρᾶς** and **λύπης** may be explained either as genitive or ablative. But such occasional ambiguity is not surprising and these instances on the "border-line" made syncretism possible. In general the context makes it perfectly clear which of the syncretistic cases is meant, just as in English and French we have to depend on the order of the words to show the difference between nominative and accusative. Yet no one would say that nominative and accusative are the same in English and French.[1]

(f) FREEDOM IN USE OF CASE. As a matter of fact it was often immaterial whether a writer or speaker used one of several ways of expressing himself, for the Greek allows liberty and flexibility at many points. Thus **τὸ γένος** and **τῷ γένει** would either answer for the specifying idea, **προσκυνέω** is used with either accusative or dative, **μιμνήσκομαι** with accusative or genitive, etc.[2] But this is not to say that one construction is used for another or is identical with the other. The difference may be "subtle, no doubt, but real" (Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 66). Moulton properly (*ib.*) cites the

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 75, illustrates the rapid disappearance of case-endings in the Irish tongue, which as late as i/A.D. had a full set of inflections, whereas by the fifth century only traces of the dat. plur. survive.

[2] W.-Th., p. 180.

well-known distinction between the accusative and genitive with ἀκούω in Ac. 9:7 and 22:9 as disproof of apparent self-contradiction and a gentle hint not to be too ready to blur over case-distinctions in Luke or elsewhere in the N. T. He notes also genitive and accusative with γεύεσθαι in Heb. 6:4 f. and the common use of εἰς with accusative after verbs of rest and ἐν locative even after verbs of motion. But it is hazardous to insist always on a clear distinction between εἰς and ἐν, for they are really originally the same word. The point is that by different routes one may reach practically the same place, but the routes are different. Indeed one may take so many different standpoints that the border-lines of the cases come very close sometimes. So ἐξ ἀριστερᾶς (abl.), ἐν ἀριστερᾷ (loc.), εἰς ἀριστεράν (acc.) are all good Greek for 'on the left' (we have also in English 'at the left,' 'to the left').[1]

II. **The Purpose of the Cases.**

(a) ARISTOTLE'S USAGE. He applied the term πτῶσις to verb, noun, adverb, etc., but the later grammarians spoke only[2] of the πτῶσις ὀνόματος, though as a matter of fact adverbs and prepositions are in cases, and even conjunctions and other particles are usually in cases. But in ordinary parlance substantives, adjectives, pronouns, the article are in cases and have inflection. The cases originally had to do only with these. The adverbs were merely later modifications or fixed case-forms.

(b) WORD-RELATIONS. The cases were used to express word-relations, the endings serving to make it plain what the particular case was. The isolating languages, like the Chinese, show such relations by the order of the words and the tone in pronunciation. Modern English and French use prepositions chiefly besides the order of the words. These word-relations concern substantives in their relations with other substantives, with adjectives, with prepositions and with verbs. So adjectives and pronouns have all these relations. It is immaterial whether verb or substantive is the earliest in the use of a case with a substantive. In the old Sanskrit practically all the word-relations are expressed by the eight cases. This was a very simple plan, but as language became more complicated a great strain was bound to be put on each of these cases in order to convey clearly so many resultant ideas.

As a matter of fact the ground-meaning of the case-forms is not known.[3] On Origin of Case-Forms see chapter VII, t, 2, (c).

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 67.
[2] Cf. Steinthal, Gesch. der Sprachw., p. 259; Hubschm., Zur Casusl., p. 3.
[3] Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 374.

III. The Encroachment of Prepositions on the Cases.

(a) THE REASON. The burden upon the cases was too great. Even in the later Sanskrit a number of set case-forms (adverbs) came to be used with some of the cases to make clearer the exact relations of words, whereas in the older Sanskrit no such helpers were felt to be needed. This was the beginning of prepositions. Prepositions have a wrong name. They do not come before anything essentially, and just as often in Homer came after the noun. Indeed ὀμμάτων ἄπο is not anastrophe, but the original type.[1] Nor was the preposition originally used with verbs. The preposition is merely an adverb that is used with nouns or in composition with verbs. But more about that hereafter (Prepositions). The point to note here is that when the burden upon the cases grew too great adverbs were called in to make clearer the meaning of the case in harmony with the analytic tendency of language.[2]

(b) NO "GOVERNING" OF CASES. These adverbs did not govern cases. They were merely the accidental concomitants, more or less constant, of certain cases. At best "the cases could express relationship only in a very general way. Hence arose the use of adverbs to go with cases in order to make the meaning more specific. These adverbs, which we now call prepositions, in time became the constant concomitants of some cases; and when this has happened there is an ever-increasing tendency to find the important part of the meaning in the preposition and not in the case-ending."[3] This quotation from Giles puts the matter in a nutshell. In spite of the average grammarian's notion that prepositions govern cases, it is not true. The utmost is that the preposition in question is in harmony with the case in question.[4]

(c) NOT USED INDIFFERENTLY. These prepositions were not used indifferently with all the cases. They are, of course, impossible with the vocative. But the nominative may be used with such adverbs, not called prepositions by the grammarians because it seems difficult to explain a preposition "governing" the nominative. But Paul does not hesitate to say ὑπερ ἐγώ (2 Cor. 11:23) though ὕπερ is not construed with ἐγώ. Cf. also εἷς κατὰ εἷς (Mk. 14:19), καθ' εἷς (Ro. 12:5). It is not certain that any prepositions are [see XII, (f)] used with the true dative and few with

[1] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 341. [2] Ib.

[3] Ib., p. 272 f.

[4] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 173. Farrar (Gk. Synt., p. 94 f.) puts the matter succinctly: "It is the case which borrows the aid of the preposition, not the preposition which requires the case."

the instrumental (ἅμα, σύν). Giles[1] denies that the genitive is ever used with a preposition. Certainly what is called the genitive with prepositions is often the ablative. Probably ἐπί and ἀντί are used with the real genitive. Naturally the cases that are more local in idea like the locative ('where'), the accusative ('whither') which is partly local, the instrumental ('wherewith') and the ablative ('whence') are those that are most frequently supplemented by prepositions.[2]

(d) ORIGINAL USE WITH LOCAL CASES. Originally most of the prepositions were used with either of these local cases (loc., instr., abl.). Some few of them continued to be so used even in the N. T. This matter will come up again under the head of Prepositions, but we may note here that ἐπί and παρά are the only prepositions that use three cases with any frequency[3] in the N. T., and in the case of ἐπί it is probably the true genitive, not the ablative. **Πρός** has accusative 679 times, locative 6, and ablative 1 (Ac. 27:34, a literary example).[4] The bulk of those that have two are narrowing down to one case[5] while ἀνά, ἀντί, εἰς, ἐν, πρό have only one, and ἀμφί has disappeared save in composition. If this N. T. situation, which is amply supported by the papyri, is compared with the usage of Homer, the contrast will be very great.[6] To carry the matter a step further one may note that in late Greek there is a constant tendency for all prepositions to be used with the accusative, so that in modern Greek vernacular all the "proper" prepositions are regularly employed with the accusative.[7] The occasional LXX use of σύν + accusative, while a mere error, was in line with this tendency.

(e) INCREASING USE OF PREPOSITIONS. The constantly increasing use of prepositions is one of the main reasons for the blending of the case-forms. This was already partly apparent in the Sanskrit in the assimilation of genitive and ablative singular and in the plural of ablative and dative. So the Latin locative, dative, ablative, instrumental, in most words merged their forms. Moulton[8] accents the fact that it was the local cases (loc., abl., instr.) in the Greek that first gave way in their endings. That is true with the exception of the accusative (not a purely local

[1] Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 341.
[2] Ib. But Monro, Hom Gr., p. 125, correctly admits the gen.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 106 f. [4] Ib. [5] Ib., p. 105 f.
[6] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 125
[7] Thumb, Handb., p. 98; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 366.
[8] Prol., p. 60 f.

case), which has shown more persistence than any case save the genitive. The genitive is a non-local case and has held on, though the dative has disappeared in modern Greek vernacular before εἰς + accusative, the accusative without εἰς, and the genitive. But this break-down of the case-endings seen in Sanskrit, much more apparent in Greek and Latin, has reached its climax in modern English and French. In modern English the six Anglo-Saxon endings, barring pronouns, have disappeared save one, the genitive (s), and even that can be expressed by the prep. *of*. In French the process is complete except in prons. Modern Greek vernacular shows the influence of this tendency very decidedly. The Greek of the N. T. comes therefore in the middle of the stream of this analytic tendency. In the old Sanskrit it was all case and no preposition. In modern French it is all preposition and no case-ending. The case-ideas have not disappeared. They are simply expressed more minutely and exactly by means of prepositions. By and by the case-endings were felt to be useless as the preposition was looked to entirely for the idea. The case without preposition belongs to the early stage of language history.[1] When Delbruck[2] speaks of a "living" case, he means the case-ending, as does Moulton[3] when he asserts that "we can detect a few moribund traces of instrumental, locative and ablative." If he means the case-meaning, the instances are abundant. And even in case-ending it is not all one-sided, for the locative --ι and the instrumental —οις both contributed to the common stock of forms. Henry[4] even suggests that in ὀνόμα-τος we have the ablative *t* (*d*), for the Latin word is *nomen* (*nominis*).

(f) DISTINCTION PRESERVED IN THE N. T. But the N. T. has not lost distinctive use of the cases and prepositions. Special causes explain some of the phenomena in the N. T. The excessive use of ἐν in the N. T. is parallel to that in the LXX (cf. Jer. 21: 5 f., 9 f.) and is doubtless due partly to the Hebrew which it so commonly translates as Moulton[5] observes. But the so-called instrumental use of ἐν like ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, (Rev. 6:8; cf. Mt. 12:26 f.) is not due entirely to the Hebrew, for, while very common in the LXX, where it is in "the plenitude of its power,"[6] yet the papyri show undoubted examples of the same instrumental

[1] See further Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 376; Brug., Kurze vergl. Gr., II, p. 419.
[2] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 193.
[3] Prol., p. 60.
[4] Comp. Gr. of Gk. and Lat., p. 217.
[5] Prol., p. 61.
[6] C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 82.

usage.[1] See further Locative Case and also Prepositions (b). Indeed in the N. T. ἐν outnumbers εἰς three to two.[2] If these two prepositions are left out of consideration, the disappearance of the locative with prepositions is quite marked in the N. T., a decay already begun a good while before,[3] only to be consummated in the modern Greek vernacular, where εἰς has displaced ἐν (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 100). When one recalls that dative and instrumental also have gone from the modern Greek vernacular and that στό with the accusative (εἰς τόν) replaces all three cases in modern Greek and that originally ἐν and εἰς were the same preposition, he is not surprised to read ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν (Mk. 13:16) where Mt. 24:18 has ὁ ἐν τ�ῳ̣ ἀγρῳ̣. So Mt. 12:41, μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ. Moulton[4] has a very suggestive study of πιστεύω. He omits those examples where the verb means 'entrust' and finds about forty others with the simple dative. In the majority of these forty the verb means 'believe.' There are some debatable passages like Jo. 5:24, 38; 8:31; Ac. 5:14; 16:34; 18:8. He finds only one passage outside of Eph. 1:13 where ἐν ᾧ is assimilated (cf. ἐσφραγίσθητε), viz. Mk. 1:15 (πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ), and he follows Deissmann[5] in taking ἐν as 'in the sphere of.' **Πιστεύω ἐπί** is found six times with the locative and seven with the accusative in the sense of 'repose one's trust' upon God or Christ. But πιστεύω εἰς occurs 45 times (37 in Jo. and 1 Jo.) in the sense of 'mystical union with Christ,' like Paul's ἐν **Χριστῷ**.[6]

IV. The Distinctive Idea of Each of the Cases.

(a) FUNDAMENTAL IDEA. The point is, if possible, to get at the fundamental idea of each of the eight original cases. To do this it is essential that one look at the Greek cases historically and from the Greek point of view. Foreigners may not appreciate all the niceties, but they can understand the respective import of the Greek cases.[7] The N. T. writers, as we now know perfectly well, were not strangers to the vernacular κοινή, nor were the LXX translators for that matter, though they indeed were hampered by translating a Semitic tongue into Greek. The N. T. writers were in their element when they wrote vernacular

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 61 f.

[2] Ib., p. 62. Helbing, Die Prepos. bei Herodot and andern Histor. (1904), pp. 8 ff., gives a summary of the uses of ἐν and εἰς. Cf. also Moulton's remarks on Helbing's items (Prol., p. 62).

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 62.

[4] Prol., p. 67 f.

[5] In Christo, p. 46 f.

[6] Cf. Heitmiiller, Im Namen Jesu, I, ch. 4

[7] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 68.

κοινή. They knew the import of the Greek cases as used at that time by the people at large.

(b) CASES NOT USED FOR ONE ANOTHER. We have no right to assume in the N. T. that one case is used for another. That is to say, that you have a genitive, but it is to be understood as an accusative. Winer[1] properly condemns such *enallage casuum*. Not even in 2 Cor. 6:4 (συνιστάνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι) do we have an instance of it, for the nominative (lit. plural) means 'as minister of God I commend myself,' while the accusative (διακόνους) would be, 'I commend myself as a minister of God.' We are then to look for the distinctive idea of each case just as we find it. In the modern Greek, to be sure, the cases are in such confusion (dative, locative, instrumental gone) that one cannot look for the old distinctions.

(c) VITALITY OF CASE-IDEA. This independence of the case-idea is not out of harmony with the blending of case-forms (abl. and gen., loc. and instr. and dat.). This is a very different matter from the supposed substitution of cases alluded to above. The genitive continued to be a genitive, the ablative an ablative in spite of the fact that both had the same ending. There would be, of course, ambiguous examples, as such ambiguities occur in other parts of speech. The context is always to be appealed to in order to know the case.

(d) THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CASES. This is always to be considered. The accusative is the oldest of the cases, may, in fact, be considered the original and normal case. Other cases are variations from it in course of linguistic development. With verbs in particular which were transitive the accusative was the obvious case to use unless there was some special reason to use some other. The other oblique cases with verbs (gen., abl., loc., instr., dat.) came to be used with one verb or the other rather than the accusative, because the idea of that verb and the case coalesced in a sense. Thus the dative with πείθομαι, the instrumental with χράομαι, etc. But with many of these verbs the accusative continued to be used in the vernacular (or even in the literary language with a difference of idea, as ἀκούω). In the vernacular κοινή the accusative is gradually reasserting itself by the side of the other cases with many verbs. This tendency kept up to the complete disappearance of the dative, locative and instrumental in modern Greek (cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 31), and the

[1] W.-Th., p. 180 f. The ancients developed no adequate theory of the cases since they were concerned little with syntax. Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 37.

genitive, accusative and **εἰς** compete for the function of the old dative (*ib* , pp. 38 ff.).[1] The accusative was always the most popular case. Krebs[2] has made a useful study of the cases in the literary **κοινή**, and Moulton[3] thinks that these tendencies of the literary **κοινή** are really derived from the vernacular. But not all the verbs fall in with the decay of the dative-locative-instrumental. Thus **προσκυνεῖν** in the N. T. has the dative twice as often as the accusative, just the opposite of the inscriptions.[4] But the papyri show little proof of the decay of the dative save in the illiterate examples.[5] The accusative gains from the genitive and ablative in the N. T. also, as Krebs found in the later literary Greek. Moulton[6] finds that out of 47 examples **κρατεῖν** has the genitive only 8 times, but **διαφέρειν** ('surpass') has the ablative. **Ἐντρέπεσθαι** takes only the accusative, and the accusative appears with verbs of filling (Rev. 17:3).[7] Moulton concludes his résumé of Krebs by calling attention to the list of verbs that were once intransitive, but are transitive in the **κοινή**. This is a matter that is always changing and the same verb may be used either way. A verb is transitive, by the way, whether it takes the accusative or not; if it has any oblique case it is transitive. As illustrations of this varied usage Moulton cites from the N. T. **ἐνεργεῖν, συνεργεῖν, ἐπέρχεσθαι, καταβαρεῖν, καταλαλεῖν, καταπονεῖν, κατισχύειν, πλεονεκτεῖν, προσφωνεῖν, ὑποτρέχειν, χορηγεῖν**. He concludes his discussion of the matter with a needed caveat (p. 65 f.) against thinking that all distinctions of case are blurred in the N. T. "We should not assume, from the evidence just presented as to variation of case with verbs, that the old distinctions of case-meaning have vanished, or that we may treat as mere equivalents those constructions which are found in common with the same word." Analogy no doubt played its part in case-contamination as well as in the blending of the case-endings.[8]

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 325.

[2] Zur Rection der Casus in der spilt. hist. Grac., 1887-90.

[3] Prol., p. 64.

[4] Ib.; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 436.

[5] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 153.

[6] Prol., p. 65.

[7] Ib. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 102. Cf. Thumb, Theol. Lit., XXVIII, p. 422, for mod. Gk. usage. As a matter of fact the acc. was always more popular in the vernac. Gk., and no wonder that the pap. show it to be so even with verbs usually in the lit. lang. used with other cases. Cf. A,Volker, Pap. Graec. Synt., 1900, p. 5 f.

[8] Middleton, Anal. in Synt., pp. 47-55. Farrar, Gk. Synt., overstates it when he says that the acc. alone has preserved its original (force. He means form alone.

(e) THE METHOD OF THIS GRAMMAR. In the study of each case the method of this grammar is to begin with the root-idea of the particular case in hand. Out of that by means of context and grammatical history the resultant meaning in the particular instance can be reached. This is not only more simple, but it is in harmony with the facts of the linguistic development and usage. Even in an instance like ἐν μαχαίρῃ (Lu. 22:49) the locative case is not out of place. The smiting (πατάξομεν) is conceived as located in the sword. Cf. ἐν ῥάβδῳ (1 Cor. 4:21). The papyri show the same usage, as indeed the older classical Greek did occasionally. In English we translate this resultant idea by 'with,' but we have no right to assume that the Greeks thought of ἐν as 'with.' The LXX shows that the Hebrew corresponded closely to the Greek ἐν in this resultant idea. In translation we often give not the real meaning of the word, but the total idea, though here the LXX follows closely the Hebrew. One of the chief difficulties in syntax is to distinguish between the Greek idiom and the English translation of the idiom plus the context. But enough of preliminary survey. Let us now examine each case in turn.

V. **The Nominative (πτῶσις ὀρθή, εὐθεῖα, ὀνομαστική)**.

For the older books on the nominative case see Hubner, *Grundriss* etc., p. 36.

(a) NOT THE OLDEST CASE. The first thing to observe about the nominative is that it is not the oldest case. The accusative is treated first in some grammars and seems to be the oldest. That is the proper historical order, but it seems best on the whole to treat the so-called "oblique" cases together. The term "oblique cases" (πτώσεις πλάγιαι) has a history. The nominative was not originally regarded as a case, but merely the noun (ὄνομα). So Aristotle.[1] The vocative is not a real case, as we shall see directly. Hence a case (*casus*) was considered ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος πεπτωκυῖα, a real πτῶσις. All the true cases therefore were oblique. Indeclinable words are ἄπτωτα. When the nominative was considered a case it was still called by the word for noun (ὀνομαστική, *nominativus*), the naming or noun case. The Hindu grammarians indeed call the nominative *prathamä* ('first') as the leading case, not in time, but in service. This is merely the logical arrangement followed by the Western scholars.[2] There was once no need felt for a nominative, since the verb itself had its own subject in the personal endings.[3] But *originally* one may suppose a word served

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 67. [2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 89.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 113; Giles, Man., p. 301.

as subject of the verb and may have become an ending. Even the impersonal verbs like καλῶς ἔχει have the subject in the same way. The use of a special case for this purpose was an afterthought,

(b) REASON FOR THE CASE. Why then was the nominative used? Why was it ever originated? Its earliest use was in apposition to the verbal subject alluded to above.[1] Greater, precision in the subject was desired, and so a substantive or pronoun was put in apposition with the verbal ending.[2] Sometimes both substantive and pronoun are employed as in αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ **Παῦλος** παρακαλῶ (2 Cor. 10:1). Other languages can even use other cases for such apposition in the predicate. Cf. English *It's me*, French *c'est moi* and Latin *dedecori est*. And the Greek itself shows abundant evidence of lack of concord of case in apposition (cf. Rev. in the N. T.).[3] But the nominative is a constant resource in appositional phrases, whatever case the other word may be in. The whole subject of apposition was discussed in the chapter on the Sentence. Cf. ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος, where the same point applies.[4] Cf. ἀνήρ τις **Ἀνανίας** (Ac. 5:1). In the modern Greek this usage partly replaces the explanatory genitive, as σπυρὶ σινάπι, 'mustard seed' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 33).

(C) PREDICATE NOMINATIVE. The predicate nominative is in line with the subject nominative. It is really apposition.[5] The double nominative belongs to Greek as to all languages which use certain verbs as a copula like **εἶναι, γίνεσθαι, καλεῖσθαι**, etc. Cf. **σὺ εἶ Πέτρος** (Mt. 16:18). The Latin is fond of the dative in such examples as *id mihi honori est,* and the Greek can use one dative, as **ὄνομά ἐστί μοι**.[6] Thus in the N. T. **ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς** (Lu. 2:21), ἀνὴρ καλούμενος **Ζακχαῖος** (Lu. 19:2), **ἦν ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος** (Jo. 18:10), as well as[7] **Ἰωάνης ἐστὶν ὄνομα αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 1:63). The use of the nominative in the predicate with the infinitive in indirect discourse (**φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί**, Ro. 1:22) is proper when the subject of the principal verb is referred to. See Indirect Discourse (Modes and Infinitive). But the N. T., especially in quotations from the LXX and passages under Semitic influence, often uses

[1] Ib., p. 302.
[2] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt,, I, p. 188.
[3] Cf. Meisterh., Gr. d. att. Inschr., p. 203, for exx. of the free use of the noun in app.
[4] Monro, Homn. Gr., p. 117.
[5] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 393 f.; Monro, Hom. Gk., p. 114 f.
[6] Cf. K.-G., I, p. 44.
[7] Cf. W.-Scli., p. 256.

εἰς and the accusative rather than the predicate nom. Moulton[1] denies that it is a real Hebraism since the papyri show the idiom ἔσχον παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς δά(νειον) σπέρματα, K.P. 46 (ii/A.D.), where εἰς means 'as' or 'for,' much like the N. T. usage. But the fact that it is so common in the translation passages and that the LXX is so full of it as a translation of לְ justifies Blass[2] in saying that it is formed on a Hebrew model though it is not un-Greek. Winer[3] finds it in the late Greek writers, but the Hebrew is chiefly responsible for the LXX situation. The most frequent examples in the N. T. are with etym. εἶναι (ἔσονται εἰς σάρκα μίαν, Mt. 19:5, which can be compared with Lu. 3:5; 2 Cor. 6:18; Ac. 8:23, etc.), γίνεσθαι (ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, Mt. 21:42, with which compare Lu. 13:19; Jo. 16:20; Rev. 8:11, etc.), ἐγείρειν εἰς βασιλέα (Ac. 13:22), ἐλογίσθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην (Ro. 4:3 ff.). Cf. also Jo. 16:20. Probably the following examples have rather some idea of purpose and are more in accord with the older Greek idiom. In 1 Cor. 4:3, ἐμοὶ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν, the point is not very different. Cf. also 1 Cor. 14:22 (εἰς σημεῖον). But observe μὴ εἰς κενὸν γένηται (1 Th. 3:5), εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα (Ro. 5:18), ἐγένετο ἡ πόλις εἰς τρία μέρη (Rev. 16:19).

(d) SOMETIMES UNALTERED. As the name-case the nominative is sometimes left unaltered in the sentence instead of being put in the case of the word with which it is in apposition. Cf. Rev. 1:5; Mk. 12:38-40; Lu. 20:27; Ac. 10:37. This is in accord with the ancient Greek idiom, though the Book of Rev. has rather more than the usual proportion of such examples. See chapter on the Sentence, pp. 413 ff. In Rev. 9:11 observe ὄνομα ἔχει Ἀπολλύων (cf. Ἀβαδδών also), where the nominative is retained much after the fashion of our quotation-marks. The same thing[4] is noticeable in Jo. 13:13 ὑμεῖς φωνεῖτέ με Ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ Ὁ κύριος, for thus W. H. print it. This is a classic idiom. Cf. Xenoph., *Oec*. 6, 14 ἔχοντας, τὸ σεμνὸν τοῦτο τὸ καλός τε κἀγαθός. Cf. Lu. 19:29; 21:37, where W. H. print εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν. But we know from Ac. 1:12, (ἀπὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν. that ἐλαιών could be in Luke a nominative (abundantly confirmed

[1] Prol., p. 71 f.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 85. "Ein starker Hebraismus," W.-Sch., p. 257.
[3] W.-Th., p. 184.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 235, endorses Blast's view (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 85) that in Jo. 13:13 we have the voc. The nom. is hardly "incredible" (Blass). Cf. loose use of the nom. in lists in Boeot. inscr. in the midst of other cases (Claflin, Synt., etc., p. 46).

by the papyri). The most that can be said about the passages in Luke is that the nominative **ἐλαιών** is entirely possible, perhaps probable.[1] In Rev. 1:4 (**ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος**) the nominative is kept purposely, as has been shown, to accent the unchangeableness of God, not that John did not know how to use the ablative after **ἀπό**, for in the same sentence he has **ἀπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων**. Moulton[2] aptly describes the nominative as "residuary legatee of case-relations not obviously appropriated by other cases." But as a matter of fact the nominative as a rule is used normally and assimilation is general so that in Mt. 1:21 (cf. 1:25 also) we read **καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν**. Cf. Mk. 3:16 **ὄνομα Πέτρον** and Ac. 27:1 **ἑκατοντάρχῃ ὀνόματι Ἰουλίῳ**. Cf. Ac. 18:2. It is, of course, nothing strange to see the nominative form in apposition with a vocative, as **οἱ φοβούμενοι** (Rev. 19:5), **πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** (Mt. 6:9). This is only natural as the article and participles have no vocative form. Cf. **ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων** (Ro. 2:3). Cf. even **οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι** (Lu. 6:25), where we have really the vocative, not apposition.

(e) THE NOMINATIVE ABSOLUTE. The nominative is sometimes used absolutely, *nominatus pendens*, just as the genitive (ablative) and accusative are. Cf. ablative absolute in Latin, locative in Anglo-Saxon, and nominative absolute in modern Greek and modern English. In titles the nominative is the natural case and is left suspended. Cf. **Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος** (1 Cor. 1:1). The LXX has an abnormal number of suspended nominatives, due to a literal translation of the Hebrew.[3] But the N. T. has some also which are due to change of structure, as **ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτόν** (Rev. 3:12), **ὁ νικῶν δώσω αὐτῷ** (Rev. 3:21), **ὁ γὰρ Μωυσῆς οὗτος—οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί ἐγένετο αὐτῷ** (Ac. 7:40), **πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργὸν—ἀποδώσουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον** (Mt. 12:36), **ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι** (Lu. 21:6). In particular is the participle (cf. Jo. 7:38, **ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ** common in such a nominative, about which see the chapter on the Sentence (anacoluthon). Moulton[4] considers this one of "the easiest of anacolutha." Cf. further **πᾶς ὅς ἐρεῖ — ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ**, (Lu. 12:10; cf. verse 8). Cf. Jo. 18:11. Some of the examples, like **τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει** (Ro. 8:3), may be regarded as accusative as easily as nominative. The

[1] See extended discussion in Moulton, Prol., pp. 69, 235. See also note in this Gr. in ch. on Orthog. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 256 f,

[2] Prol., p. 69.

[3] C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 55.

[4] Prol., pp. 69, 225.

papyri[1] show plenty of examples of this suspended nominative. For classical instances see Riemann and Goelzer, *Syntaxe*, p. 41. For elliptical nominative see **Εὐδία** (Mt. 16:2). There was a constant tendency in the LXX to drift into the nominative in a long series of words in apposition (Thackeray, p. 23).

(f) THE PARENTHETIC NOMINATIVE is of a piece with what we have been considering. So in Jo. 1:6 we have **ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάνης** all by itself. Cf. 3:1 (**Νικόδημος ὄνομα αὐτῷ**). Similarly the nominative in expressions of time rather than the accusative may be explained.[2] For example in Mk. 8:2 we read **ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι** and = Mt. 15:32. In Lu. 9:28 **ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ** the matter is simpler. Blass[3] compares with this passage **ὡς ὡρῶν τριῶν διάστημα** (Ac. 5:7) and **ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη** (Lu. 13:16). The use of **ἰδού** with the nominative is very common and may be a case of ellipsis. Cf. **ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα** (Mt. 3:17). Cf. Heb. 2:13, etc. In Mk. 6:40 observe **ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαί**. This leads one to suspect that **συμπόσια συμπόσια** in verse 39 may be nominative also. The repetition is not a mere Hebraism, since the papyri show examples of it, See Eccl. 2: 16 **καθότι ἤδη αἱ ἡμέραι ἐρχόμεναι τὰ πάντα ἐπελήσθη**. This use of the nominative is common in the papyri (cf. **ἔτι ἡμέραι γὰρ ἤδη τρεῖς καὶ νύκτες τρεῖς θέκλα οὐκ ἐγήγερται**, *Acta Pauli et Theclae* in O.P. p. 9) and can be traced in the Attic vernacular back to the fifth century B.C.[4] Thumb finds it still in the modern Greek, and Hopkins (A.J.P. xxiv. 1) "cites a rare use from the Sanskrit: 'a year (nom.) almost, I have not gone out from the hermitage'" (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 235). See other papyri examples in *Cl. Rev.*, April, 1904, p. 152. Of a piece with this is the nominative with adverbs (prepositions) like **εἷς κατὰ εἷς** (Mk. 14:19) where the first **εἷς** is in partitive apposition and the second is kept rather than made accusative. Cf. **καθ' εἷς** (Ro. 12:5), **ἀνὰ εἷς** (Rev. 21:21). Brugmann[5] indeed considers the adverbs **πρῶτον, δεύτερον**, etc., in the nominative neuter rather than the accusative neuter singular. He cites **ἀναμίξ** as proof. Cf. the use of **καὶ τοῦτο** (and also **καὶ ταῦτα**), as **καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἀπίστων** (1 Cor. 6:6). But **αὐτὸ τοῦτο** (2 Pet. 1:5) is probably accusative. The prolepsis of the nominative as in 1 Cor. 14:16 (**ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου πῶς ἐρεῖ**) is natural. Cf. examples like **χρόνος ὁ αὐτός** in Boeotian inscriptions (Claflin, *Syntax*, etc., p. 47).

[1] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1964, p. 151 f.
[2] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 70.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 85.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 70; Meisterh., Gr., etc., p. 203.
[5] Griech. Gr., p. 378,

(g) IN EXCLAMATIONS. The nominative is natural in exclamations, a sort of interjectional nominative.[1] So Paul in Ro. 7:24, ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος, and 11:33, ὦ βάθος (a possible vocative) πλούτου. So. Ro. 7:24; 1 Cor. 15:57. Cf. χάρις τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 6 : 17). For parallel in papyri see Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., 1901, p. 436. Cf. χάρις τοῖς θεοῖς, B.U. 843 (i/A.D.).

(h) USED AS VOCATIVE. It only remains to consider the nominative form which is used as a vocative. Cf. chapter VII, 7, (a), for details as to form. It all depends on what one means by the term "case" when he says that the nominative is used as a vocative. The form is undoubtedly the same as that of the vocative in a multitude of instances (all neuter nouns, for instance, singular and plural, plural of all nouns in truth). It is only in the singular that any distinction was made between the nominative and vocative in form, and by no means always here, as in the case of feminine nouns of the first declension, θεός (usually) in the second, liquid oxytones like ποιμήν in the third, etc. But if by the vocative one means the case of address, then the nominative form in address is really vocative, not nominative. Thus σύ πατήρ (Jo. 17:21) is just as truly vocative as **συ,** πάτερ (17:5). Indeed in Jo. 17:25 we have πατὴρ δίκαιε, showing that πατήρ is here regarded as vocative. The article with the vocative in address was the usual Hebrew and Aramaic idiom, as indeed in Aristophanes[2] we have **ὁ** παῖς ἀκολούθει. It is good Greek and good Aramaic too when we have **᾽Α**ββά **ὁ** πατήρ (Mk. 14:36) whether Jesus said one or both. In Mt. 11:26 (ναί, **ὁ** πατήρ) we have the vocative. When the article is used, of course the nominative form must occur. Thus in Rev. 18:20 we have both together, **οὐρανὲ καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι**. Indeed the second member of the address is always in the nominative form.[3] Thus **Κύριε, ὁ** θεός, **ὁ** παντοκράτωρ (Rev. 15:3). Cf. Jo. 20:28. I shall treat therefore this as really the vocative, not the nominative, whatever the form may be, and now pass on to the consideration of the Vocative Case.

VI. **The Vocative (πτῶσις κλητική).**

(a) NATURE OF THE VOCATIVE. Dionysius Thrax called it also προσαγορευτική, but in reality it is not a case at all. Practically it has to be treated as a case, though technically it is not (Farrar, Greek Syntax, p. 69). It is wholly outside of syntax in that the word is isolated and has no word-relations.[4] The isolation of the

[1] Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 41; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 115 f.
[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 86; Moulton, Prol., p. 70.
[3] Riem. and Goelzer, p. 42. [4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 376; Giles, Man., p. 302.

vocative may be compared to the absolute use of the nominative, genitive and accusative. The native Sanskrit grammarians do not name it in their list of cases, and Whitney[1] merely treats it in the singular after the other cases. Indeed the vocative is sometimes as much a sentence as a case, since the word stands to itself and forms a complete idea. Thus **Μαριάμ** and **Ῥαββουνεί** (Jo. 20:16) tell the whole story of recognition between Jesus and Mary. When Thomas said **Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου** (Jo. 20:28), he gave Christ full acceptance of his deity and of the fact of his resurrection.

(b) VARIOUS DEVICES. The vocative has no case-ending, but has to resort to various expedients. In general it is just like the nominative in form. This is true in all pronouns, participles and various special words like **θεός**, besides the plurals, neuters and feminines mentioned under v, (h). Cf. the same practical situation in the Sanskrit.[2] Farrar[3] indeed conjectures that originally there was no difference in form at all between the nominative and vocative and that the variation which did come was due to rapid pronunciation in address. Thus **πατήρ**, but **πέτερ**. Cf. **ἄνερ** (1 Cor. 7:16). In most languages there is no distinction in form at all between nominative and vocative, and in Latin the distinction is rare.[4] It need not be surprising, therefore, to find the nominative form of many singular words used as vocative as noted above under the discussion of the nominative. Moulton[5] indeed remarks: "The *anarthrous* nominative should probably be regarded as a mere substitute for the vocative, which begins from the earliest times to be supplanted by the nominative." Even in the singular the distinction was only partial and not very stable at best, especially in the vernacular, and gradually broke down till "in modern Greek the forms in **ε** are practically the only separate vocatives surviving." Thus Blass[6] observes: "From the earliest times (the practice is as old as Homer) the nominative has a tendency to usurp the place of the vocative," This nominative form in the singular is just as really vocative as in the plural when used in address. The N. T. therefore is merely in line with the oldest Greek idiom in such examples. So **θυγάτηρ** (Mk. 5:34; Lu. 8:48; Jo. 12:15, LXX), but see **θύγατερ** in Mt. 9:22. In Jo. 17:21, 24, 25, W. H. read **πατήρ**, but **πάτερ** in Jo. 12:28; 17: 1, 5, 11, etc. Moulton[7] rightly refuses to follow Hort in writing **πάτηρ** in voca-

[1] Sans. Gr., p. 89.
[2] Whitney, p. 105.
[3] Gk. Synt., p. 70.
[4] Ib., p. 69.
[5] Prol., p. 71.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 86.
[7] Prol., p. 71. Hort, Notes on Orth., p. 158.

tive. In the margin of Mt. 9:27 W. H. read **υἱὲ Δαυείδ** rather than **υἱὸς Δ.** Mt. 1:20 has **Ἰωσὴφ υἱὸς Δαυείδ**, and 15:22 **κύριε υἱὸς Δαυείδ**, all examples of apposition. Cf. Mt. 20:30. But in Lu. 8:28 and 18:38 we have **υἱέ.** The adjective **ἄφρων** is vocative in Lu. 12:20 and 1 Cor. 15:36. Cf. also **γενεὰ ἄπιστος** in Lu. 9:41. In Acts 13:10 **πλήρης** is vocative. Cf. indeclinable use of this word. As is well known **θεός** was usually retained in the vocative in the older Greek, not **θεέ**. In the N. T. **θεέ** only appears in Mt. 27:46 in quotation from the LXX where it is rare.[1] Jannaris[2] indeed thinks that in the N. T. this idiom is rather frequent. Cf. **λαός μου** you in Baruch 4:5. In Ac. 7:42 **οἶκος Ἰσραήλ** is vocative (from LXX). Cf. also **βάθος πλούτου** (Ro. 11:33), not address, but exclamation. When the vocative has a separate form in the singular it is usually merely the stem of the word, like **πολῖτα, δαῖμον, λέον(τ)**, etc. But it is more than doubtful if this usage goes back to the original Indo-Germanic stock.[3] Cf. **βασιλεῦ** in Ac. 26:7. In the second declension masculine nouns in the singular show a change in the stem-vowel, changing to **ε**. This usage has persisted in modern Greek vernacular in most words; but note **θεός** above and the variations about **υἱός.** But see **ἄνθρωπε** (Ro. 2:1) as usual. In **γύναι** (Mt. 15:28) **κ** has dropped from the stem, as in forms like **λέον** the **τ** vanishes for euphony. In **θύγατερ** and **πάτερ** the mere stem suffers recessive accent. In Ps. 51:6 (**γλῶσσαν δολίαν**) we actually have the accusative form used as a vocative.[4] See further discussion in ch. VII (Declensions).

(c) USE OF **ὦ** WITH THE VOCATIVE. It is rare in the N. T., only 17 times, all but four of these in Luke and Paul. In Blass-Debrunner, p. 90, the rarity of **ὦ** is attributed to the Semitic influence. The common absence of it gives a sort of solemnity where it is found.[5] Moulton[6] observes that it is only in Luke's writings that it appears in the N. T. without emphasis after the classical fashion. Take as an instance of this literary usage **θεόφιλε** (Ac. 1:1), but **κράτιστε θεόφιλε** in Lu. 1:3. Moulton likewise notes the absence of **ὦ** in prayer in the N. T. (though sometimes in the LXX) and considers "the progressive omission of **ὦ**" in Greek not easy to explain. It came up from the vernacular and then gradually vanished from the vernacular much as

1 W.-Sch., p. 258 f.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 86 f.
2 Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 327.
3 Delbruck, Syntakt. Forch., IV, p. 28.
4 C. and S., Sel. from the Sept., p. 56.
5 Jann., Hist. Gk., Gr., p. 327.
6 Prol., p. 71.

our 0 has done.[1] Blass[2] notes that in most of the N. T. examples it expresses emotion, as ὦ γύναι. (Mt. 15:28), ὦ γενὰ ἄπιστος (Mk. 9:19), ὦ πλήρης (Ac. 13:10), etc. The tone may be one of censure as in Ro. 2:3; 9:20. But it is a mistake to think that the ancient Greeks always used ὦ in formal address. Simcox[3] notes that Demosthenes often said ἄνδρες **Ἀθηναῖοι** just as Paul did in Ac. 17:22. Paul says ὦ ἄνδρες once (Ac. 27:21). But the addresses in the N. T. are usually without ὦ (cf. Ac. 7:2).

(d) ADJECTIVES USED WITH THE VOCATIVE naturally have the same form. Thus ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ (Jas. 2:20), δοῦλε πονηρέ (Mt. 18:32), πάτερ ἅγιε (Jo. 17:11), κράτιστε θεόφιλε (Lu. 1:3). In Jo. 17:25 we read πατὴρ δίκαιε, clearly showing that πατήρ was regarded as a true vocative form. In Lu. 9:41 ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος the substantive has the same form in nominative and vocative and the adjective here follows suit. Cf. also Ac. 13:10; Lu. 12:20 where the adjective alone in the vocative has nominative form.

(e) APPOSITION TO THE VOCATIVE. The nominative forms and distinctive vocative forms are freely used side by side, in apposition, etc., when the case is vocative.[4] In Mt. 1:20 we have **Ἰωσὴφ υἱὸς Δαυείδ**, and in 15:22 W. H. read in the text **κύριε υἱὸς Δαυείδ**. Cf. also Mt. 20:30. So **κύριε, ὁ θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ** (Rev. 15:3), and **ὦ ἄνθρωπε, πᾶς ὁ κρίνων** (Ro. 2:1). In the last instance the participle and article naturally are unchanged. See again **οὐρανὲ καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι**, etc. (Rev. 18:20). Cf. also πάτερ ἡμῶν **ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** (Mt. 6:9). So **κύριέ μου** πατήρ, B.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). But two vocative forms are put together also. So **Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ ὑψίστου** (Lu. 8:28), πάτερ **κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ** (10:21), **Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυείδ** (18:38). In Ac. 13:10 the nominative form is followed by two vocative forms, **ὦ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου κτλ., υἱὲ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης.** But πλήρης may be here indeclinable. There is a distinct tendency among the less educated writers in the papyri to use the nominative as a convenient indeclinable (Moulton, Cl. Rev., April, 1904). So **τῆς ἐπιτήρησις**, N. P. 38 (iii/A.D.).

(f) VOCATIVE IN PREDICATE. The vocative is rarely found in the predicate, though not grammatical predicate. This was oc-

[1] Cf. J. A. Scott, Am. Jour. of Philol., xxvi, pp. 32-43, cited by Moulton, Prol., p. 71.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 86. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 257 f.; Johannessohn, Der Gebr. d. Kasus u. d. Prap. in d. LXX, 1910, pp. 8-13.

[3] Lang. of the N. T., p. 76. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 378.

[4] K.-G., I, p. 50; Giles, Man., p. 302; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 116. Cf. also C. and S., Sel. from the Sept., p. 55.

casionally the case in the older Greek by a sort of attraction to a real vocative in the sentence.[1] But in the N. T. we only have a few examples in the nature of quotation or translation. So in Jo. 1:38, **῾Ραββεί, ὃ λέγεται μεθερμηνευόμενον Διδάσκαλε**; 20:16 **῾Ραββουνεί, ὃ λέγεται Διδάσκαλε**.

(g) THE ARTICLE WITH THE VOCATIVE. This idiom is frequent in the N. T., some 60 examples.[2] It is a good Greek idiom and not infrequent.[3] Delbruck[4] finds it in harmony with the Indo-Germanic languages. Moulton[5] denies that the coincident Hebrew and Aramaic use of the article in address had any influence on the N. T. But one must admit that the LXX translators would be tempted to use this Greek idiom very frequently, since the Hebrew had the article in address.[6] Cf. 3 Ki. 17:20, 21, etc. In Mk 5:41, the Aramaic **Ταλειθά** is translated **τὸ κοράσιον**. One is therefore bound to allow some influence to the Hebrew and Aramaic.[7] Cf. also **᾽Αββά ὁ πατήρ** in Mk. 14:36, Gal. 4:6, and Ro. 8:15. It is doubtless true that **ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε** (Lu. 8:54) has a touch of tenderness, and that **τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον** (Lu. 12:32) means 'you little flock.' But one can hardly see such familiarity in **ὁ πατήρ** (Mt. 11:26). But in Mk. 9:25 there may be a sort of insistence in the article, like 'Thou dumb and deaf spirit' (**τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα**). Even here the Aramaic, if Jesus used it, had the article. Moulton[8] considers that **βασιλεῦ** in Ac. 26:7 admits the royal prerogative in a way that would be inappropriate in the mockery of Jesus in Jo. 19:3 (**χαιρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ᾽Ιουδαίων**). But Mk. 15:18 does have **βασιλεῦ τῶν ᾽Ιουδαίων**, due, according to Moulton, to "the writer's imperfect sensibility to the more delicate shades of Greek idiom." Possibly so, but may not the grammarian be guilty of slight overrefinement just here? In Mt. 27:29 the text of W. H. has **βασιλεῦ** while the margin reads **ὁ βασιλεύς**. In Rev. 15:3 we have **ὁ βασιλεύς τῶν αἰώνων**. In Heb. 1:8 it is not certain whether (**ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεός**) **ὁ θεός** is vocative or nominative. But **ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός** (Rev. 6:10) is vocative. As examples of participles in the vocative take **ὁ καταλύων** (Mt. 27:40)

[1] Giles, Man., p. 302; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 377. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., p. 397 f.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 70.

[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 70. Cf. K.-G., I, pp. 46 ff.

[4] Vergl. Synt., p. 398 f.

[5] Prol., p. 70.

[6] C. and S., Sel., etc., p. 54.

[7] Moulton in a note (p. 235) does concede some Aram. influence. In Hebrews it only occurs, as he notes, in 0. T. citations. Cf. also Dolman, Gr., p. 118.

[8] Prol., p. 70. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 327.

and **οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν** (Lu. 6:25). In Rev. 4:11 we have also the vocative case in **ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεός**. In Jo. 20:28 Thomas addresses Jesus as **ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου**, the vocative like those above. Yet, strange to say, Winer[1] calls this exclamation rather than address, apparently to avoid the conclusion that Thomas was satisfied as to the deity of Jesus by his appearance to him after the resurrection. Dr. E. A. Abbott[2] follows suit also in an extended argument to show that **κύριε ὁ θεός** is the LXX way of addressing God, not **ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεός**. But after he had written he appends a note to p. 95 to the effect that "this is not quite satisfactory. For xiii. 13, **φωνεῖτέ με ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος**, and Rev. 4:11 **ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν**, ought to have been mentioned above." This is a manly retraction, and he adds: "John may have used it here exceptionally." Leave out "exceptionally" and the conclusion is just. If Thomas used Aramaic he certainly used the article. It is no more exceptional in Jo. 20:28 than in Rev. 4:11.

VII. The Accusative (ἡ αἰτιατικὴ πτῶσις).

(a) THE NAME. It signifies little that is pertinent. Varro calls it *accusandei casus* from **αἰτιάομαι**, while Dionysius Thrax explains it as **κατ᾽ αἰτίαν** (‘cause’), a more likely idea. Glycas calls it also **τὸ αἴτον**. So Priscian terms it *causativus*. Gildersleeve ("A Syntactician among the Psychologists," Am. Jour. Philol., Jan., 1910, p. 76) remarks: "The Romans took the bad end of **αἰτία**, and translated **αἰτιατική**, *accusativus* — hopeless stupidity, from which grammar did not emerge till 1836, when Trendelenburg showed that **αἰτιατικὴ πτῶσις** means *casus effectivus*, or *causativus* . . . The object affected appears in Greek now as an accusative, now as a dative, now as a genitive. The object effected refuses to give its glory to another, and the object affected can be subsumed under the object effected." With this I agree. Cf. Farrar, *Greek Syntax*, p. 81. Old English "accuse" could mean ‘betray’ or ‘show,’ but the "showing" case does not mark it off from the rest. Originally, however, it was the only case and thus did show the relations of nouns with other words. On the small value of the case-names see Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.,* p. 379. But at any rate *accusativus* is a false translation of **αἰτιατική**. Steinthal, *Geschichte d. Spr*., p. 295.

(b) AGE AND HISTORY. A more pertinent point is the age and history of the accusative, the oldest of all the cases. Farrar (*Greek Syntax*, p. 81) calls attention to the fact that **ἐγών** (old form of **ἐγώ**), Sanskrit *aham, tuam*, Boeotian **τούν**, Latin *idem*, all have the

[1] W.-Th., p. 183. [2] Joh. Gr., pp. 93 ff.

accusative ending though in the nominative. If it is true that the accusative is the oldest case, perhaps we are to think of the other oblique cases as variations from it. In other words the accusative was the normal oblique case for a noun, (especially with verbs) unless there was some special reason for it to be in another case. The other oblique cases were developed apparently to express more exactly than the accusative the various word-relations. Indeed in the vernacular Greek the accusative retained its old frequency as the normal case with verbs that in the literary style used other cases.[1] In the old Greek poets the same thing is noticeable. Pindar,[2] for example, has "a multiplicity of accusatives." In the modern Greek vernacular the accusative has regained its original frequency to the corresponding disuse of the other oblique cases. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 35. "When a find sense for language is failing, it is natural to use the direct accusative to express any object which verbal action affects, and so to efface the difference between 'transitive' and 'intransitive' verbs."[3] There was therefore first a decrease in the use of the accusative as the literary language grew, then an increase in the **κοινή** vernacular,[4] the later Greek,[5] and especially the modern Greek vernacular.[6] This gain or rather persistence of the accusative in the vernacular is manifest in the N. T. in various ways. But the literary **κοινή** shows it also, as Krebs[7] has carefully worked out with many verbs.

(c) THE MEANING OF THE ACCUSATIVE. It is not so easy to determine this in the view of many scholars. Delbruck[8] despairs of finding a single unifying idea, but only special types of the accusative. Brugmann[9] also admits that the real ground-idea of the case is unknown, though the relation between noun and verb is expressed by it. The categories are not always sharply defined in the soul of the speaker.[10] Hilbschmann[11] treats the expansion

[1] Mullach, Gr. der griech. Vulgarspr., pp. 328-333.

[2] Giles, Man., p. 306.

[3] Jebb, Vincent and Dickson's Handb. to Mod. Gk., p. 307.

[4] Volker, Pap. Gr. Synt. Spec., p. 5 f.

[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 328. [6] Hatz., Einl., p. 221.

[7] Zur Rect. der Casus in der spat. hist. Grdc. (1887-90). Cf. also Moulton, Prol., pp. 63 ff.

[8] Die Grundl. d. griech. Synt., Bd. IV, p. 29; Vergl. Synt., I, p. 187. Cf. III, pp. 360-393.

[9] Kurze vergl. Gr., p. 441. [10] Griech. Gr., p. 379.

[11] Zur Casusl., p. 133. For list of books on the ace. see Hubner, Grundr. etc., p. 40 f. Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 44, agree with Hubschm. Cf. also K.-G., I, p. 291.

of the verb as the ground-idea of the accusative. "The relation of the accusative to its governing verb resembles the relation of the genitive to its governing substantive."[1] La Roche[2] considers it originally a local case and that the inner meaning came later. The usage of the accusative can indeed, for convenience, be divided into the outer (οἰκίαν, Mt. 7:24) and the inner (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν, Mk. 4:41) usage. But the whole case cannot be discussed on this artificial principle, as Monro[3] rightly sees. He sees hope only in the direction of the wide adverbial use of the accusative. In the Sanskrit certainly "a host of adverbs are accusative cases in form."[4] Green[5] calls it "the limitative case," and he is not far out of the way. Farrar[6] thinks that "motion towards" explains it all. Giles,[7] while recognising all the difficulties, defines the accusative as the answer to the question "How far?" The word *extension* comes as near as any to expressing the broad general idea of the accusative as applied to its use with verbs, substantives, adjectives, prepositions. It is far more commonly used with verbs, to be sure, but at bottom the other uses have this same general idea. Being the first case it is naturally the most general in idea. If you ask a child (in English) "Who is it?" he will reply "It's me." This is, however, not a German idiom. The accusative measures an idea as to its content, scope, direction. But the accusative was used in so many special applications of this principle that various subdivisions became necessary for intelligent study.

(d) WITH VERBS OF MOTION. It is natural to begin with verbs of motion, whether we know that this was the earliest use or not, a matter impossible to decide. We still in English say "go home," and the Latin used *domum* in exactly that way. Extension over space is, of course, the idea here. One goes all the way to his home. It is found in Homer and occasionally in Greek writers.[8] Modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 37, has a local accusative) πάμε σπίτι, 'we are going home.' Moulton (*Prol*., p. 61) notes that it is just the local cases that first lost their distinctive forms (ablative, locative, associative-instrumental; and the "terminal accusative" like *ire Romam* disappeared also. "The surviving Greek

[1] Strong, Logeman and Wheeler, Hist. of Lang., p. 128.
[2] Der Accus. in Hom., p. 1.
[3] Hom. Gr., p. 92.
[4] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 90.
[5] Notes on Gk. and Lat. Synt., p. 10.
[6] Gk. Synt., p. 81 f.
[7] Man., p. 303.
[8] See K.-G., I, p. 311 f. for exx.; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 96. Extremely common in Sanskrit.

cases thus represent purely grammatical relations, those of subject, object, possession, remoter object and instrument." The place-adverb does supply the place of the terminal accusative, but not entirely of the locative, ablative and instrumental.

Some MSS. in Ac. 27:2 read **πλεῖν τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους,** but the best (W. H.) have **εἰς** after **πλεῖν**. In **ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον** and **τὸ πέλαγος διαπλεύσαντες** (cf. English "sail the sea"), verses 4 f., the prepositions in composition help to explain the case. In Mt. 4:15 **ὁδὸν θαλάσσης** has no verb of motion and comes in the midst of vocatives in a way quite startling. Green[1] refers to the LXX (Is. 9:1) for the explanation and quotes "Christ and Him Crucified." But the LXX gives little relief, for, while B does not have it, several MSS. do and without a verb. B however reads **οἱ τῆν παραλίαν**, which presents the same difficulty as to case. Winer[2] suggests **οἰκοῦντες**, with **οἱ,** possibly correct. But even in Matthew the writer may have had in mind the general accusative notion of extension, 'along the way of the sea.'

(e) EXTENT OF SPACE. The ordinary accusative for extent of space does not differ materially from that of motion above. Here the root-idea of the case is easily perceived apart from the force of the verb. The point is that this is not a special development of the accusative, but is the normal idea of the case, extension. The application to space is natural. The Greek continues all along to have this idiom as the Latin and English. The adverb **μακράν** (Ac. 22:21) is a good example. Take Jo. 6:19 **ἐληλακότες ὡς σταδίους εἴκοσι πέντε ἢ τριάκοντα**, Lu. 22:41 **ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν**. The accusative tells "how far." Observe in Lu. 2:44 **ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδόν**. **Προσελθὼν μικρόν** (Mt. 26:39) is a good example of this use of the accusative. In Ac. 1:12 **σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν** varies the construction by the insertion of **ἔχον**. In Lu. 24:13 similarly we have **ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα**. Cf. Mt. 14:24. The use of **ἀπό**, as **ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε** (Jo. 11:18; cf. 21:8; Rev. 14:20), Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 95) calls a Latinism (cf. *a millibus passuum duobus*), but Moulton (*Prol*., p. 101 f.) cites Doric and papyri parallels for **πρό** and makes a mere Latinism unlikely. So O.P. 492 (ii/A.D.) **μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα**. Diodorus and Plutarch use the same idiom. It is clearly not a direct Latinism. In modern Greek the accusative is common for locality or place affected (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 35 f.).

(f) EXTENT OF TIME. It answers the question "how far?" in time, or "how long?" In the N. T. the examples of time are far

[1] Handb., etc., p. 234. [2] W.-Th., p. 231.

more frequent than those of mere space. The locative, instrumental and genitive are also used to express time, but they bring out a different idea, as will be shown. The accusative is thus used for duration or extension in the Indo-Germanic languages generally. Cf. **τί ὧδε ἑστήκατε ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἀργοί** (Mt. 20:6); **τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι** (Lu. 15:29). A good example is **ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην** (Jo. 1:39). Cf. Jo. 2:12; 11:6. In Lu. 1:75 W. H. (text) read **πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις** (instr.). Another good illustration is **ἀπεδήμησεν χρόνους ἱκανούς** (Lu. 20:9). Cf. **ἐκ δηναρίου τὴν ἡμέραν** (Mt. 20:2) where the accusative well brings out the agreement between the landlord and the labourers. In **νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν** (Mk. 4:27) the sleeping and rising go on continually from day to day. Cf. **ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας** (2 Pet. 2:8). The papyri examples are numerous, like **τόκους διδράχμους τῆς μνᾶς τὸν μῆνα ἕκαστον**, A.P. 50 (ii/B.C.). Cf. Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, Dec., 1901. The plural is like, wise so used, as **τὰς ἡμέρας—τὰς νύκτας** (Lu. 21: 37).

Perhaps little difficulty is felt in the accusative in Ac. 24:25, **τὸ νῦν ἔχον πορεύου**. So also as to **τὸ λοιπόν** (or **λοιπόν**) in Mk. 14:41, **τὸ πλεῖστον** (1 Cor. 14:27), and even **ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλά** (Ro. 15: 22). But there are uses of the accusative in expressions of time that do furnish trouble at first blush. In some of these the accusative seems to be merely adverbial (Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 94) with little stress on duration. Indeed a point of time may be indicated. Cf. **τὸ πρότερον** (Jo. 6:62), **πρότερον** (Heb. 10:32), **πρῶτον** (Mt. 5:24). It is not hard to see how the accusative of general reference came to be used here, although it is a point of time. Note the article (**τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν**, Lu. 19:47) in the accusative. We can now go on to **τὸ τέλος** (1 Pet. 3:8) and even **τὴν ἀρχήν** (Jo. 8:25). But a more difficult example is found in Jo. 4:52, **ἐχθὲς ὥραν ἑβδόμην**, where a point of time is indicated. See also **ποίαν ὥραν** in Rev. 3:3; **πᾶσαν ὥραν** (1 Cor. 15:30). One may conjecture that this use of **ὥραν** was not regarded as essentially different from the idea of extension. Either the action was regarded as going over the hour or the hour was looked at more as an adverbial accusative like **τὸ λοιπόν** above. Cf. also **τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς γενέσθαι εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα** (Ac. 20:16). In Blass-Debrunner, p. 98, examples are given from AEschylus, Euripides, Aristotle, Demosthenes, where **ὥραν=εἰς ὥραν**. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 63, for **τὸ πέμπτον ἔτος** (0.P. 477, ii/A.D.) 'in the fifth year.' **Τὸ παρόν** B.U. 22 (ii/A.D.) means 'at present' (Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p. 437). In the modern Greek vernacular the accusative is used freely to designate a point of time as well as extent of time

(Thumb, *Handb*., p. 37). So in the N. T. the accusative is widening its scope again. In Ac. 10:30 **ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην τὴν ἐνάτην προσευχόμενος** we can see an interesting example where **τὴν ἐνάτην** is explanatory of the previous note of time, a point of time, and yet a whole hour is meant. In Ac. 10:3 (**περὶ ὥραν ἐνάτην**) observe **περί**, though some MSS. do not have the preposition. Cf. Mk. 13:35 **μεσονύκτιον** (acc.) **ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας** (gen.) **ἢ πρωί** (loc.) for points of time.[1] The papyri have examples of a point of time in the accusative,[2] as already seen. But the locative is still more frequent in the N. T. for a point of time, as **ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ** (Lu. 12:39). It is not difficult to see the appropriateness of the accusative in **τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην σήμερον ἡμέραν προσδοκῶντες ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε** (Ac. 27:33). It is good Greek with the ordinal.

(g) WITH TRANSITIVE VERBS. The most common accusative is when it is the object of a transitive verb. One cannot hope to pursue all the uses of the accusative in the order of historical development. For instance, no one knows whether cognate accusative (of inner content or objective result) preceded the ordinary objective use of the case. Does the adverbial accusative (so common in adjectives) precede the accusative with verbs? These points have to be left unsettled. In actual usage the accusative with transitive verbs calls for most attention. But the term "transitive" needs a word. It means a verb whose action passes over to a noun. This idea may be intransitive in another language, as, for instance, **μὴ ὀμνύετε μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν** (Jas. 5:12). In English **ὀμνύω** is rendered by 'swear by.' Cf. **ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν** (Jo. 6:27), English 'work for.' Not all Greek verbs are transitive, as **εἰμί**, for example. The same verb may be used now transitively, now intransitively, as **ἔμενον ἡμᾶς** (Ac. 20:5) and **ἔμενεν παρ' αὐτοῖς** (Ac. 18:3). So **ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ** (Mt. 6:4) and **τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος** (Mt. 7:3). Cf. English word "see." As further illustration of the freedom of the Greek verb note **βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε** (Mk. 4:24), **βλέπετε τοὺς κύνας** (Ph. 3:2), **βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης** (Mk. 8:15).[3] There is indeed a difference between the accusative and the use of a preposition as in **φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν** (1 Cor. 6 : 18) and **φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας**. (1 Cor. 10:14).

[1] Blass, Or. of N. T. Gk., p. 311.

[2] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 152. O.P. 477 (21) **ἔτος** is so used. The acc. is used in the Sans. for a point of time. Cf. Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 92. For exx. in the LXX see C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 56. Cf. also Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 75.

[3] Green, Handb., etc., p. 230.

But for practical purposes many Greek verbs were used with liberty. In the case of **φοβέομαι** with accus. (Mt. 10:26, 28) or with **ἀπό** and ablative (Mt. 10:28) we have a Hebraism. Moulton (Prol., p. 102) admits that this use of **ἀπό** is a "translation-Hebraism" (מִן). It occurs in both Mt. (10:28) and Lu. (12:4) and represents probably the Aramaic original. Cf. **ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπό** (Lu. 12:15) and **ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπό** (Mt. 16:6). Xen. (Cyr., 11. 3, 9) uses **ἀπό** with **φυλάσσω**. This matter will call for further discussion directly.

But we have (pp. 330 f.) observed that *transitive verbs* in Greek *do not always have* the accusative. The transitiveness may be as clearly expressed by a dative as with **ἀκολουθέω**, the genitive with **ἐπιθυμέω**, the ablative with **ἀποστερέω**, etc. The accusative is indeed the normal case with transitive verbs, but not the only one. Some verbs continued to use the accusative parallel with the other cases. Thus **ἐπιλανθάνομαι** has **τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω** in Ph. 3:13, but **φιλοξενίας** in Heb. 13:2. Sometimes the point lies in the difference of case, as **ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς** (Ac. 9:7), but **τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν** (Ac. 22:9). Then again verbs otherwise intransitive may be rendered transitive by the preposition in composition. Cf. **διήρχετο τὴν Ἰερειχώ** (Lu. 19:1), but **ἐκείνης** in 19:4. So **παραπλεῦσαι τὴν Ἔφεσον** (Ac. 20:16), etc. Another introductory remark about transitive verbs is that it is not a question of the voice of the verb. Many active verbs are intransitive like **εἰμί**; middle verbs may be either transitive or intransitive; even passive verbs may be transitive. Thus **ἤκουον ταῦτα** (Lu. 16:14), **ἐκτήσατο χωρίον** (Ac. 1:18), and **μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς** (Mt. 10:26) are all transitive constructions. Cf. Mk. 8:38; Ro. 1:16; 2 Tim. 1:8 for **ἐπαισχύνομαι** (passive) with accusative.

One cannot, of course, mention all the N. T. transitive verbs that have the accusative. Here is a list of the most frequent verbs that are not always transitive, but sometimes have the accusative.[1] **Ἀδικέω** indeed may be either transitive (Mt. 20:13) or intransitive (Ac. 25:11), in the one case meaning 'do wrong to,' in the other 'be guilty.' **Βλάπτω** (only twice in the N. T., Mk. 16:18; Lu. 4:35) is transitive both times. **Βοηθέω** has only dative (Mk. 9:22) and **ὠφελέω** only accusative (Mk. 8:36). In Lu. 17:2 we have **λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ. Ἀπορέομαι** is always intransitive in the N. T. (like διαπ.) except in Ac, 25:20 (so ancient Greek sometimes). **Ἀποστρέφομαι** as in Attic, is found with the accusative in Tit. 1:14 and Heb. 12:25. In 2 Tim. 1:15 the aorist passive

[1] See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 87-89. Cf. also W.-Th., pp. 221 ff.

(**ἀπεστράφησάν με**) is so used. For like use of the aorist or future passive with accusative see **ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου** (Mt. 21:37), where the earlier writers generally had dative (**ἐντρέπομαι**); **ἐπαισχυνθῇ με** (Mk. 8:38) from **ἐπαισχύνομαι**, whereas **αἰσχύνομαι** is intransitive (**ἀπό** and abl. in 1 Jo. 2:28). So also **οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη** (Mk. 15:5) as **οὐδὲν ἀπερίνατο** (Mt. 27:12), but note **ἀπερίθη πρὸς οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα** (Mt. 27:14). Cf. **τί ἀποκριθῇ** (Mk. 9:6). For **φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς** see Mt. 10:26 and note **φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων** (10:28) which happens to be in imitation of the Hebrew idiom (יָרֵא מִן) as of the English "be afraid of." (Cf. above.) See Jer. 1:8. In Mt. 10:31 **φοβεῖσθε** is intransitive.

Βασκαίνω in Attic Greek was used with the dative in the sense of 'envy,' but in Gal. 3:1 the accusative in the sense of 'bewitch.' **Βλασφημέω** in the Attic had **εἰς** as in Lu. 12:10, but it also occurs as transitive with accusative (Mt. 27:39). In 2 Pet. 2:12 we find **ἐν,** not **εἰς** (cf. Jude 10). **Ἐπηρεάζω** has the accusative, not dative as Attic, in Lu. 6:28; 1 Pet. 3:16. So **καταράομαι** has **ὑμᾶς** (some MSS. **ὑμῖν** like Attic) in Lu. 6:28. Cf. Mk. 11:21; Jas. 3:9. For **λοιδορέω** with accusative see Jo. 9:28; Ac. 23:4, and for **λυμαίνομαι** see Ac. 8:3. The MSS. vary in Heb. 8:8 between **αὐτούς** and **αὐτοῖς** (as in Attic) with **μεμφομαι**, but W. H. read **αὐτούς**. In Mt. 5:11 and 27:44 **ὀνειδίζω** has the accusative, though Attic used the dative. The accusative alone occurs with **ὑβρίζω** (Lu. 11:45). So also both **εὐλογέω** (Lu. 2:28) and **κακολογέω** (Ac. 19:9) have the accusative. In Ac. 23:5 **οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς** is found with the accusative. In the margin of Jo. 1:15 W. H. give **ὃν εἶπον**. In Jo. 8:27 we have **τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦις ἔλεγεν**, with which compare as **οὓς ἔλεγον** (Ph. 3:18), a construction common in the older Greek. A similar construction is found in Attic Greek with **εὖ (καλῶς) ποιέω, κακῶς ποιέω**, etc. In the N. T., however, note **αὐτοῖς εὖ ποιεῖν** (Mk. 14:7) and **καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν** (Lu. 6:27).

The remaining verbs[1] that call for discussion in this connection cannot be grouped very well. They will be treated simply in alphabetical order. In the LXX **γεύομαι**, is fairly common with the accusative, and some examples occur in other later writers instead of the usual genitive.[2] In the N. T. the genitive is still the usual case (**θανάτου**, Lu. 9:27; Jo. 8:52; Heb. 2:9; **δείπνου**, Lu. 14:24; **δωρεᾶς**, Heb. 6:4; **μηδενός**, Ac. 23:14), but the accusative

[1] Volker, Pap. Gr. Synt. Spec., pp. 6-8, gives the following verbs as having the acc. in the pap.: **ἀλλάσσω, δουλεύω, ἐπιθυμέω, ἐπιτυγχάνω, ἐπιλανθάνομαι, ἐξέρχομαι, εὐδοκέω, κατηγορέω, κρατέω, κυριεύω, λυπέω, παρίσταμαι, πορεύομαι, πληρόω, ὑπαντάω, χράομαι**

[2] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 77.

is found in Jo. 2:9 (τὸ ὕδωρ) and Heb. 6:5 (καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα). In Rev. 17:3 we even have γέμοντα ὀνόματα instead of ὀνομάτων. The accusative appears with γονυπετέω (Mk. 10:17), but absolutely in Mk. 1:40, and with ἔμπροσθεν in Mt. 27:29. In Rev. 2:14 διδάσκω has the dative (τῷ βαλάκ), a construction which might *a priori* seem natural with this verb, but not so used in Greek (cf. Latin and English).[1] Διψάω and πεινάω are intransitive in the N. T. save in Mt. 5:6 where the accusative is used, not the class. genitive. Δράσσομαι appears only once (1 Cor. 3:19) in a quotation from the LXX and has the accusative. Ἐλεέω is transitive (Mt. 9:27, etc.) as is οἰκτέρω (Ro. 9:15, quotation from LXX). Ἐμπορεύομαι occurs only twice, once intransitive (Jas. 4:13), once with accusative (2 Pet. 2:3). Ἐνεδρεύω likewise occurs only twice (Lu. 11:54; Ac. 23:21) and with accusative both times. Cf. O.P. 484 (ii/A.D.) in sense of 'defraud' with accusative. (Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., Apr., 1904). Ἐπιθυμέω is found with the genitive (Ac. 20: 33) or with the accusative (Mt. 5:28) according to W. H. (BD, etc.). Ἐραγζομαι is often transitive, but τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται, (Rev. 18:17) is somewhat unusual, to say the least. Εὐαγγελίζομαι (active in Rev. 10:7; 14:6; passive Gal. 1:11; Heb. 4:6, etc.) has the Attic idiom of accusative of the thing and dative of the person (Lu. 4:43; Eph. 3:8, etc.), but examples occur of the accusative of the person addressed (Lu. 3:18; Ac. 8:25). In Ac. 13:32 Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk*., p. 90 note) denies two accusatives to εὐαγγ., construing τὴν –ἐπαγγελίαν with ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν. This is rather forced, but even so the ὅτι clause would be in the accus. Εὐδοκέω is trans. in the LXX and so appears in the N. T. twice (Mt. 12:18, quotation from the LXX; Heb. 10: 6, 8, LXX also). Εὐχαριστέω in 2 Cor. 1:11 occurs in the passive (τὸ χάρισμα εὐχαριστηθῇ) in a construction that shows that the active would have had an accusative of the thing and a dative of the person. Cf., for instance, πλεονεκτηθῶμεν in 2 Cor. 2:11 with ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς (2 Cor. 12:17 f.), only εὐχ. did not go so far as to have the accusative. On the other hand in the N. T. θαρρέω is not transitive (2 Cor. 10:2 instr.), though in the older Greek it was sometimes. It occurs absolutely (2 Cor. 5:6), with ἐν (2 Cor. 7:16), with εἰς (2 Cor. 10:1). Θαυμάζω has the accusative in Lu. 7:9, Ac. 7:31 and Ju. 16. Θριαμβεύω has the accusative in 2 Cor 2:14 and Col. 2:15, though the verb has a different sense in each passage. Ἱερουργέω occurs only once (Ro. 15:16) and with the accusative. In Heb. 2:17 ἱλάσκομαι has accusative of the

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 80.

thing as in LXX, Philo and inscriptions (Blass, *Gr. of N. T.*, p. 88). **Καυχάομαι** has accusative in 2 Cor. 9:2 and 11:30. **Κλαίω** has accusative in Mt. 2:18 (0. T. quotation unlike LXX), but **ἐπί** in Lu. 23:28. However, D omits **ἐπί**. **Κληρονομέω** has only the accusative. **Κόπτομαι** has accusative in Lu. 8:52 (**ἐπί** Rev. 1:7). **Κρατέω** out of forty-seven instances in the N. T. has the genitive in eight, accusative in 37, one absolute, one **τοῦ** and inf.[1] **Μαθητεύω** is a late word and has the accusative in Mt. 28:19 and Ac. 14:21. The other examples (Mt. 13:52; 27:57) are passive, but in Mt. 27:57 the active (intr.) is the marginal reading of W. H. Cf. old English verb "disciple." **Μέμφομαι** has the accusative, not dative, in Heb. 8:8, but the text is doubtful. **Μένω** is usually intransitive, but in Ac. 20:5, 23, the accusative occurs (sense of 'wait for'). Cf. also accusative with **ἀναμένω** (1 Th. 1:10), **περιμένω** (Ac. 1:4), **ὑπομένω** (Heb. 10:32) in sense of 'endure.' **Νικάω** is transitive with accusative usually, but in Rev. 15:2 it uses **ἐκ** with ablative. So **ξενίζομαι** is transitive with accusative in Heb. 13:2. **Ὄμνυμι** usually has **ἐν** (Mt. 23:16, etc., cf. Hebrew בְּ sometimes **κατά** (Heb. 6:13), or occurs absolutely (Mt. 5:34), but the accusative (sense of 'swear by,' common in ancient Greek, cf. Hos. 4:15 for LXX) appears only in Jas. 5:12, except **ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν** (Lu. 1:73), a cognate accusative. The papyri show it with the accusative, B.U. 543 (i/B.c.). Moulton, Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901. **Ὀνειδίζω** has the accusative, not the dative, in the N. T. **Ὁρικίζω** has the accusative in both instances that occur in the N. T. (Mk. 5:7; Ac. 19:13), while **ἐξορκίζω** (Mt. 26:63) has the accusative and **κατά** also (**σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ**). **Ὁμολογέω** is common with the accusative or absolutely, but in Mt. 10:32 (two examples) and Lu. 12:8 (two examples) **ἐν** is used as the translation of the Aramaic בְּ. Moulton[2] is unable to find any justification for this idiom in Greek and calls attention to the fact that both Matthew and Luke have it in a parallel passage as proof of the Aramaic original as the language of Jesus. One may note **περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις** (Rev. 3:5). The use of **ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο** (Ac. 15:7) is not parallel as Winer[3] observes. Here **ἐν ἡμῖν** means 'among us.' In Ac. 27:22 **παραινέω** (like **παρακαλέω**, Blass, *Gr. of N. T.*, p. 90) has the accusative instead of the dative of the person. In 2 Cor. 12:21 **πενθέω** has the accusative, but **ἐπί** in Rev. 18:11. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 67 f.) has a very helpful discussion of **πιστεύω**

[1] Moulton (ib., p. 235) comments on Wellhausen's remark that D prefers uniformly ace. with **ἀκούω, κατηγορέω** and **κρατέω**.

[2] Prol., p. 104. [3] W.-Th., p. 226.

when not absolute and not meaning 'entrust.' Under the dative his remarks will be pertinent. **Πιστεύω** is often absolute (Jo. 1:50) and often means 'entrust' when it has the accusative (Jo. 2:24), **Προσκυνέω**) in the ancient Greek uses the accusative regularly. In the Ptolemaic inscriptions the accusative is still the more usual case,[1] but the N. T. uses the dative twice as often as the accusative.[2] In Jo. 4:23 the accusative and the dative occur with little difference in result.[3] Cf. also Rev. 13:4, 8. Abbott[4] observes that the dative is the regular usage in the LXX. As to **ὑστερέω** we find it used absolutely (Mt. 19:20), with the ablative (Ro. 3:23) and once with the accusative (**ἕν σε ὑστερεῖ**, Mk. 10:21) as in Ps. 22:1. Some of the MSS. in Mark have **σοι**, as the LXX usually.[5] **Φεύγω** occurs absolutely (Mt. 2:13), with aro (Mt. 23:33), with **ἐκ** (Ac. 27:30) or with the accusative (Heb. 11:34; 1 Tim. 6:11). So **ἐκφεύγω** is transitive (Lu. 21:36) with accusative while **ἀποφεύγω** has accusative in 2 Pet. 2:20. **Φυλάσσω** has, of course, the accusative, but in Ac. 21:25 two accusatives occur with the sense of 'shun.' In Lu. 12:15 the middle is used with **ἀπό** and in 1 Jo. 5:21 **φυλάξατε ἑαυτὰ ἀπό. Χράομαι** still uses the instrumental (cf. *utor* in Latin), as Ac. 27:3, 17, etc., but in 1 Cor. 7:31 the accusative is found (**χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον**) in response to the general accusative tendency. Cf. **καταχρώμενοι**, in the same verse. The accusative with **χράομαι** appears in later writers.[6]

It remains in this connection to call special attention to the intransitive verbs which have the accus. by reason of a preposition in composition. This applies to intrans. verbs and trans. verbs also which in simplex used some other case. **Ἀνά** furnishes one example in **ἀνα-θάλλω** (Ph. 4:10) if **τὸ φρονεῖν** there is the object of the verb after the transitive use in the LXX (Ezek. 17:24). But most probably this is the accusative of general reference. **Ἀπελπίζω** (Lu. 6:35) is indeed transitive with accusative, but so is **ἐλπίζω** (1 Cor. 13:7; 2 Cor, 1:13, etc.) sometimes. Here are some examples of **διά**: **τὸ πέλαγος διαπλεύσαντες** (Ac. 27:5), **διεπορεύοντο τὰς πόλεις** (Ac. 16:4), **διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν** (Ac. 19:21; cf. acc. in Lu. 19:1 and gen. **ἐκείνης** in 19:4). In Heb. 11:29 (**διέβησαν τὴν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς**) Blass[7] notes both accusative and genitive (with **διά**). Even **ἐνεργέω** has the accusative in 1 Cor. 12:6, 11. As examples of **κατά** observe **κατεβάρησα ὑμᾶς** (2 Cor. 12:

[1] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 436.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 64.
[3] Simeox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 80.
[4] Joh. Gr., p. 78.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 89.
[6] Simeox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 78.
[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 89.

16), **ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω** (Col. 2:18), **κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας** (Heb. 11:33). Note also **κατασοφισάμενος τὸ γένος** (Ac. 7:19). Cf. **κατα-χρώμενοι** in 1 Cor. 7:31, but instrumental in 1 Cor. 9:18. For **παρά** note **παραβαίνετε τὴν ἐντολήν** (Mt. 15:3) and **παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν** (Lu. 11:42; cf. 15:29 and Mk. **Περί** furnishes several examples like **ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν** (1 Cor. 9:5; cf. Mt. 9:35, etc.), but intransitive in Mt. 4:23. This verb, **ἄγω**, however, is both transitive (Mt. 21:7) and intransitive (Mk. 1: 38) in the simple form. **Περιερχόμεναι** has the accusative in 1 Tim. 5:13, but elsewhere intransitive. So **περιέστησαν αὐτόν** in Ac. 25:7, but intransitive (**περιεστῶτα**) in Jo. 11:42. In Mk 6:55 we find **περιέδραμον ὅλην τὴν χώραν**. With **πρό** one notes **προάγω** (Mt. 14:22, **προάγειν αὐτόν**), **προήρχετο αὐτούς** (Lu. 22:47), with which compare **προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 1:17). In Ac. 12: 10 both **διέρχομαι** and **προέχρομαι** are used with the accusative. **Προσφωνέω**, like **προσκυνέω**, has either the accusative (Lu. 6:13) or the dative (Mt. 11:16). If **ὁ θεός** be accepted in Ro. 8:28 (**πάντα συνεργεῖ ὁ θεός**), which is more than doubtful, then **συνεργεῖ** would be transitive (cf. instr. in Jas. 2:22). For **ὑπέρ** observe **ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτούς** (2 Cor. 10:14) and **ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν** (Ph. 4:7). With **ὑπό** we can mention **ὑπομένω** (1 Cor. 13:7, but see **μένω**) **ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην** (Ac. 27:7) and **νησίον δέ τι ὑποδραμόντες** (Ac. 27:16). Thus it will be seen that in the N. T. the accusative with transitive verbs, both simple and compound, follows the increase in the use of the accusative in line with the current vernacular.

Sometimes indeed the object of the verb is not expressed, but really implied, and the verb is transitive. Thus **προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς** (Lu. 17:3) implies **τὸν νοῦν**. Cf. also **προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφη-τῶν** (Mt. 7:15) and **ἐπέχων πῶς** (Lu. 14:7); **κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων** (1 Cor. 11:4). In **ἐπιθήσεταί σοι** (Ac. 18:10) **χεῖρας** must be supplied, and with **διέτριβον** (Ac. 15:35) **χρόνον** is needed.

(h) THE COGNATE ACCUSATIVE. It may be either that of in-ner content, **ἐχάρησαν χαράν** (Mt. 2:10), objective result **ἁμαρτά-νοντα ἁμαρτίαν** (1 Jo. 5:16), **φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς** (Lu. 2:8), or even a kindred word in idea but a different root, as **δαρήσεται ὀλίγας** (**πληγάς**, Lu. 12:48). Considerable freedom must thus be given the term "cognate" as to both form and idea. The real cognate accusative is a form of the *Figura Etymologica* as applied to either internal or external object. The quasi-cognate is due to analogy where the idea, not the form, is cognate.[1] The cognate is not very

[1] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 304.

common in the papyri,[1] but in the Hebrew the idiom is very frequent.[2] It is perfectly good Greek to have[3] this "playing with paronymous terms," as a passage from Plato's *Protagoras* 326 D illustrates, **ὑπογράψαντες γραμμὰς τῇ γραφίδι οὕτω τὸ γραμματεῖον**. Cf. **τίς ποιμαίνει ποίμνην** (1 Cor. 9:7). So also in Lu. 8:5, **ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον**. Gildersleeve (*Am. Jour. of Philol.*, xxxiii, 4, p. 488) objects properly to Cauer's crediting, in his *Grammatica Militans*, "the division of the accusative into the object affected and the object effected" to Kern, since Gildersleeve himself was using it as far back as 1867. In modern English this repetition of the same root condemned, but it was not so in Greek. Conybeare and Stock[4] observe that the Hebrew and the Greek coincide on this point, and hence the excess of such accusatives in the LXX in various applications. And the N. T., here unlike the papyri, shows an abundance of the cognate accusatives.

The accusative of the *inner content* may be illustrated by **τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνετε** (Jo. 7:24), **τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε** (1 Pet. 3:14), **αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ** (Col. 2:19), **ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν** (1 Tim. 1:18), **ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα** (1 Tim. 6:12), **ὡμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν** (ib.), **ἐθαύμασα ἰδὼν αὐτὴν θαῦμα μέγα** (Rev. 17:6). Cf. Rev. 16:9. In Mk. 10:38, **τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι**, and Jo. 17:26, **ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με** (cf. Eph. 2:4), the relative shows this use of the accusative. In Jo. 17:26 and Eph. 2:4 (**ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς**) the cognate accusative of the inner content is used along with the accusative of the person also.[5] Indeed in Eph. 4:1, **τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε** the relative has been attracted from the cognate accusative. The modern Greek keeps this use of the accusative.

Some *neuter adjectives* are used to express this accusative, but far less frequently than in the ancient Greek.[6] Thus, **πεποιθὼς αὐτὸ τοῦτο** (Ph. 1:6), **πάντα ἰσχύω** (Ph. 4:13), **νηστεύουσιν πυκνά** (Lu. 5:33), **πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται** (1 Cor. 9:25), perhaps even **τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι** (2 Cor. 13:1), **μηδὲν διακρινόμενος** (Jas. 1:6), **οὐδὲν ὑστέρησα** (2 Cor. 12:11). Cf. the interrogative **τί ὑστερῶ** (Mt. 19:20),

[1] Moulton, CI. Rev., 1901, p. 436. But note **ζημείαν ἐζημιωσάμην**, B.U. 146 (ii/iii) **προσκυνεῖν τὸ προσκύνημα** Letr. 70, 79, 92 (i/B.C.).

[2] C. and S., Sel. from the Sept., p. 56.

[3] Ib., P. 57. [4] Ib., p. 56.

[5] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 76, finds no instance of such a construction with **ἀγαπῶ** in anc. Gk.

[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 91. Cf. Jana., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 329.

the relative **ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν** and **ὃ δὲ ζῇ** (Ro. 6:10). Cf. also **ὃ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί** (Gal. 2:20) which may be equal to 'in that,' adverbial accusative.[1] In 2 Cor. 12:13 the accusative relative follows the nominative interrogative **τί ἐστιν ὃ ἡσσώθητε**. This neuter accusative of the adjective easily glides into the purely adverbial accunative, like **πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω** (1 Cor. 10:33), **πάντα μου μέμνησθε** (1 Cor. 11:2).

As a further example of the more objective result one may note **ᾐχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν** (Eph. 4:8, LXX), but Winer[2] rightly shows that this type is chiefly represented in the N. T. by the relative. So **μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ** (Jo. 5:32), **διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι** (Heb. 8:10), **βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν** (Mk. 3:28), **ἐπαγγελία ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο** (1 Jo. 2:25).

The cognate accusative of the *outward object* (result also) calls for little discussion. Besides **φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς** (Lu. 2:8) observe **ᾠκοδόμησεν τὴν οἰκίαν** (Mt. 7:24), **δήσατε δεσμάς** (Mt. 13:30, but **א**BC have **εἰς**).

The *analogous cognate accusative* is seen in such constructions as **μὴ φοβούμεναι μηδεμίαν πτόησιν** (1 Pet. 3:6), **βιῶσαι χρόνον** (1 Pet. 4:2), **δαρήσεται πολλάς (ὀλίγας)** in Lu. 12:47 (48), **ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδόν** (Lu. 2:44), **ἐπορεύετο τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ** (Ac. 8:39), and the relative also as in **ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν** (Lu. 1:73). Cf. the instrumental **ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν** (Ac. 2:30), etc.

(i) DOUBLE ACCUSATIVE. Some verbs may have two accusatives. Indeed, if one count space and time, three accusatives are possible.[3] In Mk. 10:18 (**τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν**) we have three accusatives, one being predicate. In the Sanskrit it is very common to have two accusatives with one verb.[4] When one recalls that the accusative is the old and normal case with transitive verbs, it is not surprising that some verbs use two accusatives, just as many transitive verbs have an accusative and a dative, an accusative and an ablative, an accusative and an intrumental, an accusative and a genitive. This double accusative is common in Homer[5] and a "multiplicity of accusatives is a characteristic of Pindar's style."[6] It is a common idiom in the papyri also.[7] It

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 91.
[2] W.-Th., p. 225.
[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 82.
[4] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 90.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 97.
[6] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 306.
[7] Volker, Pap. Gr. Synt. Spec., p. 13 f.; Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 436. He cites **με ἐτείσατο ὕβριν τὴν ἀνωτάτην**, B.U. 242 (ii/A.D.). For the Attic inscr. see Meisterh., p. 204.

is not unknown in Latin (cf. *doceo*) and English (*teach*). It is very common in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 36), going beyond the ancient idiom. Middleton[1] holds that the double accusative is due to analogy, since, in a number of examples, alternative constructions occur like accusative and ablative with **αἰτέω** (Ac. 3:2) and **ἀφαιρέομαι** (Lu. 16:3). Cf. two accusatives with **ὠνείδιζον** in Mt, 27:44.

Perhaps the simplest kind of a double accusative is what is called the predicate accusative, really a sort of apposition. Thus **οὐκέτι ὑμᾶς λέγω δούλους** (Jo. 15:15). This appositional feature is seen also in the passive of those verbs where a double nominative occurs. For other examples with verbs of saying see **λέγω** (Mk. 10: 18) and **εἶπον** in Jo. 10:35 (**ἐκείνους εἶπε θεούς**), etc. Similar to this is **καλέω (καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάνην** Lu. 1:13; cf. **Ἰησοῦν** verse 31; **ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ--Ζαχαρίαν**, 1:50). We happen to have the passive of this very construction in Lu. 2:21 (**ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς**). Cf. further Mt. 22:43. Observe also **ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον** (Lu. 6:14). **Ὁμολογέω** appears with the double accusative in Jo. 9:22; 1 Jo. 4:2; 2 Jo. 7 and curiously nowhere else outside of John's writings. **Ἡγέομαι** likewise has two accusatives as in **ταῦτα ἥγημαι ζημίαν** (Ph. 3:7). See 2 Pet. 3:15; Heb. 11:26. Blass[2] observes that **νομίζω** and **ὑπολαμβάνω** do not have the double accusative in the N. T. **Ποιοῦμαι** in the same sense does occur, as **ποιοῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν τιμίαν** (Ac. 20:24), and very frequently in the active, as **ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν** (Jo. 10:33). Cf. further for **ποιέω** Mt. 4:19; Lu. 19:46; Jo. 5:11; 6:15; 19:7; Eph. 2:14; Rev. 21:5. Closely allied to this use of **ποιέω** is **ἔχω (εἶχον Ἰωάνην ὑπηρέτην**, Ac. 13:5) and note Heb. 12:9; Ph. 2:29. **Ἔχε με παρῃτημένον** (Lu. 14:18) is to be observed. also. Cf. also **σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον** (Tit. 2:7). **Λαμβάνω** is so used in Jas. 5:10, **ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε—τοὺς προφήτας. Τίθημι** may be exemplified by **ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους** (A, 20:28). Cf. Heb. 1:2 (**ἔθηκεν)** and Ro. 3:25, **ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον. Καθίστημι** shows several examples like **τίς με κατέστησεν κριτήν** (Lu. 12:14). Cf. also Ac. 7:10; Heb. 7:28. In Gal. 2:18 we have **παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω. Ἀποδίκνυμι** shows an example in 1 Cor. 4:9 and **προορίζω** in Ro. 8:29. For further verbs with two accusatives, not to weary one, see **περιάγω** (1 Cor. 9:5), **ἱκανόω** (2 Cor. 3:6), **ἐκλέγομαι** (Jas. 2:5), **ὑψόω** (Ac. 5:31).

This second accusative may be *either substantive, adjective or participle.* As specimens of the adjective take **ὁ ποιήσας με ὑγιῆ**

[1] Anal. in Synt., p. 25. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 92.

(Jo. 5:11), **τοὺς τοιούτους ἐντίμους ἔχετε** (Ph. 2:29). In 1 Cor. 4:9 indeed the adjective makes three accusatives and with **ὡς** four, **ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν ὡς ἐπιθανατίους** (so W. H.). As an example of the participle see **κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενον** (Ac. 7:10). Cf. 2 Tim. 2:8. Sometimes **ὡς** occurs with the second accusative, as in **ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον** (Mt. 14:5). Cf. 21:26. In 2 Th. 3:15 note **μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν**. In 1 Cor. 4:1 observe also **ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθω ἄνθρωπος ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ**. In 2 Cor. 10:2 we have **ὡς** with the participle, **τοὺς λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας**. In 2 Cor. 6:4 **ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι** is not exactly what **ὡς διακόνους** would be. Cf. **ὡς** with the predicate nominative in Ro. 8:36 (LXX).

Sometimes **εἶναι** *is used as the copula* before such a predicate accusative where the sense is not greatly altered by its absence or presence. As a matter of fact with **εἶναι** we have indirect discourse with the accusative and infinitive. So **ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι** (Lu. 20:20); Mk. 1:17 = Mt. 4:19. Cf. **συνεστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς ἁγνοὺς εἶναι** (2 Cor. 7:11), **λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκρούς** (Ro. 6:11), but ADEFG do not have **εἶναι**. In Ph. 3:7 we do not have **εἶναι**, while in verse 8 we do after **ἡγοῦμαι**.

The *predicate accusative with* **εἰς** used to be explained as an undoubted Hebraism.[1] But Moulton[2] is only willing to admit it is a secondary Hebraism since the papyri show a few examples like **ἔσχον παρ᾽ ἡμῶν εἰς δά(νειον) σπέρματα**, K.P. 46 (ii/A.D.), "a recurrent formula," a probable vernacular "extension of **εἰς** expressing destination." Moulton pertinently remarks that "as a loan" (**ὡς** or just the accusative in apposition) and "for a loan" (**εἰς**) "do not differ except in grammar." But certainly the great frequency of **εἰς** in the LXX as compared with even the vernacular **κοινή** is due to the Hebrew ל which it so often translates.[3] Cf. **δώσετέ μοι τὴν παῖδα ταύτην εἰς γυναῖκα** (Gen. 34:12). Cf. the similar use of **εἰς** and the accusative instead of the predicate nominative (**λογίζομαι εἰς** Ro. 2:26, etc.). Winer[4] shows parallels for this predicate accusative from the late Greek writers. The N. T. exhibits this accusative in **εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον** (Mt. 21:46), **ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτόν**

[1] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 332, 378, who says that it is absent in mod. Gk. But mod. Gk. does use **γιά** instead of pred. acc., as **ἔχω τοὺς βράχους γιὰ κρέββατι** (Thumb, Handb., p. 36). Cf. also W.-Th., p. 228; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 93.

[2] Prol., p. 72.

[3] C. and S., Sel. from the Sept., p. 81 f. Cf. also W.-Th., p. 228.

[4] Ib. In the mod. Gk. the ace. of the thing to some extent takes the place of the dat. or abl. (Thumb, Handb., p. 37).

ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν (Ac. 7:21), ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων (AC. 7:53), ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυεὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα (Ac. 13:22), **Τέθεικά** σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν (Ac. 13:47, LXX). When all is said, one must admit some Hebrew influence here because of its frequency. Ph. 4:16 is not a case in point. See further under εἰς.

But there is another kind of double accusative besides the predicate accusative. It is usually described as the accusative of the person and of the thing. This in a general way is true of this group of double accusatives. Some of these were also cognate accusatives, as in κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας (Lu. 9:14) and, according to some MSS., δήσατε αὐτὰ δεσμάς (Mt. 13:30), ἣν ἀγάπησάς με Jo. 17:26; cf. also Eph. 2:4), both of the outer and the inner object. Cf. the passive ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτιζομαι (Mk. 10:38) which really implies two accusatives in the active. Further examples of this cognate accusative of the inner object with the negative pronoun may be seen in **οὐδέν** με ἠδικήσατε (Gal. 4:12; cf. 5:2), μηδὲν βλάψαν (Lu. 4:35). See also Ac. 25:10. In Mt. 27:44 the second accusative is likewise a pronoun, τὸ αὐτὸ ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν, while in Mk. 6:34 it is an adjective, διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.

Indeed διδάσκω is just one of the verbs that can easily have two accusatives (asking and teaching). Cf. also ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα (Jo. 14:26. In Ac. 21:21 we have a normal example, ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ **Μωυσέως** τοὺς--**Ἰουδαίους**. In Heb. 5:12 we note three accusatives, but one is the accusative of general reference with the infinitive, τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα. Cf. Mt. 15:9 where one accusative is predicate. In Rev. 2:14 ἐδίδασκεν τῷ **Βαλάκ** we have the dative, a construction entirely possible in the abstract,[1] but elsewhere absent in the concrete. The number of verbs like διδάσκω which may have two accusatives is not considerable. They include verbs like αἰτέω in Mt. 7:9, ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, but not Mt. 6:8 where ὑμᾶς is merely accusative of general reference with the infinitive, though we do meet it with αἰτέω in Mk. 6:22 f.; Jo. 16:23; 1 Pet. 3:15. But instead of an accusative of the person we may have the ablative with ἀπό as in Mt. 20:20 BD (against παρά), αἰτοῦσά τι ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, and in 1 Jo. 5:15, or the ablative with παρά as in Jo. 4:9, παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ πεῖν αἰτεῖς, and the middle ᾔτήσατο in Ac. 9:2. **Ἐρωτάω** likewise has two accusatives in Mt. 21:24 (ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ λόγον ἕνα); Mk. 4:10; Jo. 16:23. **Ἀναμιμνήσκω** in both active and middle is used only with the accusative in the N. T. (μιμνήσκομαι only with the genitive save adverbial accusative in 1 Cor. 11:2), and two accusa-

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 80.

tives occur in 1 Cor. 4:17, **ὃς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδούς μου**, and in 2 Tim. 1:6 (**σε ἀναζωπυρῖν**, both in the accusative). With **ὑπομιμνήσκω** the genitive occurs once in the passive (Lu. 22:61), the accusative elsewhere, and two accusatives in Jo. 14:26, **ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα**, and in Tit. 3:1 (**αὐτοὺς ὑποτάσσεσθαι**). In 1 Cor. 14:6 observe **τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω**. In 2 Pet. 1:12 **περὶ τούτων** occurs rather than a second accusative. **Εὐαγγελίζομαι** usually has accusative of the thing and dative of the person, as in Eph. 2:17; 3:8, etc. But in Ac. 13:32 the accusative of person[1] and thing is found, and the same thing is true in Ac. 14:15 (**ὑμᾶς—ἐπιστρέφειν**), taking object-sentence as "thing." Indeed in Gal. 1: 9 (**εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε**) the same thing exists, for while the antecedent of **ὅ** would be **παρὰ τοῦτο, τι** is really implied also, **τι παρὰ τοῦτο ὅ**.

Another group of verbs in the ancient Greek with two accusatives is that of depriving, etc. Here indeed the ablative may take the place of one accusative, as in 1 Tim. 6:5 with the passive of **ἀποστρερέω** the ablative is retained (**τῆς ἀληθείας**). But in the N. T. neither **ἀποστερέω**, nor **ἀφαιρέω**, nor **κρύπτω** has two accusatives. Either the ablative alone occurs or with **ἀπό** (Lu. 16:3; Lu. 19: 42; Rev. 6:16). With **φυλάσσεσθαι** (Ac. 21:25) **αὐτούς** is the accusative of general reference (so-called "subject") of the infinitive.

But verbs of *clothing or unclothing, anointing,* etc., do have two accusatives, though not always. Thus **ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμύδα** (Mt. 27:31; cf. Mk. 15:20; Lu. 15:22), **ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ** (Mt. 27:31; cf. Mk. 15:20). But **ἀμφιέννυμι** does not have two accusatives nor **περιτίθημι** (Mt. 27:28). In Lu. 23:11 some MSS. give two accusatives with **περιβαλών**, but **א**BLT omit **αὐτόν**. In Jo. 19:2 the text is beyond dispute **ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν περιέβαλον αὐτόν**. Cf. **περιβαλεῖται ἐν** (Rev. 3:5). Moreover **χρίω** has two accusatives in Heb. 1:9 (**ἔχρισεν σε ὁ θεὸς ἔλαιον**), a quotation from the LXX. In Rev. 3:18 **κολλούριον** is not the object of **ἐγχρῖσαι**, but of **ἀγοράσαι. Ἀλείφω** is not used with two accusatives, but has the thing in the instrumental case (Mk. 6:13). **Πληρόω** does not indeed have two accusatives in the N. T., but the passive with accusative in Ph. 1:11 and Col. 1:9 really involves the idiom.

The following *causative verbs* have two accusatives. **Ὁρκίζω σε τὸν θεόν** (Mk. 5:7) is a case in point (cf. **ἐξορκέω** in Herod.). See

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 78 f., argues unsuccessfully against the idea that **εὐαγγελίζομαι** has two accs.

also Ac. 19:13 and one example of ἐνορίζω in 1 Th. 5:27. The idea is really to "cause to swear by." In Jas. 5:12 (**ὀμνύετε μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον**) we have two constructions, one "swear by," the other the cognate accusative. So διαμαρτύρομαι in 2 Tim. 4:1 f. Cf. P.O. 79 (ii/A.D.) **ὀμνύω Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Μᾶρ[κο]ν Αὐρήλιον—ἀληθῆ εἶν[αι] τὰ προ--. Ποτιζω** is a good example of the causative sense. Thus **ὃς ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος** (Mk. 9:41). Cf. Mt. 10:42; 1 Cor. 3:2. In Ro. 12:20 ψωμίζω has the accusative of the person, in 1 Cor. 13:3 the accusative of the thing (cf. Jer. 23:15 for double accusative with both these verbs). In Lu. 11:46 we have **φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα**. Cf. **ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι**, in Heb. 2:7 (LXX).

Finally some words of *doing good or ill* have two accusatives. Thus **μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν** (Lu. 4:35) where the pronoun is really a cognate accusative, as is the case with **ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει** (Gal. 5: 2). Cf. Ac. 25:10 **᾽Ιουδαίους οὐδὲν ἠδίκηκα**. In Mt. 27:22 we read **τί οὖν ποιήσω ᾽Ισηοῦν**. Cf. also Mk. 15:12, though D has **τῷ βασιλεῖ**, (Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 91). Elsewhere in the N. T. we meet the dative of the person as in Mt. 21:40; Ac. 9:13. See **περὶ ὧν αὐτὴν πεποιήκασιν**, P. Grenf. ii, 73 (late iii/A.D.), where **ὧν** is attracted from ἅ= 'of what they have done to her.' Cf. **μηδὲν πράξῃς σεαυτῷ κακόν** (Ac. 16:28). In Mk. 7:12 the dative of the person is in keeping with ancient Greek usage. In Mt. 17:12 **ἐν αὐτῷ** may be more exactly 'in his case' (**א**D do not have **ἐν**), but note its **ὑμᾶς** in Jo. 15:21 and the likeness of this to the modern Greek use of **εἰς** with accusative as the usual dative. Blass (*ib*., p. 92) compares also the use of **ἐν ἐμοί** (Mk. 14:6) and **εἰς ἐμέ** (Mt. 26: 10) with **ἐργάζομαι** and observes that **ἐργάζομαι** in Attic had sometimes two accusatives. One may compare again the expression **τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο** (Ac. 12:18). **Λέγω** and **εἶπον** indeed have two accusatives in the N. T., but in Jo. 1:15 the margin (W. H., R. V.) really has this idiom. Cf. also Ac. 23:5.

(j) WITH PASSIVE VERBS. Indeed the accusative may be found with verbs in the passive voice. Draeger[1] calls the accusative with passive verbs in Latin "ein Gracismus." This accusative may be of several kinds. See cognate accusative in Mt. 2: 10, **ἐχάρησαν χαράν**. It occurs with the so-called passive deponents like **ἀπεκρίθην** (**οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη**, Mk. 15:5). Cf. **οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο** (Mt. 27:12), **οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη λόγον** (Mt. 15:23). As further instances note **ἀπεστράφησάν με** (2 Tim. 1:15), **ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου** (Mt.

[1] Hist. Synt., p. 362.

21:37), ἐπαισχυνθῇ με (Mk. 8:38), φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς (Mt. 10:26). Cf. Mt. 14:5; 2 Tim 1:16. To all intents and purposes these "deponent" forms are not regarded as passives. This use of the passive is common in the **κοινή**. Cf. Volker, *Synt. Spec*., p. 15.

But the *true passive* of many verbs retains the accusative of the thing. This is true of verbs that have two accusatives in the active. So ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ **Κυρίου** (Ac. 18:25), ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε (2 Th. 2:15), **οὐκ** ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου (Mt. 22:11 and cf. Mk. 1:6; Rev. 1:13; 15:6; 19:14), ἐνεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν (Lu. 16:19), ἐκαυματίσθησαν καῦμα μέγα (Rev. 16:9), δαρήσεται πολλάς (πληγάς, Lu. 12:47, ὀλίγας, 48), τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ βαπτιζομαι βαπτισθῆναι (Mk. 10:38, two examples), ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν (1 Cor. 12:13), πεπείσμεθα τὰ κρείσσονα (Heb. 6:9), πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης (Ph. 1:11; Col. 1:9 ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν and cf. Ex. 31:3, ἐνεπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα σοφίας) and compare 2 Tim. 1:5 for genitive (ἵνα χαρᾶς πληρωθῶ), ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ (Mk. 8: 36= Mt. 16:26). Cf. also Ph. 3:8; Heb. 10:22. See ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς (Mt. 15:5); τί ὠφεληθήσεται (Mt. 16:26); βραχύ τι παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον (Heb. 2:9) with active (two accs.) in Heb. 2 : 7. Once more observe ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικιάς (2 Pet. 2:13). The predicate accusative, it should be said, becomes the nominative in the passive, as in αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται (Mt. 5:9). Cf. Heb. 5:10; 2 Tim. 1:11.

Some verbs which have *only one accusative* in the active or middle yet retain the accusative of the thing in the passive with the person in the nominative. This is a freedom not possessed by the Latin. The person in the active was generally in the dative. Thus Paul a number of times uses πιστεύομαι (πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον 1 Th. 2:4; ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον 2 Th. 1:10; cf. also 1 Cor. 9:17; Gal. 2:7; Ro. 3:2; 1 Tim. 1:11). Then again περιβάλλομαι is frequently so employed, as περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα (Mk. 14:51; cf. 16:5; and especially in Rev., as 7:9, 13; 10:1; 11:3; 12:1; 17:4; 18:16; 19:13). This is not the middle as Blass[1] has it, though the future middle does occur in Rev. 3:5 with ἐν, and the aorist middle with the accusative in Rev. 19:8. In Rev. 4:4 we have περιβεβλημένους ἱματίοις (loc.), and margin (W. H.) ἐν ἱμ. Once more περίκειμαι is used as the passive of περιτίθημι with the accusative of the thing, though the verb itself means to 'lie around' instead of 'be encompassed with.' So τὴν ἅλυσιν περίκειμαι (Ac. 28:20). Cf. also Heb. 5:2, but in Lu. 17:2 we have περί repeated.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 93.

There are once more still *looser accusatives* with passive verbs, partly by analogy and partly merely an extension of the principle illustrated already. Thus **κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον** (Gal. 6:6) does not really differ from as **ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε** above. In **δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας** (Jo. 11:44) we see a close parallel to **περιβεβλημένος** above. Note active in Mt. 22:13. In **διεφθαρμένων τὸν νοῦν** (1 Tim. 6:5), **ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας** (Heb. 10:22), **λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα** (10:22) the accusative seems to be rather remote and to come close to the accusative of general reference, but not quite, for the force of the verb is still felt. This is still true of **τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα** (2 Cor. 3:18) and perhaps even of **τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν πλατύνθητε** (2 Cor. 6:13). In Ac. 21:3 **ἀναφάναντες**, not **ἀναφανέντες**, is the correct text, as Blass[1] observes.

The impersonal verbal in **—τέον** occurs only once in the N. T. (Lu. 5:38) and as in the ancient Greek it is used with the accusative, **οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.** This verbal is more usually transitive than the personal form in **–τέος,** which is not found in the N. T.

(k) THE ADVERBIAL ACCUSATIVE. It is not very common in the N. T. except in the case of pure adverbs. The adverbial accusative is really nothing more than a loose use of the accusative with intransitive verbs, with substantives or adjectives. It is rare in Homer[2] and increases steadily till it becomes very common, though perhaps never quite so abundant as in the Sanskrit, where a veritable host of such accusatives occur.[3] It is a perfectly normal development of the case, for extension is its root-idea. This accusative is sometimes called the accusative of general reference. As an example of such an accusative with an intransitive verb note **καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν** (Heb. 5:1). See also **ἀνέπεσαν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι** (Jo. 6:10),[4] **τὸν τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσασαι** (Jude 7), **ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει** (Mt. 23:37) and 2 Tim. 3:8 (**ὃν τρόπον**). Cf. **ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρόν τι** (2 Cor. 11:1). In Ro. 15:17 the whole verbal phrase is concerned with **τὰ πρὸς θεόν,** but see Ro. 12:18, **τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες,** where **τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν** is acc. In Ro. 1:15 **τὸ κατ᾽ ἐμέ** may be nom. In Heb. 2:17 this adv. acc. occurs with the adj. as in **πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν**. So also with a subst. as in **ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** (Ro. 9:5). The Text. Recept. in Ac. 18:3 had **σκηνοποιὸς τὴν τέχνην**, but W. H. read **σκηνοποιοὶ τῇ τέχνῃ**. Indeed the

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 93. [2] Giles, Man., etc., p. 309.
[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., pp. 91, 93.
[4] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 75. So 2 Macc. 8:16.

instrumental is usual in the N. T. in such instances,[1] as the following examples: **Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει** (Mk. 7: 26), **Κύπριος τῷ γένει**, (Ac. 4:36), **παντὶ τρόπῳ** (Ph. 1:18), **τῷ προσώπῳ** (Gal. 1:22). But, on the other hand, observe **τοὔνομα Ἰωσήφ** (Mt. 27:57), but elsewhere in the N. T. we have **ὀνόματι** (Ac. 18:2). In Ro. 16:19 some MSS. have **τὸ ἐφ' ὑμῖν**. The phrase **τὸ καθ' εἷς** (Ro. 12:5) is accusative, even though **εἷς** itself is nominative in form. In 1 Cor. 11:18 see also **μέρος τι πιστεύω**. Perhaps thus is to be explained the accusative with the interjection in Rev. 8:13 **οὐαὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας**. Cf. **οὐαί** and nominative (or vocative) in. Is. 1:4. There is only one instance of an accusative with an adverb of swearing in the N. T. and that is in 1 Cor. 15:31, **νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν**. In Mk. 6:39 **συμόσια συμπόσια** may be looked at as nominative (cf. **πρασιαί** in verse 40) or accusative (cf. Lu. 9: 14). Brugmann[2] considers **καὶ τοῦτο** (1 Cor. 6:6, 8) nominative rather than accusative, but that seems hardly possible with **αὐτὸ τοῦτο** (2 Pet. 1:5), and **καὶ τοῦτο** may be accusative also (Ph. 1: 29, etc.). Cf. **τοῦτο μέν—τοῦτο δέ** (Heb. 10:33). In Ac. 15: 11; 27:25 we have **καθ' ὃν τρόπον**. In Ph. 4:10 (**ἀνεθάλετε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν**) the infinitive is probably the accusative of general reference. Cf. **τὸν πόδαν πονεῖς ἀπὸ σκολάπου**, B.U. 380 (iii/A.D.).

There are indeed other expressions that come more closely to the pure adverb. Such, for instance, are **τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν** (Lu. 11:3; 19:47; Ac. 17:11), **τὴν ἀρχήν** (Jo. 8:25), **τὸ λοιπόν** (Mk. 14:41; Ph. 3:1; Heb. 10:13, etc.), **τὸ πρότερον** (Jo. 6:62, etc.), **τὸ πρῶτον** (Jo. 10:40; 12:16); **τὸ πλεῖστον** (1 Cor. 14:27), **τὰ πολλά**, (Ro. 15:22, MSS. **πολλάκις**), **τὰ νῦν** (Ac. 17:30), **τὸ νῦν ἔχον** (Ac. 24:25), **τὸ τέλος** (1 Pet. 3:8). In the case of **τὸ λοιπόν** (1 Cor. 7:29) it may be either accusative or nominative. In 2 Cor. 6:13 **τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν** is considered adverbial accusative by some, as is **πάντα** with **ἀρέσκω** (1 Cor. 10:33) and with **μέμνησθε** (11:2). Observe also **τὸ αὐτό** (Ph. 2:18; Mt. 27:44). Cf. **οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω** (Rev. 3:17), and the common use of **τί** in the sense of 'why' as in Mt. 17:10 (**διὰ τί** in verse 19). This phase of the adverbial accusative is common in the papyri.[3]

But the most numerous group of adverbial accusatives is found in the adverbs themselves. The accusative is not the only case used for adverbs, but it is a very common one. In Homer[4] in-

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 117. Cf. Landgraf, Der Accus. der Beziehung nach Adj., p. 376, Archiv fur lat. Lex. and Gr., vol. X.

[2] Griech. Gr., p. 378. [3] Volker, Pap. Gr. Synt. Spec., pp. 10-13.

[4] Giles, Man., etc., p. 309.

deed adverbial accusatives of substantives are almost absent. But the N. T. shows a few in harmony with the development of the language. Thus ἀκήν (Mt. 15:16), δωρεάν (Mt. 10:8), χάριν as a preposition (Eph. 3:1, etc.). But adjectives in the accusative were numerous in Homer[1] both in the singular and the plural. They occur in the positive, comparative and occasionally the superlative. As examples of the positive singular may be taken πολύ (2 Cor. 8:22), ὀλίγον (Mk. 6:31), μέσον (Ph. 2:15), ταχύ (Mt. 5:25), λοιπόν (1 Cor. 1:16, etc. Cf. B.U., iv, 1079, 6). Indeed the participle τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6) is used as an adv. acc. (see Acc. Absolute). As an example of the plural positive note πολλά in Ro. 16:6, though this may be construed as cognate acc. with ἐκοπίασεν. Cf. Jas. 3:2; 1 Cor. 16:12, 19. For the comparative singular note μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον (Ph. 1:23), σπουδαιότερον (2 Cor. 8:22), δεύτερον (1 Cor. 12:28), περισσότερον (Mk. 7:36), βέλτιον (2 Tim. 1:18), ἔλαττον (1 Tim. 5:9) ὕστερον (Mt. 22:27), τάχειον (Jo. 13:27), etc. Cf. πολὺ σπουδαιότερον (2 Cor. 8:22) with πολλῷ μᾶλλον (Ph. 1:23), the instrumental and usual idiom in the N. T. In the superlative it is usually the plural form like ἥδιστα (2 Cor. 12:9), μάλιστα (Ac. 20:38), τάχιστα (Ac. 17:15), etc. But note πρῶτον (1 Cor. 12:28), τρίτον (*ib.*). The later Greek continued to exhibit a wealth of adverbs in the accusative.[2]

(l) THE ACCUSATIVE BY ANTIPTOSIS.[3] It is not in reality a special use of the accusative, but merely a shifting of the noun or pronoun out of its usual order and into the government of the other preceding clause, and thus it becomes accusative whereas it would otherwise be nominative. So in Mk. 1:24, οἶδα σε τίς εἶ (cf. Lu. 4:34), Lu. 19:3, ἰδεῖν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστιν. But in Mt. 15:14 we have a kind of prolepsis (not the technical sort) without any change of case, τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὁδηγῇ. In the case of μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς (2 Cor. 12:17) the τινα is left to one side and anacoluthon takes place and the sentence is concluded by δι' αὐτοῦ.

(m) THE ACCUSATIVE BY INVERSE ATTRACTION. Thus ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν (Lu. 1:73), τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν (1 Cor. 10:16). Cf. τὸ ποτήριον (1 Cor. 10:15). In Mk. 3:16 but for the parenthesis (καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα Σίμωνι) **Πέτρον** we should seem to have the dative and the accusative in apposition.

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 93. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 348 f.; Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., III, p. 625 f.

[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 331.

[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 85.

(n) THE ACCUSATIVE WITH THE INFINITIVE. The grammars generally speak of the accusative as the subject of the infinitive. I confess that to me this seems a grammatical misnomer. The infinitive clause in indirect discourse does correspond to a finite clause in English, and a clause with **ὅτι** and the indicative may often be used as well as the infinitive clause. But it is not technically scientific to read back into the Greek infinitive clause the syntax of English nor even of the **ὅτι** clause in Greek. Besides, not only is the infinitive a verbal substantive[1] and in a case like the verbal adjective (the participle), but being non-finite (in-finitive) like the participle (partaking of both verb and noun), it can have no subject in the grammatical sense. No one thinks of calling the accusative the "subject" of the participle. Take **ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώου ἐρχόμενον** (Mt. 16:28). Here the accusative is the object of **ἴδωσιν** and the participle is descriptive of **υἱόν.** Now with the infinitive in indirect discourse it is as a rule the infinitive, not the substantive, that is the object of the verb. No further case is needed with the infinitive, if the pronoun or substantive be the same as the subject of the principal verb. Thus **εἴ τις ἀσχημονεῖν—νομίζει** (1 Cor. 7:36). If such a word is used, it may be in the pred. nom. in apposition with the subject of the verb, as **φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί** (Ro. 1:22), or the accusative may be used. This accusative may be with a verb that can have two accusatives, as in **ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι** (Ph. 3:13) or the accusative of general reference as in **πέποιθάς τε σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν** (Ro. 2:19). This latter usage is the explanation of the accusative with the infinitive in the instances where the word used with the infinitive is other than the subject of the principal verb. Typical examples are seen in **οἳ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν** (Lu. 24:23), **νομίζοντες αὐτὸν τεθνηκέναι** (Ac. 14:19), **βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας** (1 Tim. 2:8). In these examples the infinitive is the object of the verb and the affirmation is made as far forth as the word in the accusative. They affirm living as to him; considering having died or death as to him; and wish praying as to the men. This is the psychology of this accusative with the infinitive. The fact that later grammarians call it the "subject" of the infinitive cuts no figure in the matter of the origin of the usage. Clyde[2] has interpreted the matter correctly. He sees that "grammarians framed this rule in ignorance of the etymology

[1] For inf. as subject and as object. see ch. on Verbal Nouns.

[2] Gk. Synt., p. 139 f. Cf. also Donaldson's Gk. Gr., § 584, and Green's Handb. to N. T. Gk. Gr., p. 232.

of infinitives," and that "since the infinitive was originally a case, the accusative could not originally have been its subject.". This descriptive accusative or accusative of definition (general reference) has a very wide range in Greek, as seen above, and is the true historical explanation of the accusative with the infinitive (other than the accusative which may be the object of the infinitive itself). When the infinitive is used with the accusative, it indicates the agent who has to do with the action by the accusative, since the infinitive can have no subject in the technical sense. This use of the accusative with the infinitive is common also when the infinitive is in a prepositional clause like ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν (Lu. 2:27). Here the matter becomes clearer for the reason that the article τῷ cannot be slurred over and it becomes imperative to explain one of the accusatives as that of general reference. The context makes it clear that τὸ παιδίον, is the object of εἰσαγαγεῖν, while τοὺς γονεῖς is the accusative of general reference. Many examples of this sort occur. Cf. Mt. 13:4. In Mt. 26:32, μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με, note the accusative με rather than nothing or αὐτός or ἐμαυτόν. Cf. also Ac. 23:15. The article may be so used without a preposition, and either the nominative appear, as δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι (2 Cor. 10:2), or the accusative, as τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον (2 Cor. 2:13). Then again the accusative may be used with the infinitive in such constructions as καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, (Mt. 17:4). Note here the infinitive as subject, as the infinitive as object occurs in 2 Cor. 10:2. There is one example of three accusatives with the infinitive in Heb. 5:12 (πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα). Here we have a verb that is used with two accusatives, and τινὰ is the accusative of general reference. Cf. the three accusatives in Lu. 11:11. This subject will call for further discussion in the chapters on Indirect Discourse and Verbal Nouns. There was a constant tendency in the later Greek to exchange this use of the infinitive and accusative for the ὅτι clause.[1]

(o) THE ACCUSATIVE ABSOLUTE. The absolute use of the accusative is rare in the N. T. as compared with the earlier Greek.[2] Usually the genitive occurs with the participle and substantive when used absolutely. In 1 Cor. 16:6 τυχόν is really the accusative absolute though used as an adverb. The most certain example in the N. T. is in Ac. 26:3 γνώστην ὄντα σε. In 1 Tim. 2:6 τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις is in the accusative without any

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 484 f.
[2] It is rare also in the pap. Volker, Pap. Gr. Synt. Spec., p. 18.

immediate connection unless it is in apposition with the preceding clause[1] (Ellicott *in loco*) or is loosely united with **δούς**. As to **τό ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου** (Ro. 8:3) we have either the *nominativus pendens*, the accusative in apposition with the object of the sentence, the accusative of general reference or an instance of anacoluthon.[2] In Lu. 24:47 the Text. Recept. reads **ἀρξάμενον**, which would be anacoluthon, but W. H. rightly have **--νοι**. Twice **ἐξόν**, occurs in the N. T., once with **ἦν** (Mt. 12:4) and once alone, **ἃ οὐκ ἐξόν** (2 Cor. 12:4), but in both instances in the nominative. In Ph. 1: 7 **ὑμᾶς ὄντας** the **ὑμᾶς** is repeated and is not accusative absolute. A subordinate sentence may also be in the accusative of general reference. Thus **τὸ εἰ δύνῃ** (Mk. 9:23), **τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν** (Lu. 9:46). See further chapter on Verbal Nouns.

(p) THE ACCUSATIVE WITH PREPOSITIONS. Only a general remark is needed here, since each preposition will be discussed later in detail. In general one may note that the accusative is the most frequent case with prepositions.[3] Indeed in modern Greek these all have the accusative. **Πρός** in the N. T. has ablative 1, locative 6, accusative 679 times.[4] Here the preposition, like all prepositions, is merely an adverb that is used to express more exactly the idea of the case. The preposition does not technically govern a case. The accusative with the preposition has, of course, its usual force, extension. The following prepositions occur in the N. T. with the accusative, one example being given in each instance) **Ἀνὰ μέσον** (Mk. 7:31), **διὰ τὸν φόβον** (Jo. 7:13), **εἰς τὴν πόλιν** (Mtl 26:18), **ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν** (Mt. 15:35), **κατὰ τὸν νόμον** (Lu. 2:22), **μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς** (Lu. 2:46), **παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν** (Mt. 20:30), **περὶ αὐτόν**, (Mt. 26:18), **ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν** (Mt. 3:5), **ὑπὲρ δοῦλον** (Phil. 16), **ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον** (Mt. 5:15). Of these **εἰς** is, of course, by far the most frequent and has only the accusative. **Διά, μετά περί, ὑπέρ, ὑπό** have the genitive-ablative more than the accusative, while **ἐπί, κατά, πρός** have the accusative more often. For exact figures see Moulten, *Prol*., pp. 105-107. In the chapter on Prepositions there will be further discussion of the matter.

VIII. The Genitive (True) Case (**ἡ γενικὴ πρῶσις**).

(a) TWO CASES WITH ONE FORM. It is now generally accepted by the comparative grammars that in Greek two cases appear under the form of the genitive: the genitive proper and the

[1] For acc. in apposition with sentence in pap. see Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 152, **τὸ μὴ ὄν**, T.P. 1 (ii/B.C.).

[2] Green, Handb., etc., p. 234.

[3] Giles, Man., etc., p. 311,

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 106,

ablative.[1] It is a syncretistic form. The matter has already had some discussion in this grammar under Declensions and calls for little remark here. Moulton is not too hard on Winer when he calls it "an utterly obsolete procedure" to speak of the genitive as "unquestionably the whence-case."[2] Winer is followed by Green.[3] Now the ablative is the whence-case, but the genitive is a different case. Delbruck[4] gives an interesting sketch of the fate of the ablative case in the Indo-Germanic languages. In the Sanskrit singular the two cases (gen. and abl.) have the same form, except I.-G. *–o* (Sans. *–a*) stems (Sans. gen. *–asya*, abl. *–ad*). In the Balto-Slavic tongues ablative and genitive have the same endings. In the Italic languages, ablative, locative, instrumental (and partly dative) have the same form. Indeed in the Thessalian dialect as in the Latin some forms of the genitive and locative coincide (like *domi*). Dionysius Thrax[5] had the idea that both cases flourished under one form in Greek, for he describes this case as ἡ γενικὴ κτητικὴ καὶ πατρική. Thompson[6] indeed recognises the two cases, but thinks it is not possible to group the uses of the form under these two divisions because some suit either case. There is a "debatable land" as Giles[7] observes, but this applies to only a very small part of the examples and is very natural indeed. As a matter of fact it is not possible to give a really scientific explanation of the usage in Greek from any other standpoint. The ablative will therefore be treated as a separate case and the true genitive discussed now.

(b) NAME INCORRECT. The genitive case has the wrong name. The Latin *genitivus* is a translation of γεννητική (more like the ablative in idea). It is ἡ γενικὴ πτῶσις. The name γενική comes from γένος (*genus*), 'kind,' and corresponds to the Latin *generalis*.[8] Priscian[9] so calls it (*generalis casus*). It is a pity that one still has to call it "genitive."

[1] Delbruck, Grundl. der griech. Synt., IV, p. 37; Giles, Man., p. 319. Cf. Hadley, Ess. Philol., etc., p. 46 f.

[2] W.-Th., p. 184; Moulton, Prol., p. 72. But W.-Sch., p. 259, does not make this error.

[3] Handb., etc., p. 207. [4] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 200.

[5] Bekker, Anec. Graeca, 1816, Vol. II, p. 636.

[6] Gk. Synt., 1883, p. 59. [7] Man., p. 313.

[8] Cf. Max Milder, Lect., I, pp. 103-105; Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 70.

[9] Lib. V, de Casu. See Meister, Der synt. Gebrauch des Genit. in den kretischen Dial.-Inschr. Indoger. Forsch., XVIII, pp. 133-204. Cf. also Ruttgers, De accus., gen., dat. usu in inscr, archaicis cretensibus. Diss. Bonn, 47 p.

(C) THE SPECIFYING CASE. It is this and no other. The idea of the genitive case is at bottom simple. The genitive shows διαίρεσιν and something εἰδικόν. It is the case of genus (γένος) or kind. For a very full discussion of the genitive see Delbruck, Veryl. Synt., III, pp. 307-360. The genitive does indeed resemble the adjective, but it is not adjectival in origin,[1] though the source of the genitive ending is unknown. The adjectival possessive pronoun (like ἐμός) is a mere variation of the genitive case (ἐμοῦ) and the two may be in apposition with one another, as τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ **Παύλου** (2 Th. 3:17). But the function of the case is largely adjectival as in ἡμέρα παρασκευῆς (Lu. 23: 54), though the adjective and the genitive are not exactly parallel, for with two substantives each idea stands out with more sharpness, as in ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς (Ro. 6:4) and ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι (1 Tim. 6:17).[2] It is the specifying case, then, the case of appurtenance.[3] In the Sanskrit Whitney[4] finds the genitive adjectival in idea and defining the noun more nearly. So also Kuhner-Gerth[5] who find it qualitative with nouns or verbs. But Delbruck,[6] followed by Brugmann,[7] makes the verb the starting-point for explaining the genitive. One hesitates to part company with Delbruck and Brugmann, but the older view that it was first used with nouns seems here to have the best of it.[8] It may be remarked that the genitive is the most persistent of all the cases in retaining its forms, as is seen in the English s. Indeed in the modern Greek the form shares with the accusative the result of the loss of the dative, so that we often meet a construction like αὐτοῦ τὸ εἶπα ('I told him so').[9] One other remark is called for concerning the meaning of the genitive in Greek. It is that the case does not of itself mean all that one finds in translation. The case adheres to its technical root-idea. The resultant idea will naturally vary greatly according as the root-conception of the case is applied to different words and different contexts. But the varying element is not the case, but the words and the context. The error must not be made of mistaking the translation of the resultant whole

[1] Giles, Man., etc., p. 311.
[2] Cf. W.-Th., p. 236.
[3] Hadley, Ess. Philol. and Crit., p. 48.
[4] Sans. Gr., p. 98 f.
[5] Tl. I, p. 331. Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 102.
[6] Vergl. Synt., I, p6 185 f., 307-380.
[7] Griech. Gr., p. 3851.
[8] Giles, Man., etc., p. 315. Cf. Donaldson, Gk. Gr., pp. 464 ff.
[9] In late Gk. the true gen. survives while the abl. fades further away. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 333.

for the case itself. Thus in Mt. 1:12 we have **μετοικεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος**. It is translated 'removal to Babylon.' Now the genitive does not mean 'to,' but that is the correct translation of the total idea obtained by knowledge of the 0. T. What the genitive says is that it is a 'Babylon-removal.' That is all. So in Mt. 12:31, **ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία**, it is the 'Spirit-blasphemy.' From the context we know that it is blasphemy against the Spirit, though the genitive does not mean 'against.' When a case has so many possible combinations in detail it is difficult to make a satisfactory grouping of the various resultant usages. A very simple and obvious one is here followed. But one must always bear in mind that these divisions are merely our modern conveniences and were not needed by the Greeks themselves. At every stage one needs to recall the root-idea of the case (genus or kind) and find in that and the environment and history the explanation.

(d) THE LOCAL USE. This is normally the first to begin with. In Greek literature it appears mainly in poetry[1] and in adverbs of place like **αὐτοῦ, οὗ, ποῦ, ὅπου, ὅμου, πανταχοῦ**. But it is possible that these are locatives like **ἄλλοθι** in a shortened form.[2] But on the other hand in Homer the genitive undoubtedly[3] appears in local relations with the archaic genitive in **—οιο**, though even in Homer the examples are chiefly stereotyped ones. There are in the N. T. only these examples in Luke and Acts. In Lu. 5:19 **μὴ εὑρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν** and 19:4 **ἐκείνης ἤμελλεν διέρχεσθαι** we have two undoubted examples. Blass[4] indeed calls these "incorrect" on the ground that "classical Greek" would not have used the genitive thus. But it is sufficient reply to say that Luke was not writing classical Greek. Certainly Xenophon might have used **ποίᾳ ἐκείνῃ** (as D has in Lu. 19:4). Moulton[5] finds often in the papyri **νότου, λιβός**, though in Rev. 21:13 we have the ablatives **ἀπὸ νότου**. In Ac. 19:26 we have a very striking example that the commentaries have failed to notice as Moulton[7] observes. It is **οὐ μόνον Ἐφέσου ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παῦλος πείσας μετέστησεν ἱκανὸν ὄχλον**. Moulton on the whole agrees with Hackett that the genitive here is dependent on **ὄχλον**. In Homer one has a parallel like **οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν** but Moulton finds none in the vernacular **κοινή**. Still, since Luke did use **ἐκείνης** and **ποίας**, it does

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 73. Cf. K.-G., I, p. 384 f.
[2] Delbruck, Vergl. Gr., I, p. 359.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 104.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 109.
[5] Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 437.
[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 73.
[7] Ib.

not seem difficult to believe that he was ready to employ the genitive of place in Acts.

There is another passage in Luke also (Lu. 16:24) where the genitive of place occurs, **ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος**. Here **ὕδατος** emphasizes the kind of material which the speaker clearly has in mind. **א** has **ὕδατι**. One may note in this connection the Homeric idiom **λούεσθαι ποταμοῖο** 'to bathe in the river.' Cf. also the classic **ποῦ γῆς.** Somewhat similar also is **ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων** (Jo. 7:35) and **ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν** (Mt. 10:5), which are objective genitives but of place also. Cf. **ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας** (Acts 22:3) which is described by Blass-Debrunner, p. 101, as partitive genitive.

(e) THE TEMPORAL USE. It is common enough. This is a very old use of the genitive.[1] This is the true genitive.[2] The accusative when used of time expresses duration over the period, the locative regards the period as a point even if it is of some length (cf. **καιροῖς ἰδίοις**, 1 Tim. 6:15), while the genitive implies nothing[3] as to duration. In Mt. 24:20 this distinction can be seen in **χειμῶνος καὶ σαββάτῳ**, one the case of genus, the other a point of time. Brugmann[4] indeed regards the genitive of time as a development of the partitive genitive, but this seems hardly necessary. Moulton,[5] on the other hand, connects it with the genitive of possession and finds it very frequently in the papyri, like **ἔτους**, 'in the second year.' So **τοῦ ὄντος μηνός**, F.P. 124 (ii/A.D.). On the difference between the genitive and the accusative of time see **ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός** (Lu. 18:7) and **νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν** (Lu. 2:37), the genitive the time within which (kind of time), the accusative the time during which (all through). Cf. also **νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον** (Jo. 19:39). See also **τοῦ λοιποῦ** (Gal. 6:17) and **τὸ λοιπόν** (Heb. 10:13). Once more observe **μεσονύκτιον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας** (Mk. 13:35) where some MSS. have **μεσονυκτίου**. The accusative here is more like the adverb **ὀψέ** just preceding. Further examples of the genitive may be seen in **μέσης νυκτός** (Mt. 25:6), **ὄρθρου βαθέος** (Lu. 24:1). For adverbs in expressions of time, see viii, (h).

(f) WITH SUBSTANTIVES. This is the chief use of the case. The accusative indeed is chiefly connected with the verb, while the genitive is mainly related to substantives.[6]

1. *The Possessive*[7] *Genitive.* In simple point of fact it is not

[1] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 356. Cf. Sans., Whitney's Sans. Gr., p. 100.
[2] Delbruck, Grundl., etc., IV, p. 45.
[3] Monro, Hom.p. 105.
[4] Griech. Gr., p. 389.
[5] Prol., p. 73.
[6] Giles, Man., etc., p. 311.
[7] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 344.

necessary to see any particular inner connection between the many uses of the genitive with substantives other than the common root-idea of the case. For convenience it suits us to group these usages, but one must think that the Greeks themselves looked at the whole matter much more simply. After all it is the context that varies rather than the genitive.[1] The resultant idea is therefore a matter of exegesis rather than due to any particular label to be attached.[2] The most obvious illustrations like **πατάξας τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον** (Mt. 26:51) call for little remark. It is the high-priest's servant, not another's, and it is the servant's ear, not another's. The possessive pronouns, especially **ἐμός** in John's Gospel, were used to some extent in the N. T., but usually the genitive of the personal pronoun is found. In Jo. 7:16 they occur side by side. Cf. **τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου** (1 Cor. 16 : 21).

2. *Attributive Genitive*. Like an adjective the genitive may be either attributive or predicate. This is sometimes called the genitive of quality. But the name helps little, as all genitives have this idea. The sense of attribute is indeed the usual one with the genitive, as **Παῦλος δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Ro. 1:1). Thus observe the descriptive genitive in Mt. 18:9 **εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός**, Ro. 6:6 **τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως** (and **τῆς δόξης**, Ph. 3:21), **τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκός** (Col. 1: 22), **βάπτισμα μετανοίας** (Mk. 1:4), **ἡμέρας ὁδόν** (Lu. 2:44), **ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας** (Lu. 16:8). And even expressions like **υἱοὶ φωτός** (1 Th. 5:5) are shown by the inscriptions and coins (Deissmann, *Bib. Stud.*, p. 165) to be not mere Hebraisms, though far more frequent in the LXX than in the N. T. because of the Hebrew. Other examples are **λόγοις τῆς χάριτος** (Lu. 4:22), **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς** (Ac. 9:15), **σκεύη ὀργῆς** (Ro. 9:22), **κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας** (Lu. 18:6), **πάθη ἀτιμίας** (Ro. 1:26), **υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης** (Col. 1:13), **νόμον τῆς ἐλευθερίας** and **ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς** (Jas. 1:25), **ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης** (Heb. 1:3), **καρδία ἀπιστίας** (Heb. 3:12), **ῥίζα πικρίας** (Heb. 12:15), **ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου** (Rev. 13:3), where the descriptive attributive genitive expresses quality like an adjective indeed, but with more sharpness and distinctness. Cf. again **ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς** (Ro. 6:4) and **ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι** (1 Tim. 6:17). In Heb. 1:3, **τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ**, the second genitive is technically de-

[1] Giles, Man., etc., p. 312.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 72. Blass, also (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 95) thinks that the exact shade of the gen. idea is often a matter of theological, not grammatical interpretation.

pendent on δυνάμεως. Cf. 2 Th. 1:7. One may note Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 237) who says that in τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης (Ac. 5:20) the demonstrative goes in sense with ῥήματα. This point (cf. p. 706) applies to ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης (Ac. 13:26) and ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου (Ro. 7:24). Besides **υἱοὶ φωτός** above observe a similar idiom in **τέκνα φωτός** (Eph. 5:8), **τέκνα ὀργῆς** (Eph. 2:3), **τέκνα ὑπακοῆς** (1 Pet. 1:14), **τέκνα κατάρας** (2 Pet. 2:14), **υἱοὶ ἀπειθίας** (Eph. 2:2), **ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας** (2 Th. 2:3). Cf. also **οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος** (Mt. 9:15); **ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ** (Col. 1:3), **ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας** (2 Th. 2:3).

One may instance further the use of **ἡμέρα ὀργῆς** (Ro. 2:5), **ἡμέρα στωηρίας** 2 Cor. 6:2 quot. from 0. T.), **ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς** (1 Pet. 2:12), **ἡμέρα ἀναδείξεως** (Lu. 1:80) where the LXX may be appealed to for abundant illustration.

The genitive of place or country is descriptive also. Thus **Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας** (Mk. 1:9), **Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας** (Ac. 22:3), **ἥτις ἐστὶν πρώτη μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις** (Ac. 16:12), etc. This genitive of quality or descriptive genitive is largely extended in the LXX by reason of translation (Thackeray, p. 23).

3. *The Predicate Genitive*. While having the copula **εἶναι, γίνεσθαι**, etc., in reality[1] it is to be explained as a genitive with substantives. It is not the copula that affects the case of the genitive at all. It is just the possessive genitive in the predicate instead of being an attribute. Often the substantive or pronoun is repeated in sense before the predicate genitive. Thus **οὐκ ἔστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεός** (1 Cor. 14:33). Cf. **ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς—ἀλλὰ πίστεως** (Heb. 10:39), **πᾶσα παιδεία οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι** (Heb. 12:11). So **ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα** (Mk. 5:42). So Lu. 2:42. Cf. also **ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας** (Ac. 9:2), and indeed **ἐγένετο γνώμης** (Ac. 20:3 is to be explained the same way. There is as much latitude in the predicate genitive as in the attributive possessive genitive. We have **υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας** (1 Th. 5:5) and **οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους** (1 Th. 5:6) and **ἡμέρας ὄντες** (verse 8).[2] We may continue the illustrations like **ἐγώ εἰμι Παύλου** (1 Cor. 1:12), **οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν** (1 Cor. 6:19), **τοῦ θεοῦ οὗ εἰμί** (Ac. 27:23), **πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν** (1 Cor. 3:21), **οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστίν γνῶναι**, (Ac. 1:7), **ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κληρονομία** (Lu. 20:14), **τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή** (Mk. 12:23), **τελείων ἐστὶν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή** (Heb. 5:14), **Χριστοῦ εἶναι** (2 Cor. 10:7), **ὧν ἐστὶν Φύγελος καὶ Ἑρμογένης** (2 Tim. 1:15), **ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾖ τοῦ** (2 Cor. 4:7), and finally,

[1] W.-Th , p. 195. Is no distinct type, Giles, Man., p. 317.
[2] Blass, Tr. of N. T. Gk., p. 96.

though by no means all that can be adduced, **ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ-κόσμος** (1 Pet. 3:3). These passages not only illustrate the variety of the predicate genitive, but show that this is essentially a substantival genitive (cf. predicate nominative) and not a verbal genitive. As an example of the objective genitive in the predicate take **σλάδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ** (Mt. 16:23). In the modern Greek the predicate genitive has been still further extended (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 35).

4. *Apposition or Definition*. This is a very simple use of the case, but is not an extremely common idiom in the N. T., since the two substantives can easily be put in the same case. In the modern Greek mere apposition rules (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 33). But some interesting examples occur.[1] It is a well-known idiom in Homer and certainly needs no appeal to the Hebrew for justification.[2] Kuhner-Gerth[3] may also be consulted for other poetical examples. In the N. T. we note **πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας** (2 Pet. 2:6) which Blass compares with **Ἰλίου πόλιν** of Homer and observes[4] that **πόλεως Θυατείρων** (Ac. 16:14) is merely the genitive of **πόλις Θυάτειρα** (cf. **πόλει Ἰόππῃ** in Ac. 11:5). In 2 Cor. 11:32 the adjective is used as **τὴν πόλιν Δαμασκηνῶν**, while in Rev. 18:10 we have true apposition. One may note further **τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ** (Jo. 2:21), **τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος** (2 Cor. 5:5), **σημεῖον περιτομῆς** (Ro. 4:11, AC **περιτομήν**) , **τὸ σημεῖον τῆς ἰάσεως** (Ac. 4:22), **ἡ κοίμησις τοῦ ὕπνου** (Jo. 11:13), **θώρακα πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης** (1 Th. 5:8), **τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως** (1 Th. 1:3), **ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου** (Col. 1:5), **ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις τῆς κληρονομίας** (Col. 3:24), **ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας** (1 Cor. 5:8), **ἡ ὀσμὴ τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ** (2 Cor. 2:14), **ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν** (Ro. 15:16), **τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ** (Eph. 2:14), **ὁ θεμέλιος τῶν ἀποστόλων** (Eph. 2:20), **θεμέλιος μετανοίας** (Heb. 6:1), **τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου** (2 Cor. 1:9), **ὁ ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν –κόσμος** (1 Pet. 3:3), **ὁ στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς** (Rev. 2:10), **ὁ στέφαονς τῆς δόξης** (1 Pet. 5:4), **ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος** (2 Tim. 4:8), **ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων** (Lu. 22:1), **ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα** (Jo. 13:1), **ἡ οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους** (2 Cor. 5: 1), **ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος** (Ro. 8:23), **τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος** (Ac. 2:33), **νόμος πίστεως** (Ro. 3:27). These are by no means all, but they illustrate at least the freedom of the N. T. in the use of the genitive of definition or of apposition. It is, of course, possible, as Moulton (*Prol*., 74) suggests, that the vernacular has preserved the poetical

[1] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 335.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 73 f. [3] II, p. 264.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk.., p. 98. Cf. also W.-Sch., p. 266 f.

idiom in this as in so many other matters. Poetry often expresses better than prose the language of the people. In Eph. 4:9 **εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς** we probably have not this usage, but the ablative after the comparative. Cf. Ellicott *in loco*. In Jo. 21: 8 **τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων** the genitive merely gives the content (cf. material and quantity as opposed to quality). Cf. also **ἀλάβαστρον μύρου** (Mk. 14:3) and **κεράμιον ὕδατος** (Mk. 14:13), **ἀγέλη χοίρων** (Mt. 8:30) and **ἑκατὸν βάτους ἐλαίου** (Lu. 16:6).

5. *The Subjective Genitive*. It can be distinguished from the objective use only by the context. Sometimes the matter is not clear. This genitive is the common possessive genitive looked at from another, angle. In itself the genitive is neither subjective nor objective, but lends itself readily to either point of view. The subjective genitive can indeed be applied to the merely possessive genitive noted above.[1] Take Ro. 1:17 where **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ** means the righteousness which God has and wishes to bestow on us. A typical example is found in 2 Cor. 5:14, **ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς**. Mere it is unquestionably the love that Christ has for sinners and so for Paul that is the constraining influence in his life. In Ro. 8:39 the matter is explained indeed by the phrase **ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.** Abbott[2] is apparently right in finding only a couple of passages in the N. T. where **ἀγάπη** is used with the objective genitive (2 Th. 2:10, **ἡ ἀγ. τῆς ἀληθείας**; Lu. 11:42, **παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ**. Jo. 5:42 **τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς** might be either subjective or objective, but see Ro. 5:5. In Ph. 4:7 **ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ** is probably subjective and, so 'the peace that God has and gives,' but the meaning is richer than any phrase, as Simcox[3] well observes. Cf. Col. 3:15. In Ro. 15:8, **ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ**, we seem to have the subjective genitive. Note also **δικαιοσύνη πίστεως** (Ro. 4:13), which is explained as subjective by Paul in the phrase **ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως** (Ro. 10:6). In 1 Tim. 4:1, **διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων**, we have again the subjective genitive. Some passages are open to doubt, as **εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ** (Ac. 20:24), **εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας** (Mt. 4:23).

6. *The Objective Genitive*. It is. quite frequent in the N. T.,[4] especially when it is vanishing in the later Greek.[5] The adnominal genitive preserves a remnant of the old objective genitive in mod-

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 333.
[2] Joh. Gr., pp. 84 ff. Abbott gives a very just discussion of the matter.
[3] Lang. of the N. T., p. 87.
[4] Green, Handb.1, etc., p. 219. [5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 334.

ern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 34). Here again we must appeal to the root-idea of the genitive as the case of genus or kind. The resultant idea is due to the context and one must not suppose that the Greek genitive means all the different English prepositions used to translate the resultant idea. Thus in Mk. 11:22 ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ we rightly translate 'have faith in God,' though the genitive does not mean 'in,' but only the God kind of faith. Cf. Ro. 3:22. Take Mt. 12:31, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία, where the context makes it clear that it is blasphemy 'against' the Holy Spirit. Another striking example is Ac. 4:9, ἐπὶ εὐεργεσίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀσθενοῦς, where the good deed is done 'to' a sick man. In Jo. 7:13, διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, it is fear 'towards' or 'in reference to' the Jews, while Jo. 17:2, ἐξουσία πάσης σαρκός, means authority 'over' all flesh (cf. ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, Mt. 10:1, and τῆς ὑμῶν ἐξουσίας, 1 Cor. 9:12). In 1 Cor. 10:6, τύποι ἡμῶν, we have types 'for' us. In Jo. 18:29 we have accusation 'against' this man, κατηγορίαν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, etc. Each example calls for separate treatment. So τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ (Lu. 11:29) may be the sign shown in Jonah, while νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρός (Ro. 7:2) is the law 'about' the husband (cf. ὁ νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ, Lev. 14:2). In 1 Pet. 2:19, διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ, it is a good conscience 'toward' God, while εἰς τὴν ὑπακουὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Lu. 6:12) we have prayer 'to' God. Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου (Jo. 2:17) is zeal 'concerning' thy house. See Ro. 10:2; cf. also Heb. 11:26, τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In Col. 2:18, θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, it is worship 'paid to' angels, while εἰς τὴν ὑπακουὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 10:5) is obedience 'to' Christ. But see *per contra* ὑπακοὴ πίστεως (Ro. 1:5) which is subjective genitive. In 1 Cor. 1:6, μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ we have again witness 'concerning' Christ. Cf. also ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (1 Cor. 1:18) and ἀκοαὶ πολέμων (Mt. 24:6). So in 1 Cor. 8:7 ἡ συνείδησις τοῦ εἰδώλου is consciousness 'about' the idol, not the idol's consciousness. See also the two objective uses of ἀγάπη in 2 Th. 2:10 and Lu. 11:42 and possibly also Jo. 5:42; 2 Th. 3:5; 1 Jo. 2:5. In Ro. 5:5 either will make good sense. The phrase φόβος θεοῦ (Ro. 3:18) is objective, and note also 2 Cor. 5:11 (τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου). Eph. 5:21 is objective. See also καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ (Ro. 2:7), 'in' a good work, and εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς (Ro. 5:18), 'to' life. Cf. ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς—κρίσεως (Jo. 5:29). Indeed one may go on and include those genitives of "looser relation" usually set off to themselves. They are really just the objective genitive. So as to ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν (Mt. 10:5), way 'to' the Gentiles; ὁδὸν θαλάσσης (Mt. 4:15), way

'by' the sea; **τὴν διασποράν τῶν Ἑλλήνων** (Jo. 7:35), dispersion 'among' the Greeks; **πρόβατα σφαγῆς** (Ro. 8:36), 'doomed to' slaughter; **θέρα τῶν προβάτων** (Jo. 10:7), door 'to' the sheep; **μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶνος** (Mt. 1:11 f.), and even **ἀπολύτρωσις τῶν παραβάσεων** (Heb. 9:15), though this last may be regarded as an ablative. But **βαπτισμῶν διδαχήν** (Heb. 6:2) is objective genitive. Note also **τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα** (Jas. 1:17), a shadow 'cast by' turning, and **πίστει ἀληθείας** (2 Th. 2:13), faith in the truth. In Heb. 10:24, **παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων** there is little cause for comment. The same remark applies to **κίνδυνοι ποταμῶν, λῃστῶν** (2 Cor. 11:26). In Jo. 19:14 **ἡ παρσκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα** probably already means the day 'before' the Sabbath (Friday).[1] Cf. **ἡ παραβολὴ τοῦ σπείροντος** (Mt. 13:18). Cf. also the genitive of price, **χοῖνιξ σίτου δηναρίου** (Rev. 6:6), 'for' a penny; **ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ** (Mt. 16:26), exchange 'for' his soul. Cf. Lu. 10:36. Enough has been said to show how carefully the genitive must be interpreted and what great latitude was used in connection with it. Deissmann (*St. Paul,* pp. 140 f.) thinks that Paul's use of the genitive is "very peculiar" and transcends all rules about subjective and objective. He even suggests "mystic genitive" for Paul.

7. *Genitive of Relationship*. For lack of a better name this use of the genitives is called "genitive of membership"[2] or "of relationship."[3] In reality it is merely the possessive genitive of a special applications The substantive is not used because the context makes it clear. Thus **Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου** (Lu. 24:10) is James' Mary; whether mother, wife, daughter or sister, the context must decide. In this instance it is James' mother. Cf. Mk. 16:1. Mk. 15:47 gives us **Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσῆτος**, while in 15:40 we have both James and Joses. In Mt. 27:56 as in Mk. 15:40 we have the full construction **μήτηρ**. But in Jo. 19:25 **Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ** it is the wife (**γυνή**) that is meant. So in Mt. 1:6 **ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου**. In Lu. 6:16 and Ac. 1:13 we have **Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου**, which probably means the brother (**ἀδελφός**) of Jude in view of Jude 1 (**ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου**) rather than son. But **υἱός** is the word usually to be supplied, as in **Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου** (Mt. 4:21), **τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος** (Jo. 6:71), **Σίμων Ἰωάνου** (Jo. 21:15 ff.), **Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί** (Ac. 13:22). See also Ac. 20:4, **Σώπατρος Πύρρου**. Cf. Lu. 3:2 where **υἱός** is used, as **υἱοί** generally is for 'sons of Zebedee' (Mk. 10:35). In Jo. 21:2 we have **οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου** so used.

[1] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 92.
[2] Blass, Gr. of, N. T. Gk., p. 95. [3] W.-Th., p. 190.

But sometimes the article refers to the family in general as in **ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης** (1 Cor. 1:11). Cf. **οἱ περὶ αὐτόν** (Lu. 22:49). In Mk. 5:35, **ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου**, it is possible that **οἴκος** is to be supplied, since the man himself (verse 22) has already come.[1] In Ac. 2:27, 31, W. H. read **εἰς ᾅδην**, while some MSS. have **εἰς ᾅδου** (cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 395) and the MSS. vary also in Ps. 16:10 (LXX). Cf. **ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ** in Lu. 16:23. It is more likely that in Lu. 2:49, **ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός**, we have the idea of 'house' rather than that of 'business.' Cf. **εἰς τὰ ἴδια** (Jo. 19:27) and **εἰς τὰ ἴδια** and **οἱ ἴδιοι** in Jo. 1:11. See **ἐν τοῖς Κλαυδ(ίου)**, P.O. 523 (ii/A.D.), for 'house' of. It is a classic idiom. Cf. Lysias **εἰς τὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ**. These constructions are all in harmony with the ancient Greek idiom.[2] In an example like **τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας** (2 Pet. 2:22) it is not the genitive that calls for remark so much as the article without any substantive. The discussion belongs to the chapter on the Article.

8. *Partitive Genitive.* Here a part of the whole is given. See **ἓν τούτων** (Mt. 6:29), **τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως** (Rev. 11:13), **ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας** (Mk. 6:23), **ἥμισυ καιροῦ** (Rev. 12:14), **τὰ ἡμίσιά μου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων** (Lu. 19:8), **τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων** (Mt. 15:37), **τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς** (Rev. 8:7). See further **ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου** (Mt. 5:29), **τίνα τῶν προφητῶν** (Acts 7:52), **τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων** (Rom. 15:26), **οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων** (Lu. 18:11), **μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων** (Rev. 5:11), **τὰ ἡμίσιά μου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων** (Lu. 19:8) and the curious **τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων** (1 Pet. 5: 9). For the blending of the partitive genitive with the ablative and **ἐκ** and for further discussion see ix, (c). In the N. T. the partitive relation is usually more sharply defined by prepositions (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 102). Cf. Ac. 21:16, **συνῆλθον τῶν μαθητῶν**, where the partitive genitive is alone.

9. *The Position of the Genitive.* In general one may note that the genitive usually comes after the limiting substantive, as **τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός** (Mt. 5:22), but the genitive comes first if it is emphatic like **Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος** (Ac. 14:1) or if there is sharp contrast like **τὸν συστρατιώτην μου, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον** (Ph.. 2:25). In Eph. 6:9 both genitives precede, **καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ κύριος**. If the article is used with both words we may have the usual order, as **τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ**, (Eph. 6:11), or less often the classic idiom, as **τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν** (Heb. 12:2). Sometimes indeed the article may be repeated, as **ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ** (1 Cor.

[1] Green, Handb., etc., p. 213.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 95 f.

1:18).[1] **Αὐτοῦ** usually comes after the noun in the Synoptics, as **τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 3:17), but John sometimes puts **αὐτοῦ** first[2] (1:27; 9:6; cf. **σου** in 9:10, **σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί**). Sometimes a word intervenes between; the substantive and the genitive as in **ἤμεθα τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς** (Eph. 2:3). Cf. also Ph. 2:10; Ro. 9:21, etc. But note **εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία** (Mt. 13:33).

10. *Concatenation of Genitives*. Two or more genitives may be used together. This is, of course, common in the earlier Greek. Paul in particular is fond of piling up genitives. Take 1 Th. 1:3 as a typical example, **μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. Here we have practically all the points, viz., two simple genitives, two in apposition, three together, one of the person and the other of the thing. A very simple case is found in Ro. 8:21, **τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ**, and in verse 23 **τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν**. Cf. also Jo. 6:1; 2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 1: 6; 4:13; Col. 1:13, etc. In Rev. 16:19 we have four genitives, **τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ,** and five occur in Rev. 19:15, counting the appositives, **τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος**. Blass[3] calls this "a really burdensome accumulation of words," but surely the sense is clear enough. The governing genitive comes before the dependent genitive in Ilregular order here. But in 2 Pet. 3:2 this smooth order is not observed, yet all five can be readily understood: **ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου**. Cf. Ph. 2:30 also. In 2 Cor. 3:18, **ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος**, it is not clear whether **κυρίου** is genitive or is the ablative in apposition with **πνεύματος**. In Jas. 2:1 it is difficult to put into brief compass the Greek idiom, **τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης**. Here **Ἰη. Χρ**. is in apposition with **κυρίου**. **Κρυίου** has **ἡμῶν** and is itself the objective genitive with **πίστιν**, while **τῆς δόξης** is probably in apposition with **Ἰη. Χρ.** (see Mayor *in loco*).

(g) THE GENITIVE WITH ADJECTIVES. Giles[4] observes how natural it is for adjectives to take the genitive, since many of them are developed from substantives in apposition. Adjectives of fulness can logically take either the genitive or the instrumental. Giles[5] explains how with they Latin *plenus*, by analogy to *vacuus*, the ablative is used and also because the ablative and instrumental forms

[1] Cf. Green, Handy., etc., p. 215.
[2] Abbott, Joh. Gr.,1p. 90.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 99.
[4] Man., etc., p. 316. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 353 f.
[5] lb.

we have the genitive when the participle is regarded no longer as are the same in Latin. Indeed even in the case of the participle an adjective, but as a substantive, as **τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου** (1 Cor. 13: 3). Cf. Lu. 12:33; Lu. 2:27, **τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου**; and Ph. 3:8, **τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως**. The adjective itself is so used in 1 Cor. 10:33, **τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφορον**. Cf. 1 Cor. 7:35. But different is **συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ** (Ro. 8:29). Here we have the true adjective, but the genitive is due to the principle just stated. In **συνεργός**, Ro. 16:21, we have the substantive also. The case with verbals in **–τος** may be considered genitive, but see the ablative also. Thus of **οἱ ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ** (Ro. 1:7), **γεννητοὶ γυναικῶν** (Lu. 7:28), **ἐκλεκτοῖ θεοῦ** (Ro. 8:33), **κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ** (Ro. 1:6). In **διδακτοὶ θεοῦ** (Jo. 6:45), **οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις** (1 Cor. 2:13) one may question if we do not have the ablative. But in **εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός** (Mt. 25:34) the genitive is likely the case. There is only one adjective in **–ικός** in the N. T. which has the genitive, **κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων** (Heb. 4:12). **Ἄξιος** is very common with the genitive in the N. T., as **ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας** (Mt. 3:8). But **ἀνάξιος** probably has abl. because of **α–** privative, as **ἀνάξιοί ἐστε κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων** (1 Cor. 6:2). Delbruck[1] confesses his inability to explain this genitive, though Blass[2] considers it genitive of price. The figure of weighing or scales seems to be involved in the word. In 1 Cor. 9:21 (**ἔννομος Χριστοῦ**) we have a very "bold use" of the genitive[3] due to the substantive idea involved (**νόμος**). But probably in Heb. 3:12, **καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας**, the genitive is dependent on **καρδία**, not **πονηρά**. **Ἔνοχος** brings up an unusual genitive in Mt. 26:66 **ἔνοχος θανάτου**, and Mk. 3:29 (correct text) **ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος**. Moulton[4] considers this genitive "aberrant" and still more **ἔνοχος κρίσεως** in Syrian class of MSS. in Mk. 3:29. In 1 Cor. 11:27, **ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος**, we have the usage of the pre-Syrian classes in Mk. 3:29 and not the idiom in Mt. 26:66. The usual construction appears also as in **ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει** (Mt. 5:21 f.) and even **ἔνοχος εἰς τὴν γέενναν** (ib.). In the instance of **κοινωνός** the construction is also interesting. In 2 Cor. 1:7 we have **κοινωνοί ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων,** but it is debatable if the adjective has not here become a substantive as with **κοινωνὸς ἐμός** (2 Cor. 8:23; cf. **συνεργός** in same verse). **Κοινωνός** has also the dative, as **κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι** (Lu. 5:10). See **συνκοινωνὸς αὐτοῦ** (1 Cor. 9:23) and in Ph. 1:7 two genitives, **συνκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος**. But in Rev. 1:9 we have **ἐν** with locative. Note also **μεστοὶ ὑποκρίσεως**

[1] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 254.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 106.
[3] Ib.
[4] Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904, p. 152.

(Mt. 23:28) and πλήρης χάριτος (Jo. 1:14).[1] The case of **μέτοχος** in Heb. 3:1 (**κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι**) is similar to that of **κοινωνός** above, though more decidedly adjectival. Cf. **μέσος ὑμῶν** (Jo. 1:26). In Jo.18:55 W. H. read **ὅμοιος ὑμῖν**, though **א**CLX have **ὑμῶν**, a construction sometimes found in ancient Greek.[2] One may note also in 1 Pet. 5: 9, **τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων**, which is perhaps to be understood as the same "kinds" of sufferings, rather than the same sufferings.

(h) THE GENITIVE WITH ADVERBS AND PREPOSITIONS. At bottom there is little difference between the adverb and the genitive and the preposition and the genitive. The preposition is an adverb that is used with a case for clearer expression. The adverb is still an adverb when used with a case and called a preposition. Some adverbs indeed are only used as prepositions, but this is in the later stages of the language. **Ἀξίως**, like the adjective **ἄξιος**, occurs with the genitive, as **ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου** (Ph. 1:27; cf. Ro. 16:2). The genitive is not persistent with some of the adverbs and prepositions in late Greek.[3] It is more especially with adverbs of time that the genitive is found.[4] Thus **ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ** (Heb. 9:7) **δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου** (Lu. 18:12), **ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας** (Lu. 17:4). Gies[5] indeed observes that it is only the genitive of place that uses prepositions. Here only specimens without discussion can be given. Thus **ἄντικρυς Χίου** (Ac. 20:15), **ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου** (Mt. 7:61), **ἀντὶ χάριτος** (Jo. 1:16), **ἄχρι καιροῦ** (Lu. 4:13), **διὰ παραβολῆς** (Lu. 8:4), **ἐγγύς σου** (Ro. 10:8), **ἕνατι τοῦ θεοῦ** (Lu. 1:8), **ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ** (Lu. 1:6), **ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ** (Mt. 5:11), **ἐντὸς ὑμῶν** (Lu. 17:21), **ἐνώπιον κυρίου** (Lu. 1:15), **ἐπάνω ὄρους** (Mt. 5:14), **ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** (Rev. 6:10), **ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς** (Mk. 15:16), **ἕως ἡμῶν** (Ac. 9:38), **κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** (Mt. 26:59), **κατέναντι ὑμῶν** (Mk. 11:2), **κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης** (Ju. 24), **κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου** (Rev. 4:6), **μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς** (Ph. 2:15), **μεθ' ἡμῶν** (Mt. 1:23), **μεταξὺ σοῦ** (Mt. 18:15), **μέχρι τῆς σήμερον** (Mt. 11:23), **παραπλήσιον θανάτου** (Ph. 2:27), **πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου** (Jo. 4:5), **περὶ τοῦ φωτός** (Jo. 1:8), **τούτου χάριν** (Eph. 3:1). **Ἔμπροσθεν, ὄπισθεν πρό, πρός, ὑπέρ,** etc., all have the ablative. Cf. **τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν** (Lu. 11:39) where **ἔσωθεν** may be looked at more as a noun. **Ἐν μέσῳ** has almost the force of a preposition with the genitive (**ὑμῶν**, for instance, 1 Th. 2:7).

(1) THE GENITIVE WITH VERBS. As already remarked, Del-

[1] Jann. (Hist. G1. Gr., p. 338), after the analogy of the Lat. and the Gk. **κενός, ἐνδεής**, etc., considers it the abl. that we have with **πλήρης**.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 106.

[3] Jann., Hist. Gk Gr., p. 337.

[4] Giles, Man., p. 318.

[5] Ib., p. 319.

bruck[1] begins his discussion of the genitive with the verb. In Lu. 5:19, **ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν**, the genitive is not due to the verb and is a rather loose almost adverbial phrase.

1. *Very Common.* In Greek the genitive with verbs cuts a larger figure than in Latin.[2] Broadus used to say that the genitive with verbs means 'this and no other,' while the accusative with verbs means 'this and no more.' Probably therefore the genitive with verbs is a variation from the accusative with verbs, the original and normal case with verbs. This point may be illustrated by **ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ** (Mk. 9:7) and **ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμόν** (Lu. 1 41). Some verbs yield themselves naturally to the idea of the genitive, while others use the accusative. Others again use now one, now the other. The predicate genitive is passed by here, having been discussed under Substantives.

2. *Fading Distinction from Accusative*. But it must not be assumed that it is wholly a matter of indifference whether the accusative or the genitive is used with a verb, though the accusative in the later Greek constantly made inroads on the genitive. Even in the old Greek much freedom existed. In the modern Greek the genitive with verbs occurs only in some dialects (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 35). Cf. **μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ** (Lu. 17:32), but **μνημονεύετε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους** (Mt. 16:9). In **πάντα μου μέμνησθε** (1 Cor. 11:2) both cases occur. This is all in accord with classical usage. So also **ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ἡμῶν** (Heb. 6:10), but **τὰ μέν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος**. (Ph. 3:13); **γεύσεταί μου τοῦ δείπνου** (Lu. 14:24), but **ἐγεύσατο τὸ ὕδωρ** (Jo. 2:9); **γέμουσιν ὀστέων** (Mt. 23:27), but even **γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλασφημίας** (Rev. 17:3). But it is perfectly proper to appeal to the distinction in the cases in the apparent contradiction between **ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς** (Ac. 9:7) and **τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν** (22:9). The accusative (case of extent) accents the intellectual apprehension of the sound, while the genitive (specifying case) calls attention to the sound of the voice without accenting the sense. The word **ἀκούω** itself has two senses which fall in well with this case-distinction, one 'to hear,' the other 'to understand.' Cf. **οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν** (Ro. 10:14) and **μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν** (Ro. 10:18). And yet the genitive can be used where the sense is meant, though not stressed, as **ἤκουσα φωνῆς** (Ac. 22:7), but **ἤκουσεν φωνήν** (Ac. 9:4; and 26:14).[3] But see further under 3.

[1] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 308. [2] Giles, Man., p. 315.

[3] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., pp. 87 ff., has an extensive discussion of the gen. and acc. with **ἀκούω**, but seems to miss the point after all. They heard the sound but not the words. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 103, admits this classic distinction sometimes in the N. T.

3. *Verbs of Sensation*. One of the chief classes of verbs that may be used with the genitive is verbs of sensation. One seems compelled to make some division in the verbs used with the genitive for the sake of intelligible discussion. Yet as a matter of fact each class and each verb indeed relates itself to the root-idea of the genitive. That is the thing to keep in mind and not a mere artificial grouping of the verbs. Analogy was at work, of course, but the verbs after all were separate units and had independent development. These groupings of the grammarians are mere matters of convenience. And it is a delicate matter that varies somewhat with the writer, this use of the genitive. By sensation we refer to verbs that mean to hear, smell, taste, touch, though verbs of seeing have the accusative. The most common verb of hearing is **ἀκούω**, about which some remarks have already been made. It is not necessary to give an exhaustive list of the instances of **ἀκούω**. A typical one is **ἤκουσεν συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν**, (Lu. 15:25). The genitive is used either with things, as in this illustration, or with persons, as in **αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε** (Lu. 9:35). For accusative with persons see Eph. 4:21. Besides the use of the accusative with this verb, both with the classic distinction as above and without, there may also be the accusative and the ablative as in Ac. 1:4 **ἣν ἀκούσατέ μου**. Then again the verb itself is used in the sense of hear, to understand, and even to obey (hearken). The sense of hearken is often in John's Gospel with the genitive, as **οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα** (Jo. 10:8). Cf. Rev. 3:20, etc. The apparent double genitive in the last passage **τῆς φωνῆς μου** is not to be attributed to the verb, for **μου** is merely possessive. Cf. Ac. 22:1. Blass[1] makes careful distinction between the usages in the various N. T. writers, but that is not to be pushed too far. In 2 Cor. 6:2 (LXX, Is. 49: 8) we have **ἐπήκουσά σου**, but **ὑπακούω** uses the dative (Mt. 8:27). But we have **ἐπηκορῶντο αὐτῶν οἱ δέομιοι** (Ac. 16:25) in the sense of hearken. No verb of smelling is used with the genitive in the N. T., but **ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου** (Ac. 9:1) is certainly analogous. as Blass[2] observes, who refers to the LXX for parallels (Josh. 10:40, **πᾶν ἐμπνέον ζωῆς**), for both genitive and accusative. Cf. Johannessohn, *Der Gebr*., p. 36. Thus **οὐ μὴ γεύσηται θανάτου** (Jo. 8:52), but in Heb. 6:4 f. we have the genitive and accusative right together, a matter hardly accidental,[3] **γευσαμένους τῆς δωρεᾶς, γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα**. But Blass[4] considers the accusative here, as in Jo. 2:9, merely a colloquialism in harmony with the general

[1] Or. of N. T. Gk., p. 103.
[2] Ib.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 66.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 101.

tendency to retain the accusative (see 2 above). Other verbs of tasting are **κορεσθέντες τροφῆς** (Ac. 27:38) and **τούτους χορτάσαι ἄρτων** (Mk. 8:4). Cf. also **μετελάμβανον τροφῆς** (Ac. 2:46) and **προσελάβοντο τροφῆς** (Ac. 27:36). **Διψάω** and **πεινάω** use only the accusative (Matt. 5:6). The verbs of touching can be briefly disposed of. Thus **ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων** (Mk. 5:30) and often in the Gospels. So **κἂν θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους** (Heb. 12:20), but **ψηλαφάω** has only the accusative (Ac. 17:27). Perhaps the other verbs of taking hold of and seizing may as well be mentioned, for it is less than a step from the idea of touch. Thus **ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται** (Lu. 16:13); **τὰ ἐχόμενα τῆς σωτηρίας** (Heb. 6:9); **ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 1:54) and **οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι** (1 Tim. 6:2); **ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ** (Mt. 14:31), and **ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ** (Mk. 8:23), where the part taken hold of is indicated; **ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρός αὐτῆς** (Mt. 9:25), where the part is again in genitive, but the whole is in the accusative in **κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάνην** (Mt. 14:3); **πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς χειρός** (Ac. 3:7), where the whole is in the accusative and the part in the genitive. Blass[1] notes that this last (**πιάζω**) is a "vulgar" word. But here, as usual, the N. T. is in harmony with the vernacular. The papyri[2] show **ἔχομαι** with the genitive as well as **ἀντιλαμβάνομαι**. So **ἐχόμενός μου**, P. Par. 51 (B.C. 160). Besides Mk. 8:23 (above) the double genitive (whole and part) may be seen in Lu. 20:20, **ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου** (cf. also verse 26), though here **αὐτοῦ** is probably dependent on **λόγου**.

4. *Verbs of Emotion*. These naturally have the genitive, such as to desire, care for, neglect, have compassion, spare, bear with, aim after, obtain, remember, forget, enjoy, etc. **Ἐπιθυμέω** has the genitive in Ac. 20:33, **ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσίου ἢ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενός** but the accusative probably in Mt. 5:28 (text uncertain, but LXX has accusative, Ex. 20:17). **Ὀρέγομαι** also has the genitive, as in Heb. 11:16, **κρείττονος ὀρέγονται**. Cf. 1 Tim. 3:1, where both **ὀρέγεται** and **ἐπιθυμεῖ** are used with the genitive. Cf. also **ὀμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν** (1 Th. 2:8). The verbs of concern are fairly numerous ands uniform. Thus **ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων** (Col. 3:13) in the N. T. as in the older Greek. So **μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος** (1 Tim. 4:14), **μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου** (Heb. 12:5). But these three verbs may have the ablative. **Ἀνέχομαι** here is 'hold oneself back from.' Like the earlier Greek also is **ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 10:34) and **μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ** (1 Cor. 9:9). Blass[3] considers **οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἔμελεν** (Ac. 18:17) the personal construction,

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 101. 0-6
[2] Moulton, Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 437.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 104.

as often in the classical Greek. But already in the Attic inscriptions (Meisterhans, p. 211) we have **ἐπιμελέομαι** with the dative. So, too, **περί** appears with the genitive in Jo. 10:13, etc. Consider further **τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα οἰκείων οὐ προνοεῖ** (1 Tim. 5:8) and **ἵνα φροντίζωσιν καλῶν ἔργων** (Tit. 3:8). In Mt. 6:34 we have **μεριμνήσει αὑτῆς,** though some MSS. read **τὰ ἑαυτῆς**. Once again take **τοῦ ἰδίου οὐκ ἐφείσατο** (Ro. 8:32). These all are in regular order. In Mt. 18:27 **τοῦ δούλου** is more likely dependent on **ὁ κύριος** rather than on **σπλαγχνισθείς**. Verbs of obtaining are illustrated by **ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι** (Lu. 1:9), not mere "appearance,"[1] though the accusative is elsewhere found in the N. T. as in Ac. 1:17 (cf. classic frequency of the accusative). On the other hand **τυγχάνω** always has the genitive in the N. T., as **τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν** (Lu. 20:35). But with **ἐπιτυγχάνω** we have **ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν** (Heb. 11:33) and **τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν** (Ro. 11:7). Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, p. 437, Dec., 1901) notes genitive and accusative with **ἐπιτυχόντες—τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας καὶ ἐπιγαμίαν**, B.U. 113 (ii/A.D.). In general the papyri confirm the N. T. use of these verbs. Verbs of remembering and forgetting call for little remark. Thus **μνησθῆναι διαθήκης** (Lu. 1:72), **μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου** (Jo. 15:20). **Μιμνήσκομαι** always has the genitive and **μνημονεύω** usually. But **ἀναμιμνήσκω** (act., mid. and pass.) always has the accusative in the N. T. Cf. **ἀνεμνήσθη τὸ ῥῆμα** (Mk. 14:72), whereas ancient Greek usually had the genitive. With **ὑπομιμνήσκω** the usage is divided again, as the accusative is alone used in the active (Jo. 14:26), but the genitive in the passive deponent), as **ὑπεμνήσθη τοῦ ῥήματος** (Lu. 22:61; cf. Mk. 14:72 above). **Ἐπιλανθάνομαι** again has usually the genitive, as **φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε** (Heb. 13:2), but the accusative once (Ph. 3:13) and **א** in Heb. 13:2 according to classic idiom. Cf. Oxy. P. IV, 744, 11 and 12 (i/A.9.). We once also have **ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως** Heb. 12:5). Of verbs of enjoying we have only **ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην** (Phil. 20). **Ἀπολαύω** does not occur in the N. T., and neither **ἀγαλλιάω**, nor **χαίρω** is used with the genitive, but only absolutely, with the instrumental, or with prepositions. **Αἰσθάνομαι** appears only once (Lu. 9:45) and with accusative.

5. *Verbs of Sharing, Partaking and Filling.* Indeed, verbs of sharing can be looked at as taking the partitive genitive. Thus with **μετέχειν** we have **τραπέζης**. (1 Cor. 10:21), **ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου** (verse 17; clear1y ablative) and **χάριτι** (verse 30, associative instrumental by analogy of **συνκοινωνέω**. Cf. **κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός** (Heb. 2:14), though elsewhere in the N. T. the associative

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 102.

instrumental occurs with persons. **Μεταδίδωμι** has only the accusative and instrumental. As to **μεταλαμβάνω** and **προσλαμβάνω** it is more doubtful if it is not ablative rather than genitive. Cf. ix, (f), 7, for discussion. The partitive idea is divided between the genitive and the ablative.[1] In the N. T. prepositions are chiefly used and with the ablative. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 102) finds in the partitive idea the explanation of the local and temporal use of the genitive, but not rightly. The true genitive is found with verbs of filling like **ἐπλήσθη ἡ πόλις τῆς συγχύσεως** (Ac. 19: 29), **πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἰερουσαλὴν τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν** (Ac. 5 : 28), **γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος** (Jo. 2:7), **περισσεύονται ἄρτων** (Lu. 15:17), **ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν** (Lu. 1:53). In Latin words of filling (*plenus*, etc.) use the ablative or instrumental, as the Greek has the ablative with words of lacking (**ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης** (Ro. 3:23). By analogy therefore we find **ἐκ** and the ablative with **πληρόω**, as **ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς** (Jo. 12:3) and **γεμίζω**, as **ἐγέμισεν αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ πυρός** (Rev. 8:5). For the instrumental with the passive see Ro. 1:29, etc. Indeed the accusative is seen in Ph. 1:11 and Rev. 17:3 and some MSS. in Ac. 2:28.

6. *Verbs of Ruling*. These probably have the true genitive, though verbs of excelling use the ablative. Thus in Mk. 10:42 we have three such verbs in one sentence, **οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν.** Other examples are **ἀνθυπατεύοντος** according to some MSS. in Ac. 18:12, **αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός** (1 Tim. 2:12), **βασιλεύει τῆς Ἰουδαίας** (Mt. 2:22 **א**B; elsewhere **ἐπί**), **ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας** (Lu. 2:2), **κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως** (2 Cor. 1:24), **καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν** (Jas. 2:6), **τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας** (Lu. 3:1). These verbs all have a distinct substantive-affinity like 'be ruler of,' etc. See further Lu. 22:25 for **κυριεύω**) and **ἐξουσιάζω**, Mt. 16:18 for **κατισχύω**.

7. *Verbs of Buying, Selling, Being Worthy of*. It is not perfectly clear what the origin of this usage is. The use of **ἐκ δηναρίου** with **συμφωνήσας** (Mt. 20:2) may be noted, but in verse 13 **δηναρίου συνεφώνησας**. Cf. also **ἠγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν** (Mt. 27:7 with **πραθῆναι πολλοῦ** (Mt. 26:9). **Ἀγοράζω** is used also with **ἐν** (Rev. 5:9). So again one may note **ἐκτήσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας** (Ac. 1:18. Cf. Lu. 16:9, **ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ**) with **μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν**(Ju. 11). Cf. **διά** with **περιποιέομαι** (Ac. 20:28). These, examples show that it was easy to go from the genitive to and the ablative. Consider also **ὠνήσατο τιμῆς ἀργυρίου** (Ac. 7: 16), **ἀσσαρίου πωλεῖται** (Mt. 10:29), **τοσούτου ἀπέδοσθε** (Ac. 5:8), **ἠγο-**

[1] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 340.

ράσθητε τιμῆς (1 Cor. 6:20). In Mk. 14:5, πραθῆναι ἐπάνω δηναρίων τριακοσίων, the a verb ἐπάνω has no effect on the case as is shown by ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς (1 Cor. 15:6). Blass[1] compares the use of ἐκ in the Attic inscriptions with πραθῆναι. And Monro (*Homeric Grammar*, p. 109) considers this the ablative, which is certainly possible. But on the other hand the undoubted genitive with ἀξιόω suggests the idea of exchange or barter as the true origin and thus a real genitive. **Ἀ**λλάσσω is not so used itself, but buying and selling easily fall in with the notion of worth. Thus ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως (2 Th. 1:11), καταξιωθῆναι τῆς βασιλείας (2 Th. 1:5). Cf. also 1 Tim. 5:17; Heb. 3:3; 10:29. On the whole one is inclined to this explanation of the usage and to treat it as a true genitive. Cf. Rev. 6 : 6 for the genitive of price without a verb. But the use of ἀπό with verbs of buying and selling goes back in single instances to the Attic time (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 91). So στέφανον διδόντες ἀπὸ πεντήκοντα χρυσῶν, Inscr. of Magn., 16, 29.

8. *Verbs of Accusing and Condemning*. Blass[2] observes that the old Greek usage of the genitive of the thing has well-nigh vanished in the N. T. We do have ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως (Ac. 19:40), but περί, with the genitive is the usual construction in the N. T. both with ἐγκαλέω (Ac. 23:29), κρίνω (Ac. 23:6), and even κατηγορέω (Ac. 24:13). However, in the case of κατηγόρεω we do find ὧν in Lu. 23:14 and Ac. 25:11, but in each instance the genitive seems to be due to attraction to the case of the suppressed antecedent **τούτων.** Ac. 24:13 for περί. Still the point is not absolutely certain and ὧν, could be due to κατηγορέω. At any rate κατηγορέω is also used with the genitive of the person as in ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ (Mt. 12:10). Cf. also Mk. 15:3 where we have genitive and accusative, κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ πολλά. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 235) notes that D often has accusative with κατηγορέω as with ἀκούω, κρατέω.

9. *Genitive Due to Prepositions in Composition.* Some verbs have the genitive because of the preposition in composition which gives a distinct change in idea to the verb. The preposition is often repeated with the noun. As a matter of fact the only[3] preposition that seems to figure thus in the N. T. is κατά which is used with a number of verbs with the genitive.[4] Not all the κατά com-

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 105. He cites Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 173.

[2] Ib., p. 104. [3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 106.

[4] Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 341) comments on the blending of meaning between prep. and verb in the later Gk.

pounds use the genitive. Cf. the accusative case and note as illustrations of the accusative in the N. T. **καταγωνίζομαι, καταβραβεύω, καταδικάζω, κατακρίνω, κατασοφίζομαι**. It may be that some of the verbs already instanced as using the genitive may owe it to **κατά** in composition, like **κατηγορέω** (Mt. 12:10). But the point seems to be reasonably plain as to **κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ** (Mt. 9 : 24), **ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία** (1 Jo. 3 : 20, and note verse 21), though **ἡμῶν** might go with **καρδία**), **κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως** (Jas. 2:13), **καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων** (Jas. 4:11), **σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν** (Mt. 27:13), **κατενάρκησα ἡμῶν** (2 Cor. 12:13), **καταστηνιάσωσιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ** (1 Tim. 5:11), **αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας** (Heb. 12:2), **κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς** (Mk. 14:3); but in Mt. 26:7 the text of W. H. has **ἐπί** with genitive as some MSS. in Mk.

10. *Attraction of the Relative*. A word only is needed about the attraction of the relative, a matter treated properly in the chapter on Pronouns, which see. Here it may only be noted that the genitive (as of other oblique cases) of the relative sometimes appears with a verb when the case is due, not to the verb, but to the antecedent. Thus we note **περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίσεν** (Lu. 3:19), an idiom common in Luke, but rare elsewhere, as **ἀστέρων οὓς εἶδες** (Rev. 1:20).

(j) THE GENITIVE OF THE INFINITIVE. This is more properly an instance of the genitive of substantives as it is the substantival aspect of the infinitive that is in the case. The full discussion of the matter belongs to the chapter on Verbal Nouns. Here it may simply be remarked that the infinitive with **τοῦ** is not unknown to ancient Greek, though nothing like so common as in the LXX as the translation of the Hebrew infinitive construct. But the Hebrew infinitive is not an exact analogy as it does not have the article.[1] But Thucydides had already shown a fondness for this idiom which is thoroughly Greek. As an example from the LXX take **τοῦ ἐξελέσθαι** (Dan. 6:14). For the N. T. note **ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν** (Mt. 13:3). The substantival nature of this infinitive with **τοῦ** is well shown in **καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι** (1 Pet. 4:17). But in general **τοῦ** with the infinitive has as wide an extension of meaning in the vernacular **κοινή** as the genitive absolute.[2] The details come later.

(k) THE GENITIVE ABSOLUTE. It may indeed be ablative absolute as Farrar[3] holds, following the analogy of the Latin. But, as Giles[4] observes, the Latin absolute is very likely instru-

[1] C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 59.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 216.
[3] Gk. Synt., p. 76.
[4] Man., etc., p. 339 f.

mental or locative. The various languages differ greatly, however, in the use of the absolute cases, nearly all having a turn in one language or another. Cf. dative in Anglo-Saxon. Since the Sanskrit uses genitive as well as instrumental and locative (usual construction), Giles considers the Greek genitive absolute a true genitive. In this he is perhaps correct. But Brugmann (*Griech. Gr.*, p. 523) discusses the genitive absolute separately from both genitive and ablative. Cf. Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p.437. Mullach[1] observes that the genitive absolute is a mark of the higher style and was not much used in the vernacular. Jebb[2] remarks that in the modern Greek the genitive absolute is more commonly paraphrased in harmony with the general disuse of the participle. However, in th vernacular **κοινή** "the rapid extension of the *genitive absolute* is very obvious feature,"[3] and the N. T. is in line with the papyri on this point also as in most other matters of grammar. Moulton observes further that "in the papyri it may often be seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines," which is rather more than can be said of the N. T. It naturally occurs in the N. T. chiefly in the historical books. Abbott[4] has felt that Mark uses the genitive absolute "somewhat monotonously to introduce the circumstances of a new narrative," and he finds it common in Matthew in temporal clauses. John, he observes, has the construction nowhere in recording Christ's words, though he elsewhere[5] "employs it with more elasticity of meaning than is found in the Triple Tradition." The LXX show many examples of the genitive absolute and with abundant freedom also.[6] The normal usage in the older Greek is to have a genitive absolute when a participle occurs with a noun that is disconnected from the rest of the sentence as in **ἀναχωρησάντων αὐτῶν** (Mt. 2:13). Cf. 2 Cor. 2:12. But the older Greek did not always conform to this norm, and variations appear also in the N. T. Thus sometimes the participle is found alone as in **ἐλθόντων** (Mt. 17:14) and **εἰπόντος** (17:26), a very frequent idiom in the papyri.[7] Cf. **ἀναγνωσθέντων** B.U. 925 (iii/A.D.?), **δηλωθέντος** B.U. 970 (ii/A.D.). The papyri also show **ἐξόντος** instead of the old **ἐξόν.**[8] Cf. **οὐκ ἐξόντος** P.O. 275 (A.D. 66). Then again the genitive absolute occurs when as a matter of fact the noun or pronoun is not absolute and the participle might have merely

[1] Gr., p. 357.
[2] V. and D., Handb., p. 334.
[3] Moulton, Prol. p. 74.
[4] Joh. Gr., p. 83.
[5] Ib., p. 84.
[6] C. and S., p. 58; Thack., p. 24.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 74
[8] Ib.

agreed in case with the word in question. The simplest example is the repetition of the pronoun in the same case as **εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ** (Mk. 9:28). But more noticeable is an example like **μὴ ἔχοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτόν** (Mt. 18:25), or **ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος—ἐφάνη αὐτῷ** (Mt. 1:20), a usage more common apparently in the N. T. than in the papyri. But note **μου κινδυνεύσαντος εἰς θάλασσαν ἔσωσε**, B.U. 423 (ii/A.D.), where **με** is implied with **ἔσωσε**. One even notes the genitive absolute when the nominative is present as in **μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας—εὑρέθη** (Mt. 1:18). Moulton[1] notes "a violent use" of the genitive absolute in Heb. 8: 9 from the LXX, where we have **ἐν ἡμερᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου**. Here the participle is treated almost like the infinitive (as a substantive). Moulton regards it as due to the original Hebrew, and Westcott (*in loco*) cites **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου σου αὐτῷ** (Baruch 2:28). See further under Participles.

IX. The Ablative ("Ablatival Genitive") Case (ἡ ἀφαιρετικὴ πτῶσις). The treatment of this case will be briefer, for it never had the, manifold development of the Greek genitive. In the original speech the genitive and ablative had no distinctive endings save in the *o* stems in the singular.[2] See chapter VII, (a), for discussion of form.

(a) THE NAME. But the name *ablativus* is credited to Julius Caesar.[3] Besides **ἀφαιρετική** it is also called **πατρική**. The name is quite appropriate.

(b) THE MEANING. The ablative is then the 'whence' case, the ease of origin, source, separation or departure. Some of the grammars use the expression " ablatival genitive." That implies that the case is after all a kind of genitive. That is only true as to form, not as to sense, and causes some confusion. In Greek the ablative is not a live case in form, but in sense it is.

(C) RARE WITH SUBSTANTIVES. It is possible (though not probably correct) to regard **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ** (Ro. 1:17) as ablative, **θεοῦ** being the source of the righteousness. More likely are the following examples: **τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς** (Heb. 13:7), **διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος** (Ro. 10:12), **διάκρισις καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ** (Heb. 5:14). See Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 146. In 2 Pet. 1: 20 we have a clear case of the ablative in the predicate after the copula **γίνεται**. Here **ἐπιλύσεως** ('disclosure') is in the ablative. Cf. also **τοῦ θεοῦ** in 2 Cor. 4:7. One may note also **ἐγένετο γνώμης** (Ac. 20:

[1] Prol., p. 74.
[2] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 193.
[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 71.

3) as probably parallel. In Heb. 12:11 χαρᾶς and λύπης may be considered either true genitives or ablatives. Doubtful also are ὑποστολῆς and πίστεως in Heb. 10:39. But we have a clear ablative in Ac. 20:37 ἱκαὸς δὲ κλαυθμὸς ἐγένετο πάντων. Moulton[1] notes the obvious fact that ἀπό and ἐκ (with abl.) are freely used for the old "partitive enitive." Delbruck[2] thinks the genitive of material originally abl. Cf. viii, (f), 8, for the true genitives in the partitive sense. This partitive gen. may be illustrated by ἓν τούτων (Mt. 6:29) which is to be compared with ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν (Mt. 10:29). In Jo. 3:25 the use of ἐκ makes clear the ablative, ἐγένετο ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν. Blass[3] rather needlessly explains this usage by appeal to the Hebrew מִן. Note also πᾶς ἐξ ἡμῶν (Lu. 14:33). The matter mar be further illustrated by τίς αὐτῶν (Lu. 7:42) and τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (Mtl 6:27). Indeed with τίς, as Blass[4] observes, the N. T. nearly always uses ἐξ in such examples. He finds the opposite true of τὶς save in John. Thus τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων (Mt. 12: 38), but τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν (Lu. 11:15. Cf. Jo. 6:64). But ἀπό is also found with τίς Mt. 27:21). One may note also τὶς ἐν ὑμῖν (Jas. 5:13). A classical but curious use of this idiom, like the partitive genitive (already noted), is as the subject or object. The explanation lies, of course, in the ellipsis. Thus συνῆλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν, (Ac. 21:16) may be compared with εἶπαν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν (Jo. 16:17), ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου συνεβίβασαν (Ac. 19:33). Cf. Rev. 11: 9. Take Mt. 23:34 as an example of the use as object, ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε, ἐξ αυτὼν μαστιγώσετε. Cf. especially ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου περιπατοῦντας (2 Jo. 4). In Ac. 15:2 we have the full expression τινας ἄλλους ἐξ αυτὼν. Brugmann (*Griech. Gr.*, p. 397) notes the syncretism between the ablative and the genitive with the superlative. See a like confusion in the predicate (Monro, *Hom. Gr.*, p. 148). W. Havers (*Indog. Forsch.*, XXXI, Bd. 1, Heft 3, 1912) "on the splitting of the genitive in Greek" suggests that the partitive genitive was originally independent and adverbial.

(d) THE ABLATIVE WITH ADJECTIVES. The number is not large (cf. the Genitive with Adjectives). In Plato we have, for instance, ἐπιστήμης κενός, ἐλεύθερος αἰδοῦς, but see Kuhner-Gerth[5] for a full list in the ancient writers. Thus in the N. T. we find with proposition καθαρὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος (Ac. 20:26), a clear ablative. Cf. also ἐλευθέρα ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου (Ro. 7:3) and ἐλεύθερος ἐκ πάντων (1

[1] Prol., p. 72. C. also Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 109.
[2] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 340. [3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 97. [4] Ib.
[5] I, p. 401. The adjs. with α– privative are regarded as usually with abl.

Cor. 9:19). But the ablative occurs without prepositions. So ξένοι τῶν διαθήκων, (Eph. 2:12). It is probably best to regard the verbal adjectives as having the ablative in these examples: ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ (Ro. 1:7), γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν (Mt. 11:11), διδακτοὶ θεοῦ (Jo. 16:45), διδακτοῖς πνεύματος (1 Cor. 2:13), κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ro. 1:6). One may also suggest here εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός (Mt. 25:34), but on the whole it is to be regarded as a true genitive. The ablative with adjectives with α– privative have "plentiful Illustrations from papyri."[1] For instance; ἀκίνδυνος παντὸς κινδύνου Tb. P. 105 (iii/B.C.), τῆς εἰς ἅπαντας εὐεργεσίας—ἀβοήθητος B.U. 970 (ii/A.D.). In Mt. 27:24 we find ἀθῷός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος with ἀπό. Cf. also ἄσπιλον ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου (Jas. 1:27). Thus we easily See the ablative in ἀκαταπάστους ἁμαρτίας (2 Pet. 2:14), ἀνάξιος κριτηρίων (1 Cor. 6:2), ἄνομας θεοῦ (1 Cor. 9:21), ἄπειρος λόγου (Heb. 5:13), ἀπείραστος κακῶν (Jas. 1: 13).

Moreover, the ablative after the comparative is very common the N. T., apparently more so than in the papyri. Let a few examples suffice: ἰσχυρότερός μου (Mt. 3:11), μικρότερον ὂν πάτων τῶν σπερμάτων (Mk. 4 : 31), πλείονας τῶν πρώτων (Mt. 21:36), πλεῖον τῆς τροφῆς (Lu. 12:23), πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ (Mt. 12:45), μείζων τοῦ κυρίου (Jo. 13:16). Cf. Jo. 21:15; 1 Cor. 10:22; 1 Tim. 5:8. Here the ablative idea of difference or distinction isll very plain. The Latin also uses the ablative in this sense. Cf. χήρα μὴ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν ἑξήκοντα (1 Tim. 5:9). In Jo. 5:36, μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάνου, it is not clear whether it is the witness borne by John or to him. In Ac. 4:19 θεοῦ after ἢ is genitive, not ablative, due to ἀκούειν. The superlative may likewise have tie ablative as in πρῶτός μου (Jo. 1:15), a usage found in the papyri.[2] Abbott[3] rather needlessly endeavours to explain πρῶτος as a substantive meaning 'chief,' like τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς νήσου (Ac. 28: 7). Note also ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων (Mk. 12:28) where πάντων is neuter plural (a possible partitive genitive). Cf. ἔσχατον πάντων (1 Cor. 15:8). The positive περισσός may even have the ablative, as τὸ περισσὸν τούτων, (Mt. 5:37). Cf. πλεῖον with the verb περισσεύω and the ablative πλεῖον τῶν –Φαρισαίων (Mt. 5: 20). In Eph. 3:8, ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἁγίων the comparative and the superlative are combined.

(e) THE ABLATIVE WITH PREPOSITIONS. It 1S very common in 'the N. T. Thus ἄνευ λόγυ (1 Pet. 3:1), ἀπέναντι πάντων (Ac.

[1] Moulton, Prol., pp. 74, 235; Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 152 f.
[2] Ib., 1901, p. 437, σοῦ πρῶτός εἰμι, L.P. ω (ii/iii A.D.).
[3] Joh. Gr., p. 90.

3:16), ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας (Mt. 9:22), ἄτερ ὄχλου (Lu. 22:6), ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος (Mk. 11:10), ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ (Mt. 23:26; cf. ἐντός in same verse), ἔμπροσθεν πάντων (Mt. 26:70), ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος (Ac. 7:43), ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας (Mt. 10:14); ἔξωθεν τῆς πόλεως (Rev. 14:20), ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Lu. 23:26), ὀπίσω μου (Mt. 4:19), possibly ὀψὲ σαββάτων (Mt. 28: 1), παρ' αὐτῶν (Mt. 2:4), παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Mt. 5:32), πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Mt. 19:1), πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου (Ac. 27:22), πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 11:55), πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας (Ac. 27:34), ὑπὲρ πάντων, (2 Cor. 5:15, true genitive according to some), ὑπεράνω αὐτῆς (Heb. 9:5), ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν (2 Cor. 10:16) ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν (Eph. 3:20), ὑπὸ κυρίου (Mt. 1:22), ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν (Mk. 6:11), χωρὶς παραβολῆς (Mt. 13:34). In the case of ὀψὲ σαββάτων (Mt. 28:1) ὀψέ means 'late from' (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 72). Cf. ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας, Par. P. 35, 37 (ii/B.C.), ὀψίτερον τῆς ὥρας Tb. P. 230 (ii/B.C.) and ὀψὲ τούτων in Philostratus (Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk*., p. 312). Cf. Blass-Debrunner, p. 101, for still other examples in late Greek. See also μετ' ὀλίγον τούτων in Xen., *Hellen*., I, 1, 2. The list of such adverbs was growing constantly. This is a considerable list, but the ablative idea is patent in all with the notion of separation. An interesting example of the ablative is τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν (Ac. 23:21). In **ὑπέρ, πρό, πρός** it is the comparative idea that is involved and that implies separation. Hence it seems likely that **ὑπό** is to be construed also with the ablative rather than the genitive, though this point is debatable. "In both Greek and Latin the ablative expresses the agent as the source of Ithe action, almost invariably with prepositions" (Buckland Green, *Notes on Greek and Latin Syntax,* p. 32). There is some truth here. For the ablative with prepositions in Cypriotic see Meister, Bd. II, p. 295. See chapter on Prepositions. A number of adverbs are themselves in the ablative case, like **καλῶς, οὕτως** (all adverbs in --ως), ἄνω, etc.

(f) THE ABLATIVE WITH VERBS. The ablative is not used so frequently with verbs as the accusative, genitive or dative, and yet it is by no means uncommon. Of course, wherever **ἀπό** (cf. Ac. 5:2), **ἐκ** (cf1. Mk. 1:10) and παρά (Mt. 2:4) are used with the ablative after a verb, these examples[1] are not considered, but they throw light on the use of the same case without the preposition. **Ἀπό** and **ἐκ** have only the ablative. The ablative is so common with compound verbs like **ἀφίστημι, ἀποστερέω**, etc., that no effort is made to separate the simple from the compound verbs. There

[1] Indeed, as Winer (W.-Th., p. 197) remarks, the prep. is most frequently employed.

are examples where the ablative seems to be due purely to the preposition, as τσκ χὰριτος ἐξεπέσατε (Gal. 5:4); cf. same word in 2 Pet. 3:17). But in many other instances the ablative idea in the verb is clue to the effect of the preposition.

1. *Verbs of Departure and Removal.* This is the simplest ablative with verbs. Take, for instance, **οὐκ ἀφίστατο τοῦ ἱεροῦ** (Lu. 2:37) where the ablative idea is perfectly plain. So also **ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως** (1 Tim. 4:1). The predicate ablative of source in 2 Pet. 1:20 (**ἐπιλύσεως**) was noticed under the discussion of substantives. As a rule **ἀπό, ἐκ** or παρά will be found with the mere idea of departure. So **χωρίζω ἀπό** (1 Cor. 7:10). In Lu. 7:6 **ἀπέχω** has **ἀπό**, but **ℵ**D have merely the ablative.

Naturally verbs meaning to free from, to separate, to deprive of, to hinder from, etc., use the ablative. **Ἐλευθερόω** always has **ἀπό** (Ro. 6:18), as **καθαρίζω ἀπό** (1 Jo. 1:7), **κύω ἀπό** (Lu. 13:16), **λούω ἀπό** (Ac. 16:33), **λυτρόω ἀπό** (Tit. 2:14), **ῥύομαι ἀπό** (Mt. 6:13), **σώζω ἀπό** (Ro. 5:9) and **ἐκ** (Ro. 7:24). Cf. also **μεθίστημι ἐκ** in Lu. 6:4. But we have the ablative alone in **ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς** (Eph. 4:18), **ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας** (1 Tim. 6:5), **ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σου** (Lu. 13:12), **καθιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς** (Ac. 19:27),[1] **ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι** (Lu. 24:16), **ἐκώλυσεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ βουλήματος** (Ac. 27:43). Cf. Lu. 10:42, **αὐτῆς**. This use of the mere ablative was not unknown to good prose in the ancient Greek. Moulton[2] finds it also in the papyri. Thus **τούτων ἄφελε** L.Pb. (ii/B.C.), **ἀφελέσθαι ὧν ἔδωκαν** O.P. 237 (ii /A.D.). One may note here again **ἐκπίπτω** with the ablative in Gal. 5:4 and 2 Pet. 3:17. Cf. **κωλύω ἀπό** (Lu. 6:29).

2. *Verbs of Ceasing, Abstaining.* So one may interpret **οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας** (2 Pet. 3:9), the marginal reading in W. H. (1 Pet. 4:1) **πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας**, and **ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων** (Ac. 15: 28 cf. also 15:20; 1 Tim. 4:3; 1 Pet. 2:11), though **ἀπό** also is used with **ἀπέχομαι** (1 Th. 4:3; 5:22). One can only repeat that these divisions are purely arbitrary and merely for convenience. For **ἐκ** with **ἀναπαύομαι, ἀπό** with **καταπαύω** see Rev. 14:13; Heb. 4:4, 10.

3. *Verbs of Missing, Lacking, Despairing.* Thus we note **ὧν τινες ἀστοχήσαντες** (1 Tim. 1:6), **λείπεται σοφίας** (Jas. 1:5), **ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης** (Ro. 3:23), **ὅσων χῄζει** (Lu. 11:8), **προσδεόμενός τινος** (Ac. 17:25), **ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν** (2 Cor. 1:8). Cf. **τῶν ἀναγκαίων ὑστερεῖν** L.Pb. (ii/B.C.), **τῶν δεόντων ἐγλιπεῖν** (ib.). Moulton *Cl. Rev*., p. 437, Dec., 1901.

[1] An "impossible". reading to Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 106.
[2] Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 437.

4. *Verbs of Differing, Excelling*. Here the comparative idea is dominant. We (observe **πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε ὑμεῖς** (Mt. 10:31), **τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην** (Eph. 3:19), **ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν** (Ph. 2:3), **ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων** (2 Cor. 11:5; cf. use of **ὑστερέω** in sense of lack above. Here the comparative idea of **ὕστερος** is uppermost.

5. *Verbs of Asking and Hearing.* These may also use the ablative. This is the usual construction with **δέομαι**, especially in Luke, as **δέομαί σου** (Lu. 8:28). The person is in the ablative, but the thing will be in the accusative, as **δέομαι δὲ τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι** (2 Cor. 10:2). So also note **ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου** (Ac. 1:4), but both **ἀπό** (Lu. 22:71) and **παρά** (Jo. 1:40), and **ἐκ** (2 Cor. 12:6) occur.

6. *Verbs with the Partitive Idea*. Here a sharp difference exists between the accusative which presents the whole and the genitive or the ablative which accents a part. Thus in Rev. 2:17 we have **δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα** where the point lies in the idea of "some" of the manna, but B reads **τὸ** and **א ἐκ τοῦ**. In the same verse note the accusative **δώσω αὐτῷ ψῆφον λευκήν**. When the whole is expressed in the N. T. the accusative is used. Thus **φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα** (Rev. 2:14), but **ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων** (Mt. 15:27) and **ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω** (1 Co 11:28). Thus also **πίνων οἶνον** (Lu. 7:33), but **πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ** (Mt. 26:27), **ὃς ἂν πίῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος** (Jo. 4:14). Cf. also **ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων** (Jo. 21:10). Phrynichus says: **ἔπιον οἴνου ᾽Αττικοί, οἶνον ῞Ελληνες—ἔφαγον κρέως ᾽Αττικοί, κρέας ῞Ελληνες.** Cf. **ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ δώσουσιν** (Lu. 20:10), **ἵνα λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν** (Mk. 12:2). Cf. also 1 Jo. 4:13. Cf. Mt. 28:1; Ac. 21:16. See Moulton, *Introduction to the Study of N. T. Gk.*, p. 72, where the "partitive gen." is shown to be often ablative in idea. In modern Greek **ἀπό** is the regular construction for the partitive sense, as **δῶσε μου ἀπὸ τοῦτο**, 'give me some of that' (Moulton, Prol., p. 245). Prepositions **ἀπό** and **ἐκ** are thus uniformly used in the N. T. with (this construction of the part (clearly ablative therefore) save in Rev. 2:17 above and in **προσελάβοντο τροφῆς** (Ac. 27:36). In this last example the MSS. vary a good deal. **Μεταλαμβάνω** (see (i), 3) may be abl. or gen. in **μεταλαμβανον τροφῆς** (Ac. 2:46). Blass[1] notes that only Luke, Paul and the author of Hebrews, the more literary writers in the N. T., use the ablative (gen.) with **μεταλαμβάνω** and **προσλαμβάνω**. Examples like Ro. 9:16; Heb. 12:11 may be regarded as either ablative or genitive.

7. *Attraction cif the Relative*. Thus **ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγώ δώσω**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 100.

αυτῷ (Jo. 4:14), **οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν** (Ac. 26:22). Cf. Pronouns.

X. **The Locative (" Locatival Dative ") Case** (ἡ τοπικὴ πτῶσις).

(a) THE NAME LOCATIVE. It is derived from the Latin locus[1] land is a "grammatical neologism," but is modelled after vocative. Still Delbruck[2] prefers "local" to locative and uses it. It is indeed a local case. It is worth noticing that in the Thessalian dialect the old genitive had this locative ending[3] as did the Arkadian[4] also, though this **-οι** may have come from **-οιο**. The Latin grammarians took this **ι** for the dative.[5] We have remnants of the ending in English *here, there, where*. The modern grammars generally recognise the distinction in the three cases (locative, instrumental and dative), which have usually identical endings, though Blass[6] is correct in saying that it is not always possible to decide the case. However that uncertainty exists but seldom. Jannaris[7] makes four cases, counting the associative as a separate case. Compare the blending in the Latin.

(b) THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LOCATIVE. It is indeed the silmplest of cases in its etymological idea. It is the *in* case as Whitney[8] finds it in the Sanskrit. It is location, a point within limits, the limits determined by the context, not by the case itself. The word itself is the main determining factor in the resultant sense, and each example has its own atmosphere. There is indeed variation in the resultant idea. Hence, besides *in,* we come to the ideas of *on, at, amid, among, by, with*. This development was not only in the early Greek[9] but in the still earlier Sanskrit. The use of the locative without **ἐν** is much more common in Homer than in the later Greek. In the modern Greek vernacular indeed the locative disappears along with the instrumental and dative before **εἰς** and the accusative. As to **ἐν** it adds so little to the locative case that it is not surprising to find it so frequently used, especially as 'the locative, instrumental and dative all used the same endings. Thus we may compare **τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον** (Jo. 21:8) with **ἐν πλοίῳ** (Mt. 14:13), **ὕδατι βαπτίζω** (Lu. 3:16) with **βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι** (Mt. 3:11), **τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ** (Jo. 6:40) with **ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ** (Jo. 6:44). The tendency in the older Greek was constantly towards the use of **ἐν,** though the mere locative survived, es-

[1] Cf. Riem. et Goelzer, Synt., p. 196.
[2] Vergl. Synt., I, p.182 f., following Gaedicke.
[3] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., p. 307.
[4] Hoffmann, Gr. Dial., Bd. I, p. 303.
[5] Riem. et Goelzer, Synt., p. 197.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 109.
[7] Hist. of Gk. Gr., p. 342.
[8] Sans. Gr., p. 101.
[9] Giles, Man., etc., p. 329 f.

pecially in some constructions. In Mt. 13:52 MSS. vary between the mere locative **τῇ βασιλείᾳ**, and **ἐν** with locative and **εἰς** with accusative.

(c) PLACE. his was probably the original locative. Place of rest was put in the locative without a preposition. As already indicated, this usage abounds in Homer.[1] Some of these distinctively locative forms persisted in the Greek as in the Latin. Thus **οἴκοι, Ἰσθμοι, Μαραθῶνι, Ἀθήνῃσι, θύρασι,** *humi, Corinthi, Romae* (*ai*). Brugmann (*Griech. Gr.*, p. 226) thinks that **χαμαί** is dative. Indeed the locative forms and the dative forms used as locative, after the blending of the three case-forms into one, still occur in Pindar side by side.[2] The orators up to the time of Demosthenes use the mere locative frequently.[3] The AEolic[4] has **μέσοι= ἐν μέσῳ** (cf. **οἴκοι** and **οἴκῳ**). But the rule in Attic literary prose is to use a preposition with the locative of place. Thus **ἐν Ἀθήναις** (1 Th. 3:1), **ἐν οἴκῳ** (1 Cor. 11:34)= 'at home' and usually **ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ** (Jo. 11:20). But observe **λῃσταῖς περίεπεσεν** (Lu. 10:30), where the resultant idea is "among" and **περί** is used with the verb in composition, but none the less it is the locative. Blass[5] indeed remarks that the "local dative" does not occur in the N. T. He means the pure locative of place without a preposition, not considering the adverb **κύκλῳ** (Mk. 3:34), and possibly **χαμαί** (Jo. 18:6). We have indeed **ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα** (Jas. 2:25), possibly instrumental. Cf. the figurative usage in 2 Pet. 2:15, etc. It is indeed a very short step to the figurative usage, **πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν** (Ac. 14:16), **μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν** (Ac. 21:21), **στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἴχνεσιν** (Ro. 4:12). I think that we have the pure locative also in **τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον** (Jo. 21:8); **ὕδατι βαπτίζω** (Lu. 3:16), **καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος** (Eph. 5:26), **τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παρεδρεύοντες** (1 Cor. 9:13). Cf. also **ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ** (Jo. 19:2), **ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν** (Ac. 14:8). Hence it is overstating it to assert that the locative of place without prepositions has entirely disappeared from the N. T. The scarcity of this usage in comparison with Homer is in perfect harmony with the linguistic development. Moulton[6] indeed finds the locative of place

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 100. Cf. also Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 221; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 403; K.-G., I, p. 441.

[2] Giles, Man., ec., p. 330.

[3] Main, Loc. Ex r. in the Attic Orators (1892), p. 231.

[4] Meister, Dialee., Bd. II, p. 193. [5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 119.

[6] Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 153. Cf. also ib., 1901, p. 438, for **Ἐλευσῖνι**, Letr. 220 (iv/A.D.).

in inscriptions as late as the sixth century A.D., *B.C.H.*, 1903, p. 335, τῷ τύβῳ.

(d) TIME. It is expressed much more persistently with the mere locative. It has outlived the usage as to place and is "fairly frequent"[1] in the N. T. Cf. Sanskrit, Latin, older Greek, Anglo-Saxon. Here, of course, time is regarded from the point of view of a point, not of duration (accusative). But the accusative is making inroads on the locative and is already used occasionally for a point of time. See Accusative. For papyri examples take τοῖς παλαιοῖς χρόνοις B.U. 903 (ii/A.D.) and γενεσίοις, γάμοις B.U. 1 (iii/A.D.), Moulton, *Cl. Rev.,* April, 1904, and Dec., 1901. See also τῇ ἀναβάσει, O.P. 742 (ii/B.C.). Observe the difference between the accusative (τὸ σάββατον ἡσύχασαν) and the locative (τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἦλθαν) and the genitive (ὄρθρου βαθέως) all in the same sentence (Lu. 24:1). The accusative is easily differentiated from both the locative and the genitive. As between the locative and the genitive the matter is not quite so clear. Brugmann[2] indeed thinks that originally there was little difference. The difference lies in the essential meaning of the two cases. The locative is a point and the genitive is the case of genus. Thus in Mt. 24:20 we have ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμῶνος μηδὲ σαββάτῳ. It is not mere hair-splitting to note that winter is here set over against summer (time within which) and that Sabbath is the point of time. In practical result the difference is very slight, but it is hardly just to regard the two usages as without difference. Cf. νυκτός (Mt. 25: 6), νυκτί (Mk. 14:30), νύκτα (Ac. 26:7). **K**αιρῷ (Lu. 20:10) for 'in due time' may be illustrated by, τῷ δέοντι καιρῷ O.P. IV, 729, 5, and τῷ τῆς ὀπώρας καιρῷ *ib*., 11. As further examples of the mere locative we may note the various instances of ἡμέρα. So τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Mt. 20:19), τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων (Jo. 20:1), τῇ πτώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων (Mk. 14:12), τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ (Ac. 7:8), τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 6:40), ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ (Mt. 24:42), ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ (Lu. 17:29 f.), τατῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Ac. 12:21), τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 20:19), τῇ ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ(Ac. 7:26), τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Ac. 21:26), and even ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ (2 Cor. 4:16). The substantive is not expressed in τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ (Mt. 28:1) and τῇ ἑξῆς (Ac. 21:1).[3] Cf. also σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί (Mk. 14:30), where the adverb is accusative, but the substantive locative. With some of these phrases ἐν is also

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 119.

[2] Griech. Gr., p. 405. Cf. also Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 223.

[3] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 120, for careful discussion. Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., pp. 77 ff.

found as with **ταύτῃ** (Lu. 19:42), **ἐκείνῃ**; (Lu. 6:23), **ὀγδόῃ** (Lu. 1: 59), **μιᾷ** (Lu. 20:1), **ἐσχάτῃ** (Jo. 6:44), with **ἡμέρᾳ** and **σαββάτων** (Lu. 4:16), **ἡμέρᾳ**, and genitive (Lu. 4:25), with **ἑξῆς** (Lu. 7:11), where W. H. read in text **ἐν τῷ**) rather than **ἐν τῇ.** The MSS., especially D, vary a good deal. **Νυκτί**, occurs without **ἐν** (Lu. 12:20) and with **ἐν** (Mt. 26:31). So also we find **σαββάτῳ** (Mt. 24:20), **σὰββασιν** (Mk. 2:24), but also **ἐν** with each (Mt. 12:2; Mk. 2:23). With **ὥρα** we have both **ὥρᾳ** (Lu. 2:38) and **ἐν** (Lu. 12:1). Once more **φυλακῇ** occurs without **ἐν** (Mt. 14:25) and with (Lu. 12:38). With **ἔτος** we have **ἐν** once (as Lu. 3:1) and without **ἐν** twice (Jo. 2:20; Ac. 13:20), but these two examples **(ἔτεσιν τεσσεράκοντα, ὡς ἔτεσιν τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα** are probably associative-instrumental.[1] Cf. **προβεβηκότας ἤδη τοῖς ἔτεσιν**, Tb.P. i (ii/A.D.) with Lu. 1:7 **ἐν.** Moulton observes that it is hard sometimes to draw the line between the locative and the instrumental (*Cl. Rev*., Dec., 1901). With **ἑορτή** again we note the mere locative (Lu. 2:41) or usually **ἐν** (Jo. 2:23). See also **καιροῖς ἰδίοις** (1 Tim. 6:15), but usually **ἐν καιρῷ** (Mt. 11:25, etc.). **Χρόνος** has only **ἐν** (as Ac. 1:6) save the associative-instrumental usage like **ἱκανῷ χρόνῳ** (Ac. 8:11). Observe also **τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ**, (Mk. 6:21). So again **ἑτέραις γενεαῖς** (Eph. 3:5), but **ἐν** in Mk. 8:38. **Νυνί** (chiefly in Paul, as Ro. 3:21) is a locative form (cf. **οὐχί**). Other locative adverbs to note are **ἀεί** (2 Cor. 6:10), **ἐκεῖ** (Mt. 6:21) **πέρυσι** (2 Cor. 8:10), **πρωί** (Mk. 16:2).

(e) LOCATIVE WITH ADJECTIVES. Thus we note **οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι** 5:3), **καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ** (5:8), **ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσίν** (Ac. 14:8), **στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει** (1 Pet. 5:9), **νωθροὶ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς** (Heb. 5:11), **περιτομῇ ὀκταήμερος** (Ph. 3:5), **ἐλεύθεροι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ** (Ro. 6:20), **ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ** (Mt. 11:29), **ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις** (Ac. 7:51), **ἁγία καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι** (1 Cor. 7:34). Cf. Ro. 12:10-13. In Blass-Debrunner, p. 118, these examples are treated as instrumental.

(f) LOCATIVE WITH VERBS. Cf. **δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι** (Ac. 20: 22), **περιβεβλημένους ἱματίοις λευκοῖς** (Rev. 4:4, marg. **ἐν**). In Ro. 12: 10-13 note the various examples of the locative with participles, though **ταῖς χρείαις κοινωνοῦντες** is probably instrumental. Cf. also **ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ** (Eph. 4:18), **ζωοποιηθεὶς πνεύματι** (1 Pet. 3:18), **σχήματι εὑρεθείς** (Ph. 2:8). We seem to have the locative in **κατειργάσατο ὑμῖν** (2 Cor. 7:11), but usually **ἐν** appears in such examples as **ἐν ἐμοί** (Gal. 1:24). Further examples with verbs are

[1] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 405; Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., p. 225; Moulton, Prol., p. 75.

τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν (Ac. 21:21), πορευομενη τῷ φόβῳ (Ac. 9:31), ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις (Jas. 1:2), λῃσταῖς περιέπεσεν (Lu. 10:30), ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει καὶ ἐπερίσσευον τῷ ἀριθμῷ (Ac. 16:5), κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς (Heb. 12:3), ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει (Ac. 14:22), ἐπιμένωσιν τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ (Ro. 11:23; cf. 22), ἐνκεντρισθήσονται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ (Ro. 11:24), τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν (Mt. 7:22; cf. ἐξεβάλομεν also), ζέων τῷ πνεύματι (Ac. 18:25; cf. Lu. 10:21 and Mk. 5:29), τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες (Ro. 12:12), and perhaps even βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (Mk. 1:8). See Ac. 16:5. For the so-called instrumental use of ἐν (like ἐν μαχαίρῃ, Mt. 26:52) see the chapter on Prepositions (cf. also Instrumental Case). As a matter of fact ἐν always has the locative, and this use of ἐν has he locative also. The activity of the verb is conceived as finding expression in the object mentioned. It is not a mere Hebraism, for the papyri have it as indeed the earlier Greek occasionally. But as a practical matter this use of ἐν with the locative was nearly equivalent to the instrumental case. The use ὁμολογέω (Mt. 10:32 = Lu. 12:8) Moulton (*Prol*., p. 104) considers a Semiticism due to the common Aramaic original. Cf. the usual dative (Heb. 13: 15).

(g) THE LOCATIVE WITH SUBSTANTIVES. Cf. Heb. 11:12, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει. So in Col. 2:14, τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν, the adjective is used as a substantive. In 1 Cor. 14:20 we have the locative with substantive, verb and adjective, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε.

(h) THE LOCATIVE WITH PREPOSITIONS. Just because the prepositions that were used with the locative were only "adverbial elements strengthening and directing its meaning"[1] they were very numerous. Originally nearly all the prepositions occurred with the locative. Thus in Homer and epic and lyric poetry generalk, we meet with the locative with ἀμφί, ἀνά, μετά. (Buck, *Class*. *Phil*. II, 264), and when the so-called dative is found in Greek with ἐν, ἐπί, παρά, περί, πρός, ὑπό, it is really the locative case.[2] But with a compound verb the case may not always be locative, as instance προκείμενον ἡμῖν (Heb. 12:1). A number of the prepositions like ἀμφί, ἀντί ἐν (ἐνί), ἐπί, περί, πρός (προτί) are themselves in the locative case. Cf. the locative adverbs of time already mentioned and Ἑβραϊστί (Jo. 5:2), Ἑλληνιστί (Jo. 19:20), κύκλῳ (Mk. 3:34), the conjunction καί, etc. There are only four prepositions in the N. T. that use the locative. As examples note ἐν τῷ

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 103. [2] Monro, Hom, Gr., p. 101.

Ἰορδάνῃ (Mt. 3:6), **ἐπὶ θύραις** (Mt. 24:33), **παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** (Jo. 19:25), **πρὸς τῷ μνημείῳ** (Jo. 20:11). But of these **πρός** has the locative only 6 times, **παρά**, 50, while **ἐπί** has it 176 times.[1] **Ἐν**, of course, having only the locative, is very common. One may note, here **ἐν πρώτοις** (1 Cor. 15:3) almost like an adverb.

(1) THE PREGNANT CONSTRUCTION OF THE LOCATIVE. It is common in the N. T. with **ἐν**, as the accusative with **εἰς** after verbs of motion or rest. This matter comes up for discussion again under the head of Prepositions, but a few words are perhaps needed here. The identity of **ἐν** and **εἰς** in origin and early usage must be borne in mind when one approaches these two prepositions. Cf. **ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν** in Mk. 13:16. On the other hand note **ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ** (Mt. 26:23). Here Mark (14:20) has **εἰς τὸ τρυβλίον**. This interchange of **ἐν** and **εἰς** is a feature of the LXX (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 245). Originally there was no difference, and finally **ἐν** vanishes before **εἰς** in modern Greek. Each writer looks at the matter in his own way. Cf. English vernacular, "come in the house," "jump in the river," etc. So also Mt. (3:6) has **ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ**, while Mk. (1:9) reads **ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην**. Cf. **ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν**, text of Mk. 2:1 and marg. **εἰς οἰκόν ἐστιν**. This same pregnant idiom appears with **παρά** as **στᾶσα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 7:38). See also Mk. 4:1. Cf. again **ἐμβάντι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον** (Mt. 8:23). But observe the locative with **ἐν** in composition (Ro. 11:24). With **ὄνομα** we have the mere locative (Mt. 7:22), **ἐν** and the locative (Mt. 21:9), **ἐπί** and locative (Mt. 18:5), **εἰς** and accusative (Mt. 10:41; 28:19).[2] Cf. also Mt. 12:41.

XI. **The Instrumental (" Instrumental Dative ") Case (ἡ χρηστικὴ πτῶσις).**

(a) THE TERM INSTRUMENTAL. As applied to case it is modern and the adjective itself appears first in the fourteenth century.[3] The Hindu grammarians, however, recognised this case.[4] There are not wanting signs indeed that it survived in the Greek as a separate case-form. Meister[5] concludes that in the Cyprian dialect the instrumental was still a separate case-form (a "living" case). He cites **ἀρᾶ, εὐχωλᾶ**, besides **σὺν τύχα**, and in Kuhner-Gerth[6] we find **οἴκοι** locative, **οἴκω** instrumental, and **οἴκῳ** dative. Other examples are **ἅμα, δίχα, τάχα** in later Greek, not to mention the many ad-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 106.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 123 f.
[3] Elem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 207.
[4] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 89.
[5] Gk. Dial., II, p. 295.
[6] I, p. 405.

verbs[1] in –α and –η (--ᾳ, --ῃ) like κρυφῇ, λάθρᾳ, σιγῇ βίᾳ, etc. This corresponds with the Sanskrit singular ending, and the plural *bhis* may be compared with the Homeric φι (φιν), as θεόφι, θεόφιν. But in Homer one must note that these endings for singular and plural are used for the locative, ablative, and possibly for the dative also.[2] It is not always easy to draw the line of distinction between the locative and instrumental in Greek after the forms blended.[3] Sometimes indeed a word will make good sense, though not the same sense, either as locative, dative or instrumental, as τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς (Ac. 2:33; cf. also 5:31). The grammars have no Greek term for the instrumental case, but I have ventured to call it χρηστικὴ πτῶσις. The increasing use of prepositions (ἐν, διά, μετά) makes the mere instrumental a disappearing case in the N. T. as compared with the earlier Greek,[4] but still it is far from dead.

(b) SYNCRETISTIC? It is a matter of dispute as to whether this instrumental case is not itself a mixed case combining an old associative or comitative case with the later instrumental. Both of these ideas are present in the Sanskrit case (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar,* p. 93). On the whole, however, one is constrained to doubt the existence of this so-called comitative case. Most of the difference is due to the distinction between persons (association, accompaniment) and things (means, implement, instrument). Cf. Delbruck, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, p. 231. Hence neither term covers exactly the whole situation. We have a similar combination in our English "with" which is used in both senses. So also the Greek σύν (cf. Latin *cum*) and even μετά (ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων, Mk. 14:48). In Mk. 14:43, μετ' αυτοῦ—μετὰ μαχαιρῶν, both senses occur together. But we may agree that the associative was the original usage out of which the instrumental idea was easily and logically developed.[5] The comitative usage, for instance, is very common in Homer[6] and Herodotus.[7]

(c) PLACE. There is no example of this usage in the N. T. except παντᾳχῇ (W. H. text, Ac. 21:28). In Jas. 2:25, ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ

[1] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 99. [2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 239.

[3] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 438.

[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 116. The mod. Gk., of course, does not use the instr. case at all, but only μέ (μετά). Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 103.

[5] Giles, Man., p. 334. Cf. Draeger, Hist. Synt., p. 428.

[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 99.

[7] Helbing, Uber den Gebrauch des echten and sociativen Dativs bei Herod., p. 58 f.

ἐκβαλοῦσα, we probably have the locative, though the instr. is possible.

(d) TIME. But we do find examples of the associative-instrumental used with expressions of time. This is indeed a very old use of the instrumental, as Brugmann[1] and Delbruck[2] show. The Sanskrit had it also as the time "by the lapse of which anything is brought about."[3] The singular, like χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ (Lu. 8:27; Ac. 8:11), finds parallel in the papyri,[4] as is seen also in Pindar, Euripides, Aristophanes, Thucydides.[5] For the papyri note πολλοῖς χρόνοις N.P. 50 (iii/A.D.), χρόνῳ A.P. 77 (ii/A.D.). Cf. Polybius xxxii, 12, πολλοῖς χρόνοις (Moulton, Prol., p. 76). There is no doubt about the plural instrumental in Ro. 16:25, χρόνοις αἰωνίοις, a parallel to which Moulton[6] finds in the epistolary formula in the papyri, ἐρρῶσθαι σε εὔχομαι πολλοῖς χρόνοις. He rightly doubts the necessity of appealing to the Latin as W. Schulze[7] does for the explanation of the use of the plural, since the classical τῷ χρόνῳ could easily give the impulse.

In Jo. 2:20, τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη, we have the instrumental also, though, of course, this might be looked at as a locative, the whole period regarded as a point of time. In an example like πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν (Lu. 8:29) we probably have the instrumental also, though here the locative would give a good idea, 'on many occasions' ('oftentimes' Rev. V.), whereas the marg. ('of a long time') gives the instrumental idea. For the instrumental idea Moulton[8] cites from Letronne (p. 220, fourth century A.D.) πολλοῖς ὕστερον χρόνοις. See also ὡς ἔτεσει τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα (Ac. 13:20). Cf. also πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις (Lu. 1:75), but marg. of W. H. has accusative. As Moulton[9] observes, only the context can decide which is locative and which instrumental in such examples and he suggests that this uncertainty had something to do with the increasing use of ἐν to make the locative clear and distinct from instrumental or dative. "Speakers of Greek were certainly beginning to feel that they could not trust the dative out alone, and we an understand the occasional employment of nursemaid ἐν in places where she would have been better left at

[1] Griech. Gr., p. 410h [2] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 246.
[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 94.
[4] Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 438; 1904, p. 153; Prol., p. 75.
[5] Delbruck, Vergl. Srnt., I, p. 246. [6] Prol., p. 75.
[7] Gr. Lat., p. 14. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 121, calls this "duration of time" "unclassical," but incorrectly as is already shown.
[8] Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 438. [9] Ib.

home, or replaced by **σύν**." Blass[1] comments on the frequency of the instrumental with expressions of time in Josephus with no perceptible difference between it and the accusative. One can hardly agree to. Blass[2] explanation of the instrumental of time Ithat it is due to the disinclination of the writer to put another accusative beside the direct object of the verb. Certainly the accusative is the most frequent idiom in the N. T. for the idea of extension of time, as can be seen in Mk. 2:19; Lu. 13:8; Ac. 13:18; Rev. 20:3, etc. In Jo. 14:9 W. H. have **τοσοῦτον χρόνον** in the text and put **τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ** in the marg. In Lu. 8:27 some MSS. have instead of the instrumental **χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ** the ablative **ἐκ (ἀπὸ) χρόνων ἱκανῶν**.

(e) THE ASSOCIATIVE IDEA. The idea of association alone is responsible for a good many examples, chiefly with verbs, though adjectives are not wanting. Substantives cut no figure at all according to Blass,[3] for **τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος** (2 Cor. 6:14) is an example of the pure dative (cf. also Lu. 5:10; 2 Cor. 6:16), and in Ro. 15:26 we have **εἰς τοὺς πτωχούς** and in 1 Jo. 1:3, 6, 7 **μεθ' ἡμῶν**. But another example in 2 Cor. 6:14, **τίς μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνῃ καί ἀνομίᾳ**, comes much closer to the substantive use of the associative-instrumental. But an undoubted example of a substantive followed by the associative-instrumental appears in **εἰς ὑπάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ** (Mt. 8:34). So **εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἡμῖν** (Ac. 28:15). Cf. also Jo. 12:13 (**αὐτῷ**) and 1 Macc. 3:11 **εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτῷ**. There is nothing in this construction out of harmony with the Greek idiom. The verb has the associative-instrumental. The genitive with this substantive occurs in Mt. 27:32 (δ text) and 1 Th. 4:17 (but 5 text has associative-instrumental). Cf. Moulton, *Prol*., p. 14. There is no doubt as to the adjectives **σύμμορφος** and **σύμφυτος** . Thus **τὸ σῶμα σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι** (Ph. 3:21) and **σύμφυτοι τῷ ὁμοιώματι** (Ro. 6:5), but **σύμμορφος** has the genitive **τῆς εἰκόνος** in Ro. 8:29 like a substantive. The other compounds in **σύν** are treated as substantives[4] with the genitive, like **συναιχμάλωτος, συγγενής, συνεργός, σύντροφος, μέτοχος** (Heb. 1:9). But note **ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς** (Mk. 6:48), **ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν** (Col. 2:14). With verbs the associative-instrumental is very common in the N. T. as in the older Gk. The most important examples will be given in illustration. **Ἀκολουθέω** is a common instance, as **ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ** (Mk. 1:18). Cf. also **συνακ.** (Mk. 5:37). Rather oddly **ἕπομαι** is not so used, but once we find **συνείπετο αὐτῷ** (Ac. 20:4). So

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 121. Cf. Schmidt, de Jos. elocut., p. 382 f.
[2] Ib [3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 115. [4] Ib.

διελέγετο αὐτοῖς (Ac. 20:7), though πρός (Mk. 9:34) also is used. Other compounds of διά with this case are διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ (Mt. 5:24), διεβλήθη αὐτῷ (Lu. 16:1), τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος (Ju. 9), τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διακατηλέγχετο (Ac. 18:28). But closely allied to these words are κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 5:10), σοι κριθῆναι (Mt. 5:40), ὡμίλει αὐτῳ (Ac. 24:26), which last may have πρός and accusative (Lu. 24:14). Then again note ἑτεροζυγοῦντες (2 Cor. 6:14), τοῖς πνευματικοῖς ἐκοινώνησαν (Ro. 15:27), κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς (Ac. 5:13), ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 11:2). Cf. further ἀνδρὶ δέδεται (Ro. 7:2) and μεμιγμένην πυρί. (Rev. 15:2). In Rev. 8:4 we may (R. V. dative) have the associative-instrumental[1] ταῖς προσευχαῖς with ἀνέβη. Moulton cites ἀποδώσω σοι τῷ ἔνγιστα δοθησομένῳ ὀψωνίῳ, B.U. 69 (ii/A.D.) 'with your next wages' (*Cl. Rev.*, Dec., 1901). Cf. the old Greek αὐτοῖς ἀνδράσιν and the "military dative" (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 61). The compounds with σύν that use this case are numerous. Thus συλλαβέσθαι (Lu. 5:7), συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις (Jo. 18:14), though this might be a dative (cf. συμβαίνω and συμφέρει), συνεφωνήθη ὑμῖν (Ac. 5:9; cf. 15:15),[2] μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει (Ph. 1:27, two examples probably of the instrumental, the first of manner), συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ (Mk. 14:51), αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ (Mk. 15:41), συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Mt. 9:10), μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ (2 Th. 3:14), συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν (Ro. 15:32), συνήτησεν αὐτῷ (Lu. 9:37), μοι συναντιλάβηται (Lu. 10:40; cf. Ro. 8:26), συναποθανεῖν σοι (Mk. 14:31), οὐ συναπώλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν (Heb. 11:31), συνέβαλλον αὐτῷ (Ac. 17:18), ὑμῖν συνβασιλεύσωμεν (1 Cor. 4:8), συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ (Col. 3:1), συνεισῆλθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Jo. 18:15), συνείπετο αὐτῷ (Ac. 20:4), συνήργει τοῖ ἔργοις (Jas. 2:22), συνῆλθεν αὐτοῖς (Ac. 9:39), συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς (Lu. 15:2), συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις (Lu. 11:48), συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν (2 Pet. 2:13), συνειχετο τῷ λόγῳ (Ac. 18:5), συνζήσομεν αὐτῷ (Ro. 6:8), συνζητεῖν αὐτῷ (Mk. 8:11), συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ (Eph. 2:5), συνήδομαι τῷ νόμῳ (Ro. 7:22), συνταφέντες αὐτῷ (Col. 2:12), συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ (Lu. 9:32), συγκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς (Ac. 26:30), συνκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (2 Tim. 1:8), συνκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ (Heb. 11:25), συνκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ (Lu. 23:51), μὴ συνκεκερασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν (Heb. 4:2, two examples of the instrumental), συνκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις (Eph. 5:11), συνκρίνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς (2 Cor. 10:12), συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Mk. 9:4), συνμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι (Ro. 8:16), συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ (Ac. 9:7), συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ (Ac. 18:7), συνπαθῆσαι

[1] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 75.
[2] Considered peculiar by Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 114.

ταῖς ἀσθενείαις (Heb. 4:15), συνπαρόντες ἡμῖν (Ac. 25:24), συν-ἐπέμψαμεν αὐτοῖς (2 Cor. 8:22), συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ (Lu. 7:11), συνσταυρωθέντος αὐτῷ (Jo. 19:32), συνστοιχεῖ τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ (Gal. 4:25), μὴ συνσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ (Ro. 12:2), συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ (Lu. 8:19), συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ (Gal. 2:13), συνέχαιρον αὐτῇ (Lu. 1:58), συνχρῶνται Σαμαρείταις (Jo. 4:9), though χράομαι uses the strict instrumental usually; a rather long list surely, but one not in vain, if one gets a just idea of the N. T. usage. Some of these verbs occur frequently and some have πρός or μετά.

(f) WITH WORDS OF LIKENESS AND IDENTITY. We find this usage with several adjectives. Thus ὅμοιος ἀνθρώπῳ (Lu. 6:48) and always, save the accusative in Rev. 14:14 and in 1:13 (true text). In Jo. 8:55 some MSS. actually have ὅμοιος ὑμῶν instead of ὑμῖν. Cf. our vulgar "the likes of you." So also ἴσους ἡμῖν (Mt. 20:12) and ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν πίστιν (2 Pet. 1:1). Ὁ αὐτός with the instrumental is found once only, ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ (1 Cor. 11:5). In 1 Th. 2:14 we find τὰ αὐτὰ καθώς, and in Ph. 1:30 τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶν οἷον. Several verbs are used the same way. So ἔοικεν ἀνδρί (Jas. 1:23), τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, (Heb. 2:17), παρομοιάζετε τάφοις (Mt. 23:27), ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ (Heb. 2:10). Some MSS, have ὁμοίως αὐτῇ in Mt. 22:39. In Rev. 4:3 ὅμοιος ὁράσει λίθῳ live have two instrumental examples.

(g) MANNER. It is expressed by the instrumental case. This, like the other uses of the case in the N. T., is in harmony with ancient usage,[1] not to say that of the κοινή. Some N. T. adverbs illustrate this usage well, like δημοσίᾳ (Ac. 16:37), εἰκῇ (1 Cor. 15:2), ἰδίᾳ (1 Cor. 12:11), κρυφῇ (Eph. 5:12), λάθρᾳ (Mt. 2:7), πανοικεί (Ac. 16:34), πανπληθεί (Lu. 23:18), πάντῃ (Ac. 24:3), πεζῇ (Mk. 6:33), τάχα (Ro. 5:7). But the usage is abundant outside of adverbs, chiefly with verbs, but also with adjectives and even with substantives. Thus we find τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς (Eph. 2:3) and Κύπριος τῷ γένει (Ac. 4:36; cf. also 18:2, ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν, Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει). See also the participle τῷ ὄντι (Ro. 7:23). Cf. also φύσει in Gal. 2:15 and τῷ προσώτῳ in Gal. 1:22. Here are some of the chief examples with verbs: χάριτι μετέχω (1 Cor. 10:30), προσευχομέν ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ (1 Cor. 11:5), περιτμηθῆτε τῷ ἔθει (Ac. 15:1), τῇ προθέσει προσμένειν (Ac. 11:23), ὅτι παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται (Ph. 1:18, all three examples), ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ κατοπτριζόμενοι (2 Cor. 3:18). Blass notes also ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον (Mk. 14:65) as a vulgarism which finds a parallel in a papyrus[2] of the first century

[1] K.-G., I, p. 435. [2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 118.

A.D., **κονδύλοις ἔλαβεν**. Cf. **τῇ βίᾳ** B.U. 45 (iii/A.D.). But often **μετά** and the genitive (**μετὰ βίας**, Ac. 5:26), **ἐν** and the locative (**ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν**, Lu. 14:31), **κατά** and the accusative (Ac. 15:11) or the mere accusative (Mt. 23:37) occur rather than the instrumental. There is one usage in the N. T. that has caused some trouble. It is called[1] "Hebraic" by some of the grammarians. The instances are rather numerous in the N. T., though nothing like so common as in the LXX.[2] Conybeare and Stock quote Plato to show that it is, however, an idiom in accordance with the genius of the Greek language. Thus **λόγῳ λέγειν, φεύγων φυγῇ, φύσει πεφυκυῖαν**, etc. They call it the "cognate dative." That will do if instrumental is inserted in the place of dative. Moulton[3] admits that this idiom, like **βλέποντες βλέψετε** (Mt. 13:14), is an example of "translation Greek," but thinks that a phrase like **ἐξολεθρεῦσαι οὐκ ἐξωλέθρευσαν** (Josh. 17:13) is much more like the Hebrew infinitive absolute which is reproduced by this Greek instrumental or participle. Blass[4] insists that the classical parallels **γάμῳ γαμεῖν, φυγῇ φεύγειν** are not true illustrations, but merely accidentally similar, an overrefinement in the great grammarian, I conceive. The Latin has the idiom also, like *curro curriculo*. Here are some of the important N. T. instances: **ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε** (Mt. 13:14), **ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν** (Ac. 23:14), **ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται** (Ac. 2:17), **ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα** (Lu. 22:15), **θανάτῳ τελευτάτω** (Mt. 15:4); **ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν** (Ac. 2:30), **ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ** (Mk. 5:42), **παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν**, (Ac. 5:28), **προσευχῇ προσηύξατο** (Jas. 5:17), **χαρᾷ χαίρει** (Jo. 3:29; cf. 1 Pet. 1:8). Cf. also **σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν** (Jo. 18:32) and **σημείνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν** (Jo. 21:19), where the idiom seems more normal. Blass[5] observes that this usage "intensifies the verb in so far as it indicates that the action is to be understood as taking place in the fullest sense." In Ro. 8:24 we more likely

[1] Moulton, prol., p. 75.
[2] C. and S., p. 60 f.
[3] Prol., p. 75 f. Cf. **θάνον θανάτῳ** in Homer.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 119.
[5] Ib. Thack. (Jour. of Theol. Stu., July, 1908, p. 598 f.) shows that in the Pentateuch the Hebrew infinitive absolute was more frequently rendered by the instr. case, while in the Books of Samuel and Kings the participle is the more usual. In the LXX as a whole the two methods are about equal. On p. 601 he observes that the N. T. has no ex. of the part. so used except in 0. T. quotations, while several instances of the instr. occur apart from quotations, as in 22:15; Jo. 3:29; Ac. 4:17; 5:28; 23:14; Jas. 5:17. See also Thack., Gr., p. 48.

have the means than the manner. Cf. ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς ὀψωνίοις in Lu.13:14.

(h) DEGREE OF DIFFERENCE (Measure kin to idea of manner). The accusative is sometimes used here also with the comparative, as πολὺ μᾶλλον (Heb. 12:9). But in Lu. 18:39 we have πολλῷ μᾶλλον (cf. Mt. 6:30). Cf. πολλῷ μᾶλλον, P. Par. 26 (ii/B.C.). In Ph. 1:23 we find the instrumental with the double comparative πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον. In particular observe τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ βλέπετε (Heb. 10:25) which corresponds to the English idiom "the more, the less" in "the more one learns, the humbler he grows." As a matter of fact the English "the" here is instrumental also, as is seen in the Anglo-Saxon dy. Cf. also τοσούτῳ κρείττων (Heb. 1:4).

(i) CAUSE. The instrumental may be used also to express the idea of cause, motive or occasion. This notion of ground wavers between the idea of association and means. Here are some illustrations: ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ ὧδε ἀπόλλυμαι (Lu. 15:17), ἵνα σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκωνται. (Gal. 6:12), λύπῃ καταποθῇ (2 Cor. 2:7), τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἐσθίουσιν (1 Cor. 8:7), οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστιᾳ ἀλλὰ ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει (Ro. 4:20), τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν (Ro. 11:20), ἠλεήθητε τῇ τούτων ἀπειθίᾳ (Rom. 11:30), τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ νῦν ἐλεηθῶσιν (11:31), μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει (1 Pet. 4:12), τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται (Heb. 13:16), τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον (2 Cor. 2:13), εὐδοκήσαντες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ (2 Th. 2:12). In 1 Cor. 9:7 we have τίς στρατεύεται ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις ποτέ; cf. τῇ ὑπερβολῇ (2 Cor. 12:7). But some verbs in the N. T. prefer a preposition for this idea, but not with the instrumental case. Thus ἠγαλλίασεν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ (Lu. 1:47), ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ (Mt. 7:28), ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα (Mk. 1:11), εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις (Ac. 7:41). With θαυμάζω we find ἐν (Lu. 1:21), ἐπί, (Lu. 4:22), περί (Lu. 2:18), διά (Rev. 17:7), not to mention εἰ (1 Jo. 3:13), ὅτι (Lu. 11:38).[1]

(j) MEANS. But no usage of this case is more common than that of means. With things sometimes we call it means, with personk agent, though more often the agent is expressed by ὑπό with genitive-ablative (cf. *ab* with the ablative in Latin). There is no essential difference in the root-idea. Donaldson (*New Cratylus*, p. 439) calls it the "implementive case." This is, of course, an idiom found with verbs. Note especially χράομαι (cf. Latin *autor* with instrumental, not ablative), τῷ Παύλῳ χρησάμενος (Ac. 27:3), πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα (2 Cor. 3:12), ἐάν τις αὐτῷ

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 118. Cf. for the pap. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 438.

νομίμως χρῆται (1 Tim. 1:8), in which examples we have both thing and person.[1] Cf. 1 Cor. 9:12, 15, etc. But see accusative in 1 Cor. 7:31. Among the many examples we can only select the most striking. Thus **μή ποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς** (Mt. 13:15), **ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ** (Mt. 8:16), **πέδαις καὶ ἁλύσεσι δεδέσθαι** (Mk. 5:4), **ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν** (Lu. 6:1), **ταῖς θριξὶν ἐξέμασεν** (Lu. 7:38), **ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ** (ib.), (Lu. 9:32), **φιλήματι παραδίδως** (Lu. 22:48), **ταῖς μαγίαις ἐξεστακέναι αὐτούς** (Ac. 8:11), **ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν πνευματι καὶ δυνάμει** (Ac. 10:38), **ἀνεῖλεν Ἰάκωβον μαχαίρῃ** (Ac. 12:2) **δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει** (Jas. 3:7), **συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει** (Gal. 2:13), **πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πονηρίᾳ κτλ.** (Ro. 1:29), **χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι** (Eph. 2:5, 8), **μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ** (Eph. 5:18), **ῥεραντισμένον αἵματι** (Rev. 19:13), **πνεύματι** (Ro. 8:14), **οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χυρσίῳ ἐλυτρώθητε, ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι** (1 Pet. 1:18 f.) **ᾧ τις ἥττηται** (2 Pet. 2:19), **ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι** (Eph. 1:13), **πηλίλοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί** (Gal. 6:11, one dative and two instrumental cases). Cf. **κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ** (Mk. 10:33, but **θανάτου** in D, and in Mt. 20:18 **א** has **εἰς θάνατον**). See the frequent use of **πίστει** in Heb. 11, which is more than mere manner, though in verse 13 we have **κατὰ πίστιν**. Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, Dec., 1901) cites **δήλωσον ἢ πλοίῳ ἐξέρχει ἢ ὄνῳ**. O.P. 112 (iii/iv A.D.). Cf. Jo. 19:40, **ὀθονίοις μετὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων** for proximity of **μετά** to the instrumental. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 76) notes "the remarkable instrumental in Ep. Diogn. 7, **ᾧ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἔκτισεν**." Besides some examples are open to doubt. Thus **κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ** (Mt. 3:12) may be either locative or instrumental. The same might be true of **τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον** (Jo. 21:8) and **ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι** (Ac. 1:5), though the locative is pretty clearly right here. Then again in Ac. 22: 25, **προέτειναν τοῖς ἱμᾶσιν**, we have either the instrumental or the dative. But in 2 Pet, 1:3 **ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ** (marg. in W. H.) are clearly instrumental, not dative. In Ro. 8: 24, **τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν**, we have either the modal instrumental or the instrumental of means. Cf. also 1 Cor. 14:15. Blass[2] perhaps overemphasizes the influence of the Heb בְּ; on the N. T. Greek in what is called the instrumental use of **ἐν** (the case with **ἐν** is always locative, historically considered). This is a classic idiom[3] and the papyri give numerous illustrations[4] of it, though the Heb.

[1] In Herod. we find a double instr. with **χρῆσθαι**. Cf. Helbing, Der Instrumental in Herod., 1900, p. 8.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 117.

[3] K.-G., II, p. 464 f.

[4] Moulton, Prol., pp. 76, 104; Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 153.

בְּ did make it more frequent in the LXX. Some of the uses of ἐν and locative, like ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται (Mt. 26:52), πολεμήσω ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ (Rev. 2:16), ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρης ἀπέθανον (Heb. 11:37), are fairly equivalent to the pure instrumental case, as ἀνεῖλεν μαχαίρῃ (Ac. 12:2), πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρης (Lu. 21:24). But others without ἐν in Blass' list are more debatable and may be construed as merely locatives after all, as seen above. Besides the examples already mentioned, πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται (Mk. 9:49) may be compared with ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε (9:50) and ἐν τίνι ἁλισθήσεται (Mt. 5:13). See further Mt. 7:2 and ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω (1 Cor. 4:21) which stands over against ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματί τε πραΰτητος.

Some doubt remains as to whether the instrumental case is used for the agent. In the Sanskrit the instrumental is a common idiom with a perfect passive verb or participle. But the Latin uses the dative in such an example as is seen by *mihi*, not *me*. Most of the grammarians take the Greek passive perfect and verbal as the Latin with the dative.[2] But Delbruck[3] recognises the doubt in the matter. The one example in the N. T. is in Lu. 23:15, **οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ.** D here reads ἐν αὐτῷ and Blass[4] suggests that the right reading is without πεπραγμένον as in Ac. 25:5. It is possible also that in 2 Pet. 2:19, ᾧ τις ἥττηται, we lave person, not thing, of whom (Am. St. V), not of what. Cf. also Jas. 3:7. One may mention here also as a possible instrumental κἀγὼ εὑρεθω ὑμῖν (2 Cor. 12:20), ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς (Lu. 24:35), ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις (1 Tim. 3:16), but these are most probably true datives. The usual way of expressing the agent in the N. T. is ὑπό for the direct agent and διά, for the intermediate agent, as in Mt. 1:22. But other prepositions are also used, like ἀπό (Ac. 2:22), ἐκ (Jo. 1:13), ἐν (Col. 1:17), παρά (Jo. 1:6), etc. See a real distinction between ὑπό and ἐν in Ro. 12:21.

(k) WITH PREPOSITIONS. The Greek uses the instrumental with only two prepositions ἅμα and σύν, both with the comitative idea. In the Cypriotic Greek we have σὺν τύχα, the distinctive instrumental ending. Cf. the Sanskrit *sam* with the instrumental and the Latin *cum*. There is only one instance of ἅμα in the N. T. with the instrumental, ἅμα αὐτοῖς (Mt. 13:29), but note ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς (1 Th. 4:17; cf. also 5:10). Σύν appears chiefly in Luke's

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 95.

[2] K.-G., I, p. 422; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 400 f.; Meisterh., p. 210, for inscr. (Attic); Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 344; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 98 f., considers it a true dative.

[3] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 300. But cf. pp. 184, 297.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 112.

writings, as **σὺν αὐτῇ** (Lu. 1:56). But in composition **σύν** is very common, as has already been shown. So **συνχαίρετέ μοι** (Ph. 2:18).

XII. The Dative (True) Case (ἡ δοτικὴ πτῶσις).

(a) SYNCRETISM. That of the locative, instrumental and dative cases has not advanced so far in Greek as has that between the genitive and the ablative. Monro[1] thinks that "distinct forms for these three cases survived down to a comparatively late period in Greek itself." He rightly conceives that it is not difficult, as a rule, to distinguish the three cases in usage. Brugmann[2] gives various examples of how the three cases made contribution to the common endings for the final blending.

(b) THE DECAY OF THE DATIVE. But in modern Greek this syncretistic combination has vanished in the vernacular. Moulton[3] can properly speak of the "decay of the dative," a decay that applies for the modern Greek to the locative and instrumental also. In the Sanskrit (Lanman) the dative, after the ablative, was the most infrequent case. The modern Greek simply uses **εἰς** and accusative for the 1 usual dative (and locative) ideas and **μέ (μετά)** with accusative for the instrumental. We see an approach to this use of **εἰς** in the N. T., **ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εις τὸ ἔθνος μου** (Ac. 24:17), **τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς** (Lu. 7:30). So **εἰς ὑμᾶς** (1 Pet. 1:4). Winery (Winer-Thayer, p. 213) is correct in refusing to consider **εἰς** with **κηρύσσω** or **εὐαγγελίζομαι** (Mk. 13:10; Lu. 24: 47; 1 Pet. 1:25) as at all out of the way. The pregnant idea is in Mk. 8:19 and Ro. 8:18. **Εἰς** is found also with **ἔνοχος** (Mt. 5: 22), **εὔθετος** (Lu 14:35), **εὔχρηστος** (2 Tim. 4:11), but **ὠφέλιμος** with **πρός** (1 Tim. 4:8). Only in the most illiterate papyri is the decay of the dative seen, as in **τίνι λόγου**, N.P. 47 (iii/A.D.), and in the late inscrs. like **ὁ βοηθῶν ὑμῶν**, J. H. S., XIX, 14. Cf. Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., Apr., 1904. *Per contra* note **ἐπιμελήθ[ητ]ι τῷ παιδίῳ**, P. Oxy. 744 (i/B.C.). Leaving out the locative, instrumental and dative show a contraction in the N. T. as compared with the earlier Greek.[4] But even in the N. T. "**ἐν** is considerably more than a match for **εἰς**," yet the vernacular revived and intensified the old identity of **ἐν** and **εἰς** seen in the early dialects.[5] Hatzidakis[6] shows how this tendency increased in the later Greek till **εἰς** triumphed over **ἐν** in the modern Greek. But even in the N. T. it is often impossible to insist on the idea of motion or extension in

[1] Hom. Gr., p. 97 f.
[2] Griech. Gr., pp. 226
[3] Prol., p. 62.
[4] Ib.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 122.
[6] Einl., p. 210 f.

εἰς, as ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον (Jo. 1:18), ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν (Mk. 13:16). Cf. τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον (Lu. 9:61). Moulton[1] cites from D ἐν as equivalent to εἰς in Acts 7:12; 8:23. One may compare the disappearance of the locative with ὑπό and the use of the accusative for both motion and rest,[2] whereas in Appian and Herodian (Atticists) the locative is in the lead.[3] Cf. the disappearance of the dative forms in English save in the pronouns *him, whom*, etc. Even Wyclif had "believe ye to the gospel" (Mk. 1:15).

(c) THE IDEA OF THE DATIVE. It is that of personal interest. It is sometimes used of things, but of things personified.[4] Apollonios Dyscolos calls the dative the case of περιποίησις. The accusative, genitive and dative are all cases of inner relations,[5] but the dative has a distinctive personal touch not true of the others. The dative is not a local case. There was originally no idea of place in it.[6] It is thus a purely grammatical ease (*rein grammatisch*). Even ἔρχομαι σοι (Rev. 2:16) is used of a person, not place. Cf. ἔρχεταί σοι, (Mt. 21:5, from the LXX) and ἐλθέ μοι, P. Par. 51 (B.C. 160). But in physical relations the dative approaches the accusative in idea.[7] Thus we find the dative of place in Heb. 12: 22, προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος (cf. 12:18) and ἐγγίζοντι τῇ Δαμασκῷ (Ac. 22:6). Cf. ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ (Lu. 7:12). It is not used for the notion of time.

(d) THE DATIVE WITH SUBSTANTIVES. I am not here insisting that the dative was used first with substantives rather than with verbs,[8] but only that the dative has often a looser relation to the verb than the accusative or the genitive.[9] It is more common to have the verb without the dative than without the accusative or genitive (Brug., *ib*.). This is seen also in the common use of the dative as the indirect object of verbs that have other cases and in the use of the dative with substantives somewhat after the manner of the genitive. Not all substantives admit of this idiom, it is true, but only, those that convey distinctly personal relations. But some of these substantives are allied to verbs that use the dative. So εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. 9:12), θλίψιν τῇ σαρκί (1 Cor. 7:28), ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου (2 Cor. 2:13), σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί (2 Cor.

[1] Prol., p. 235. [2] Ib., p. 63.
[3] Cf. Helbing, Die Prap. bei Herod., p. 22. Cf. Moulton, Prol., pp. 63, 107.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 98.
[5] Wundt, Volkerpsych., 1. Bd., Tl. II, p. 126.
[6] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 185. But see E. W. Hopkins, Trans. Am. Hist. Assoc., XXXVII, pp. 87 ff.
[7] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 95.
[8] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 277. [9] Brug., Griech Gr., p. 399.

12:7), ἀνάπαυσιν ταις ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν (Mt. 11:29), εὐωδία τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. 2:15), εἰς ταφὴν τοῖ ξένοις (Mt. 27:7), τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία (1 Cor. 1:18). Cf. Lu. 5:14. With some of these examples verbs occur, but the dative is not here due to the verb. Some of them are in the predicate also, as χὰρις τῷ θεῷ (Ro. 7: 25), with which compare marg. εὐχαριστῶ. See Lu. 10:5. Cf. τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν (1 Cor. 8:9). So in 1 Cor. 9:2, εἰ ἄλλοις οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλά γε ὑμῖν εἰμί, the dative is not due to εἰμί. Cf. in next verse ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσιν. Cf. also αὐτοῖς in Ph. 1:28. So νόμος ἑαυτοῖς (Ro. 2:14), ἐμοὶ θάνατος (Ro. 7:13), and, not to multiply examples, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου (Ph. 1:22), ἡ ἐπίστασίς μοι (2 Cor. 11:28). Cf. Ro. 1:14; 8:12. In 1 Cor. 4:3 both the dative and εἰς and accusative occur, but properly so, ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν. Cf. 1 Cor. 14:22 for the same thing. The dative due to attraction of the relative is seen in οἷς Lu. 9:43.

(e) WITH ADJECTIVES. This dative occurs naturally. These adjective and verbals, like the substantives, have a distinctly personal flavour. Here are the most striking examples: ἀπειθὴς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασίᾳ (Ac. 26:19), ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ (Jo. 8:29), ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ (Mt. 10:25), ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ (2 Pet. 3:14), ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ (Ac. 7:20), γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ (Jo. 18:15), δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ (Ro. 6:19), δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ (2 Cor. 10:4), σωτήριος πᾶσιν (Tit. 2:11), ἐμφανῆ—ἡμῖν (Ac. 10 : 40), ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ (Mt. 5:22), τὸ εὔσχημον καὶ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ (1 Cor. 7:35), ἱκλανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ (2 Cor. 2:6), καλόν σοί ἐστιν (Mt. 18:8), μονογενὴς τῇ μητρί (Lu. 7:12), νεκροὺς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (Ro. 6:11), πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ (Ac. 16:15), πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ (Jas. 2:5), σωτήριος πᾶσιν (Tit. 2:11), ᾧ . . . ὑπήκοοι (Ac. 7:39), φανερὸν ἐγένετο τῷ Φαραώ (Ac. 7:13), ὄντες αὐτῷ φίλοι (Ac. 19:31), ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (Tit. 3:8). Wellhausen (*Einl*., p. 33 f.) calls ἔνοχος τῷ "ungriechisch." But note ἔνοχος ἔστω τοῖς ἴσοις ἐπιτε[ί]μοις P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). The participle in Lu. 4:16 (Ac. 17:2) almost deserves to be classed with the adjectives in this connection, τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ.

(f) WITH ADVERBS AND PREPOSITIONS. The dative is found a few times with adverbs. Thus ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖ πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν (1 Th. 2:10), οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ (Mt. 18:7) and so frequently (but accusative in Rev. 8:13; 12:12). Blass[1] compares Latin *vae mihi* and *vae me*. Brugmann[2] indeed considers καταί, παραί πάλαι, χαμαί all to be dative forms. But, while this is true, the dative is not used with prepositions in the

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 112. Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1904, p. 153, finds ἀκολούθως with dat. in pap. [2] Griech. Gr., pp. 226, 228.

Sanskrit[1] and not certainly in the Greek.[2] The locative is very common with prepositions, and the instrumental appears with two, but the dative is doubtful. In reality this statement must be modified a bit, for **ἐγγύς** has the dative twice in the N. T. (Ac. 9:38), **τῇ Ἰόππῃ; ᾧ ἐγγύς** (Ac. 27:8), though the genitive is the usual case employed. Cf. **ἐγγίζω** with dative, Ac. 9:3; 10:9; Jas. 4:8. Brugmann[3] admits the dative with **ἀντίον, ἐναντίον, πλησίον** in the older Greek, though no N. T. examples occur. Delbruck (*Grundl*., p. 130) finds the dative with **ἐπί.**

(g) WITH VERBS. Here the dative finds its most extensive use.

1. *Indirect Object*. Perhaps the earliest use. Certainly it remains the one most commonly met. Indeed there are few transitive verbs that may not use this dative of the indirect object. In the passive of these verbs the dative is retained. Some representative illustrations are here given. **Ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον** (Mt. 5: 40), **ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν** (Mt. 6:12), **ἀνεῴχθησαν αὐτῷ** (marg.) **οἱ οὐρανοί** (Mt. 3:16), **δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖ κυσίν** (Mt. 7:6), **δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς** (Mk. 14:5), **ὑμῖν πρῶτον . . ἀπέστειλεν** (Ac. 3:26), **ἀπειλησώμεθα αὐτοῖς μηκέτι λαλεῖν** (Ac. 4:17), **ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν** (Gal. 1:20), **ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας** (Ac. 4:3), **λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι** (Mk. 14:27), **ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον** (Mk. 14:15), **ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις** (Mt. 5:21), **προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία** (Mk. 10:13), **εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην** (Lu. 2:10), **ὤφειλεν αὐτῷ ἑκατὸν δηνάρια** (Mt. 18:28), **πάντα ἀποδώσω σοι** (Mt. 18:26), **θλίψιν ἐγείρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου** (Ph. 1:17), **ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν κτλ.** (Mt. 17:4), **ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν** (1 Jo. 2:25). An example like **ἐπεῖχεν αὐτοῖς** (Ac. 3:5) is really the indirect object. Cf. Ac. 26:27. In 2 Cor. 12:7, **ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί**, the **μοι** is indirect object and **σαρκί** may be either dative of advantage or locative.

2. *Dativus Commodi vel Incommodi*. The so-called dative of advantage or disadvantage does not differ very greatly from the indirect object. A good example is **ἔρχομαί σοι** (Rev. 2:5, 16). Moulton (Prol., p. 245) cites AEschylus (P.V. 358), **ἀλλ' ἦλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἄγρυπνον βέλος**. It is indeed rather more loosely connected at times and varies more in the resultant idea. Thus in **μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι** (Mt. 23:31) we have to translate 'against yourselves,' though, of course, the dative does not mean 'against' any more than it means 'for' or 'in behalf of.' The personal relation is expressed by the case and it may be favourable or unfavourable.

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 96.
[2] Giles, Man., etc., p. 329, but see Prepositions (ch. XIII).
[3] Griech. Gr., p. 455.

Indeed, nowhere does the personal aspect of the dative come out more clearly than in this usage. Thus **πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα—τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου** (Lu. 18:31), **γραμματεὺς ματθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ** (Mt. 13:52), **νύμφην κεκοσμηνένην τῷ ἀνδρί** (Rev. 21:2), **ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς** (Mt. 13:14), **δικαίῳ νομος οὐ κεῖται** (1 Tim. 1:9; note long list of datives), **ἀναστανροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱόν** (Heb. 6:6), **ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας** (Jo. 3:26) **ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο** (2 Cor. 2:1), **μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῷ ψυχῇ** (Mt. 6:25) **ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς** (2 Pet. 2:6), **εἴτε ἐξέστημεν, θεῷ· εἴτε σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν** (2 Cor. 5:13), **ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ (**Mk. 6:19). Blass[1] notes how frequent this idiom is in Paul's Epistles, especially in the vehement passages. Thus **μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν** (2 Cor. 5:15), **ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω** (Gal. 2:19), **ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ** (Ro. 6:2; cf. 6:10 f.), **ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ--εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ** (Ro. 7:4), **εὑρέθη μοι** (Ro. 7:10), **τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει** (Ro. 14:4), imply **ἐσθίει** (Ro. 14:6), **ἑαυτῷ ζῇ—ἑαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκει** (verse 7). Cf. **ἐμοί** in Ro. 7:21, **ὑμῖν** in 12 Cor. 12:20 and **μοι** with **ἐγένετο** in Ac. 22:6. A good example is **ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν,** Lu. 10:11. See **ἐμαυτῷ** in 2 Cor. 2:1 and **τῷ πνεύματι**. (2:13). Cf. **βαστάζων αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν** (Jo. 19:17). In Mk. 10:33 note also the other datives, either the indirect objet or the direct object like **ἐμπαίζουσιν αὐτῷ.** Cf. also **πᾶσιν** and **ποῖς Ἰουδαίοις** in 1 Cor. 9:19 f. In this connection one may note also **τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος** (1 Cor. 15:32), **τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί** (Lu. 4:34). The intense personal relation is also manifest in the examples in 1 Cor. 1:23 f. Cf. also 1:18, 30. Prof. Burkitt (*Jour. of Theol. Stud*., July, 1912) interprets **τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί**. (Jo. 2:4) to mean 'What is it to me and thee?' That is, 'What have we to do with that?' In a word, 'Never mind!' like the modern Egyptian *ma 'alesh* in colloquial language. The so-called ethical dative (cf. **σοι** in Mt. 18:17) belongs here. A very simple example is **ἔρχομαί σοι** (Mt. 5:29). Moulton[2] cites a papyrus example for **ἔρχομαι σοι** (Rev. 2:5, 16), though from an illiterate document. For **μέλει** see Ac. 18:17; 1 Pet. 5:7.

3. *Direct Object.* Then again the dative is often the direct object of transitive verbs. These verbs may be simple or compound, but they all emphasize the close personal relation like trust, distrust, envy, please, satisfy, serve, etc. Some of them vary in construction, taking now the dative, now the accusative, now.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 111.

[2] Prol., p. 75. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 113, calls this the ethical dative. The so-called dative of "majesty" Blass considers a Hebraism. He compares **ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ** with **πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ** (Jonah, 3:3), 'a very great city.' But it is doubtful if the N. T. follows the LXX here.

a preposition. But this is all natural enough. Thus **και. ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς** (Lu. 24:11), **ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ** (Jo. 3:36), **ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ** (Ac. 5:36), **ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ** (Mk. 1:27). Once we find the dative with **πέποιθα** (Ph. 1:14), but elsewhere prepositions, as **ἐν** (2 Th. 3:4), **εἰς** (Gal. 5:10), **ἐπί** (Lu. 18:9). In particular **πιστεύω** calls for a word. Deissmann[1] has made an exhaustive study of the subject, and Moulton[2] has given a clear summary of results. This verb may be used absolutely (Jo. 20:31) or with an object clause (ib.) in the sense of believe. Moreover, it often means entrust (Gal. 2:7). Leaving out these uses Moulton finds that **πιστεύω** occurs with the dative 39 times and always in the sense of believe or trust (especially in John, as Jo. 5:46, **εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωυσεῖ ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί**. It is rather remarkable that **ἐν** occurs only once (Mk. 1:15, **πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ**) explained by Deissmann[3] as meaning 'in the sphere of,' to which Moulton agrees. In Eph. 1:13 **ἐν** more properly belongs to **ἐσφραγίσθητε**. The LXX uses **ἐν** rarely with **πιστεύω** and no other preposition. But in the N. T. **εἰς** occurs 45 times (37 times in John's Gospel and 1 Jo.) while **ἐπί** appears 6 times with the locative and 7 with the accusative. Moulton objects to overrefining here between **εἰς** and **ἐπί** (at most like *believe in* and *believe on*). So also as to accusative and locative with **ἐπί.** What he does properly accent is the use of these two prepositions by the Christian writers to show the difference between mere belief (dative with **πιστεύω**) and personal trust (**εἰς** and **ἐπί**). This mystic union received a further development in Paul's frequent **ἐν Χριστῷ**. The relation between **ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι** and **ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι** is parallel.[4]

We must note other groups with the dative, like verbs of serving. Thus **διηκόνουν αὐτῷ** (Mt. 4:11), **τῷ νοΐ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ** (Ro. 7:25, both instrumental and dative here), **λατρεύειν αὐτῷ** (Lu. 1:74), **ὑπηρετεῖν αὐτῷ** (Ac. 24:23). But in Ph. 3:3 we have the instrumental with **λατρεύω**, and **προσκυνέω** uses either the dative (Mt. 2:2) or the accusative (Jo. 4:23), not to mention **ἐνώπιον** (Lu. 4:7). The dative with **δουλόω** in 1 Cor. 9:19 is merely the indirect object.

Another convenient group is verbs to please, to suffice, to be envious, angry, etc. Thus **θεῷ ἀρέσαι** (Ro. 8:8), **ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ**

[1] In Christo, p. 46 f. My friend, Prof. Walter Petersen, of Lindsborg, Kan., does not believe that the dative is ever the direct object of a verb, and Dr. W. 0. Carver agrees with him.

[2] Prol., p. 67 f. [3] In Christo, p. 46 f.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 68; Heitmuller, Im Namen Jesu, I, ch. i.

(Mk. 14:5), **μετριοπαθεῖν τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν** (Heb. 5:2), **ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ** (Mt. 5:22), **ἀρκεῖ σοι** (2 Cor. 12:9), **ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες** (Gal. 5:26, accusative, margin of W. H.).

Once more, we may note verbs meaning to thank, to blame, to enjoin, etc. So **εὐχαριστῶ σοι** (Jo. 11:41), **ἐγκαλείτωσαν ἀλλήλοις** (Ac. 19:38), **ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς** (Mt. 12:16), **τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει** (Lu. 8:25). So also **προσέταξεν αὐτῷ** (Mt. 1:24), **διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς** (Mk. 8:15); **ἐμοὶ χολᾶτε** (Jo. 7:23). But **κελεύω** has accusative, though the dative occurs in the papyri.

There remain verbs meaning to confess, to lie, to help, to shine, etc. Thus we find **ὁμολογοῦντων τῷ ὀνόματι** (Heb. 13:15)[1] and **ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ θεῷ** (Lu. 2:38), **οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις** (Ac. 5:4), **βοήθει μοι** (Mt. 15:25, but **ὠφελέω** has accusative), **ἵνα φαινωσιν αὐτῇ** (Rev. 21:23). In the later **κοινή** we find **βοηθέω** with accusative or genitive (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 110). Cf. also **τῷ θεῷ προσεύχεσθαι** (1 Cor. 11:13), **ᾧ ἀντίστητε** (1 Pet. 5:9). Cf. two datives in Lu. 11:4.

4. *The Dative with Intransitive Verbs*. However, this is not a point that it is always easy to decide, for in **ἀρκεῖ σοι** (2 Cor. 12: 9) one is not sure where to place it. See above. Cf. Lu. 3:14. We are so prone to read the English into the Greek. The same remark applies in a way to **τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ** (Mt. 18:12), **πρέπει ἁγίοις** (Eph. 5:3). But there is no doubt about **τί ἐγένετο αὐτῷ** (Ac. 7:40), **αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν** (Mk. 10:32), and the passive constructions like **ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ** (perhaps *dativus commodi*, Heb. 4:9), **ἐφάνη αὐτῷ** (Mt. 1:20), **ἐρρήθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις** (perhaps indirect object; Mt. 5:21). The same thing is true of a number of the examples of "advantage or disadvantage" already given, like. Ro. 6:10; 14:4, etc. Cf. also **μέλει τῷ θεῷ** (1 Cor. 9:9). See **ἕν σοι λείπει** (Lu. 18:22), but **ἕν σε ὑστερεῖ** (Mk. 10:21).

5. *Possession.* The Greek, like the Latin, may use the dative for the idea of possession. Thus **οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος** (Lu. 2:7), **οὐκ ἔστιν σοι μερίς** (Ac. 8:21), **ὑμῖν ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία** (Ae. 2:39), **τίνι ἔσται** (Lu. 12:20), **εἰσὶν ἡμῖν τέσσαρες ἄνδρες** (Ac. 21:23), **ἔστιν συνήθεια ὑμῖν** (Jo. 18:39), **ἐὰν γένηταί τινι ἀνθρώπῳ ἑκατὸν πρόβατα** (Mt. 18:12). The idiom is extended even to examples like **οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο** (Mt. 16:22), **ἔσται χαρά σοι** (Lu. 1:14). Cf. Ac. 2:43; Lu. 9:38. This is a frequent idiom in the ancient Greek and a perfectly natural one. This predicative dative at bottom is just like the usual dative.

6. *Infinitive as Final Dative.* Giles[2] calls attention to the in-

[1] But note Mt.10:32 **ἐν**, and **ὁμολογῶ ἐν αὐτῷ** in Lu. 12 : 8. [2] Man., p. 327.

finitive as a final dative. This was the original use of the dative in –αι, the expression of purpose. So ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ (Mt. 2:2). Here we have the dative form and the dative of purpose. Cf. the old English "for to worship." This dative form continued, however, when the case of the infinitive was no longer dative.

7. *The Dative of the Agent.* It was discussed under the instrumental and there is nothing new to be said here. The one clear example is found in Lu. 23:15. But not very different is the idiom in Mt. 6:1 (πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς) and 23:5. Cf. also 2 Pet. 3:14.

8. *The Dative because of the Preposition*. We have already had examples of this. Compound verbs often have the dative where the *simplex* verb does not. The case is due to the total idea of the compound verb. The dative occurs with ἀνατί θεμαι in Ac. 25:14; Gal. 2:2. So[1] with ἀντί, as ᾧ ἀντίστητε (1 Pet. 5:9), ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι (Jo. 19:12), ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ (Lu. 13:17), τῷ ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε (Ac. 7:51). Ἀπό in ἀποτάσσομαι goes with the dative (Mk. 6:46). The same thing is sometimes true of ἐν, as ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ (Mk. 15:20), ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς (Mk. 10:27). Sometimes with ἀντι– we have πρός, as with ἐν we find ἐν or πρός after the verb. With ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ (Mk. 6:19) we must supply θυμόν or some such word. Εἰς and ἐπί usually have a preposition after the compound verb, except that compounds of ἐπί often have the indirect object in the dative (especially ἐπιτίθημι). But compare ἐπιτάσσω and ἐπιτιμάω above. Cf. ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς (Lu. 2:9), but ἐπί repeated (Lu. 21:34). With παρά we note παρέχω and παρίστημι with indirect object. In παρέστησαν αὐτῷ (Ac. 9:39) we can see either the dative or the locative. Cf. παρεδρεύειν (1 Cor. 9:13). In 2 Pet. 1:9 we may have the possessive dative with πάρεστιν. With περί again there is doubt as between the locative and dative in περίκειμαι (Heb. 12:1), περιπείρειν (1 Tim. 6:10), περιπίπτω (Lu. 10:30). Πρός with προστίθημι has the indirect object in the dative (Mt. 6:33), but with προσέρχομαι the dative directly as with ὄρει (Heb. 12:18, 22). With προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lu. 17:3) the object νοῦν has to be supplied, but this is not the case with προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ (Ac. 2:42), nor with ᾧ προσεκλίθη (Ac. 5:36), nor with προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ (Mk. 5:33) nor with προσεφώνει αὐτοῖς (Ac. 22:2). With προσκυλίω (Mt. 27:60) the dative is merely the indirect object, but note ἐπί in Mk. 15:46. Compounds of ὑπό likewise generally have the dative, as

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 116.

ὑπακούω (Mt. 8:27), **ὑπάρχω** (Lu. 12:15), **ὑποτάσσω** (Lu. 10:17), **ὑποτίθεμαι** (1 Tim. 4:6).

(h) AMBIGUOUS EXAMPLES. Sometimes it is not easy to decide whether the case is locative, instrumental or dative. The example in Ac. 2:33, **ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ**, has already been cited. This may mean 'to lift up to the right hand,' 'at the right hand' or 'by the right hand.' Cf. also Ro. 8:24; Jo. 21:8. But it is not often that there is any serious difficulty in the matter. In 2 Cor. 11:1, **ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρόν τι ἀφροσύνης**, note ablative, accusative, genitive. And, if some cases remain, as with the genitive and ablative, that cannot be finally settled, the matter must simply remain in abeyance. It so happens that in Lu. 8:29f. we have all eight cases used if **πολλοῖς χρόνοις** be here locative and not instrumental. It may serve as a good exercise to discriminate in this passage each of the cases and explain the distinctive meaning and the result in this special context. The cases have kept us for a good while, but the subject is second to none in importance in Greek syntax. Nowhere has, comparative philology shed more light than in the explanation according to historical science of the growth and meaning of the Greek cases.

CHAPTER XII

ADVERBS (**᾽ΕΠΙΡΡΗΜΑΤΑ**)

I. Special Difficulties. See chapter VII (Declensions) for discussion of the origin, formation and history of adverbs. The matter will come up again in chapter XIII (Prepositions) where the so-called "improper" prepositions are treated. Brugmann[1] has no syntactical handling of the subject, though Delbruck[2] gives an exhaustive presentation of the matter. But even Delbruck gives less than a page to the purely syntactical phases of the adverb (p. 643), whereas Winer[3] treats the adverb only under syntax.

(a) NATURE OF THE ADVERB. The first difficulty is in deciding what is an adverb. As shown in chapter VII, the adverb not only has great variety in its origin, but also wide expansion in its use. In simple truth a large portion of the "parts of speech" are adverbs. Brugmann[4] pointedly says that it is not possible to draw a sharp line between adverb, particle and preposition. The development of adverb into preposition, conjunction, intensive particle and even interjection was illustrated in chapter VII with perhaps sufficient fulness. To this list may be added the negative particles which are really adverbs. In particular in the Sanskrit is there difficulty in the treatment of preposition and conjunction as distinct from adverb, since the indeclinable words were less distinctly divided.[5] But this vagueness applies to other members of the Indo-Germanic group.[6] In Greek and Latin no distinct line can be drawn between adverbs and prepositions.[7]

(b) THE NARROWER SENSE OF ADVERB. These wider and more specialized forms of the adverb must be dropped out of view

[1] Griech. Gr., pp. 250-257.
[2] Vergl. Synt., I, pp. 535-643. [3] W.-Th., pp. 462-473.
[4] Griech. Gr., p. 250. On final s in adv. see Fraser, Cl. Quarterly, 1908, p. 265.
[5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 403.
[6] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 536. [7] Giles, Man., p. 341.

before we can do anything with the mere adverb which is not preposition, conjunction, particle nor interjection. There is a good deal that needs to be said concerning the syntax of the mere adverb, for, in spite of its being a fixed case-form, it has a varied and interesting usage in the Greek sentence. The adverb has been treated by the grammars as a sort of printer's devil in the sentence. It has been given the bone that was left for the dog, if it was left.

II. Adverbs with Verbs.

(a) COMMONEST USE. This is indeed the etymology of the word and the most frequent use of the pure adverb. But one cannot say that this was the original use, as the name ἐπίρρημα might suggest. The truth is that the adverb has such a varied origin that it is difficult to make a general remark on the subject that will be true. Only this may be said, that some adverbs began to be used with verbs, some with adjectives, some absolutely, etc. At first they were not regarded as strictly adverbs, but were used progressively so (cf. χάριν) until with most the earlier non-adverbial uses ceased.

(b) N. T. USAGE. Winer[1] suspects that the N. T. writers did not understand the finer shades of meaning in the Greek adverbs, but this is true only from the point of view of the Attic literary style and applies to the vernacular **κοινή** in general. But he is wholly right in insisting on the necessity of adverbs for precise definition in language. The grammarians find offence[2] in the adverbs of the **κοινή** as in other portions of the vocabulary. Some of the "poetic" adverbs in Winer's list are at home in the papyri as in the N. T., like εὐαρέστως. A few examples will suffice for the normal usage in the N. T. See the majestic roll of the adverbs in. Heb. 1:1, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι. Cf. σπουδαιοτέρως (Ph. 2:28), περισσοτέρως and τάχειον (Heb. 13:19), περαιτέρω (Ac. 19: 39) as examples of comparison.

(c) PREDICATIVE USES WITH γίνομαι AND εἰμί. There is nothing out of the way in the adverb with γίνομαι in 1 Th. 2:10, ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοις πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν. Here the verb is not a mere copula. Indeed εἰμί appears with the adverb also when it has verbal force. Thus καθὼς ἀληθῶς ἐστίν (1 Th. 2: 13) is not equivalent to καθῶς ἀληθές ἐστιν. Cf. καθὼς ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Eph. 4:21). So also ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν (Mt. 1:18), εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Mt. 19:10), τὸ οὕτως εἶναι (1 Cor. 7:26). Cf. 1 Cor. 7:7. The adverb in all these instances is different from the adjective. Cf. τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως (Ro. 9:20) for

[1] W.-Th., p. 462. [2] Ib., p. 463.

a similar predicate use of the adverb. Cf. also **οὕτως πεσών** and **ὄντως ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστίν** (1 Cor. 14:25) and **ἀληθῶς** in Mt. 14:33. In Ph. 4:5, 6 **ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς,** the copula **ἐστίν** is to be supplied and here the adverb is not far from the adjective idea. Cf. also **πόρρω ὄντος** (Lu. 14:32), **μακράν** (Mk. 12:34), **ἴσα** (Ph. 2:6).

(d) WITH **Ἔχω**. It has some idiomatic constructions with the adverb that are difficult from the English point of view. Thus **τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας** (Mt. 14:35), and with the instrumental case in Mk. 1:34. Cf. Lu. 7:2. In English we prefer the predicate adjective with have (He has it bad), whereas the Greek likes the adverb with **ἔχω.** So **ἐσχάτως ἔχει** (Mk. 5:23) and in Jo. 4:52 **κομψότερον ἔσχεν** the comparative adverb. One must be willing for the Greek to have his standpoint. Cf. **οὕτως ἔχει** in Ac. 7:1 and **πόρρω ἀπέχει** (Mk. 7:6). **Πῶς ἔχουσιν** (Ac. 15:36) needs no comment. It is a common enough Greek idiom. Cf. **βαρέως ἔχουσα**, P.Br.M. 42 (B.C. 168).

(e) WITH PARTICIPLES. **Ἅμα ἐλίζων** (Ac. 24:26) belongs to the discussion of participles. But one may note here **ἤδη τεθνηκότα** (Jo. 19:33) and **ὡς μέλλοντας** (Ac. 23:15). Cf. also the use of **ἤδη** with **παρῆλθεν** (Mt. 14:15), a matter that concerns the aorist tense. But note both **νῦν** and **ἤδη** with **ἐστίν** in 1 Jo. 4:3.

(f) LOOSE RELATION TO THE VERB or any other part of the sentence. So **ἀκμήν** (cf. **ἔτι**) in Mt. 15:16 and **τὴν ἀρχήν** in Jo. 8:25, for this accusative is really adverbial. Cf. also **τὸ λοιπόν** (Ph. 3:1), **τούνατίον** (Gal. 2:7).

III. Adverbs Used with Other Adverbs. There is, to be sure, nothing unusual about this either in Greek or any other tongue. So **πολύ μᾶλλον** (Heb. 12:9), **μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον** (Ph. 1:23), **μᾶλλον περισσότερον** (Mk. 7:36) are merely normal uses barring the double comparative in the two examples which, however, have their own explanation. The compound adverbs, which are common in the N. T. (as **ὑπερπερισσῶς**, Mk. 7:37; cf. **πολυτρόπως** in Heb. 1:1), call for no more explanation than other compound words. Cf. **καθόλου** (Ac. 4:18). The Greek, like the German, easily makes compound words, and the tendency to long compound words grows with the history of language. See **ἀπερισπάστως** in 1 Cor. 7:35. For compound adverbs see chapter VII, (c) . For the comparison of adverbs see ib., (e) .

IV. Adverbs with Adjectives. A typical illustration is found in 1 Tim. 3:16, **ὁμολογουμένως μέγα.** So **οὕτω μέγας** in Rev. 16:18. The instances are not very numerous in the N. T., since indeed, especially in the Gospels, the adjective is not excessively abundant.

In Ac. 24:25, **τὸ νῦν ἔχον,** the participle being both verb and adjective, causes no difficulty. In Ac. 23:20, **ὡς μέλλων τι ἀκριβέστερον πυνθάνεσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ**, we have the adverbial use of **τι** as well as **ἀκριβέστερον**. Cf. **ἀπερισπάστως** with **εὐπάρεδρον** in 1 Cor. 7:35.

V. Adverbs with Substantives. Here indeed one may recall that the substantive as well as the adjective gives a basis for this idiom (cf. Jordan River). **Νῦν** is a typical example in the N. T. Thus we find **ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ** (Ro. 3:26), **τῇ νῦν ʼΙερουσαλήμ** (Gal. 4:25), **ζωῆς τῆς νῦν** (1 Tim. 4:8), **τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα** (2 Tim. 4:10). Here indeed the adverb has virtually the force of the adjective, just as the substantive in this descriptive sense gave rise to the adjective. The English can use the same idiom as "the now time," though this particular phrase is awkward. The Greek has so much elasticity in the matter because of the article which gives it a great advantage over the Latin.[1] Cf. also **ἡ δὲ ὄντως χήρα** (1 Tim. 5:5), **ἡ δὲ ἄνω ʼΙερουσαλήμ** (Gal. 4:26), **τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως** (Phi 3:14), **ὁ τότε κόσμος** (2 Pet. 3:6).

VI. **Adverbs Treated as Substantives**.[2] The very adverbs named above may be here appealed to. It is especially true of words of place and time. Thus **ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί** (Jo. 8:23), **τὸ ναί** (2 Cor. 1:17), **τὰ ἄνω** (Col. 3:1 f.), **τά νῦν** (Ac. 5:38), **ἕως τοῦ νῦν** (Mk. 13:19), **ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν** (Lu. 1:48) and often. Cf. **τοῖς ἐκεῖ**, (Mt. 26:71), **τὰ ὧδε** (Col. 4:9). So **πλησίον** always in the N. T. save once as preposition with genitive (Jo. 4:5). It usually has the article (Mt. 5:43), but may be used without it in the nominative case (Lu. 10:29). A striking instance of the adverb treated as substantive appears in **χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτός** (2 Cor. 11:28). Other examples of the adverb with the article are **ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο** (Ro. 1:13), **ἐκ τῶν κάτω** (Jo. 8:23), **εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω** (Mk. 13:16), **τοὺς ἔξω** (1 Cor. 5:12), **τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν** (Lu. 11:40), **εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν** (Lu. 19:4). In **τοῖς μακράν** and **τοῖς ἐγγύς** (Eph. 2:17) the adverb is rather adjectival in idea. In **τῇ ἑξῆς** (Ac. 21:1) we have to supply, of course, **ἡμέρᾳ**, though the text of Lu. 7:11 reads **ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς.** Here the adverb is treated rather as an adjective, but the point of distinction between the use as substantive and adjective is not always clear. Cf. also **ἡ αὔριον** (Mt. 6:34), **περὶ τῆς σήμερον** (Ac. 19:40). But it is not merely when the adverb has the article that it is treated as a substantive. Prepositions are used with adverbs without any article. Then it is not always clear whether we have two words or one. Thus editors print **ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνα** as well as **ὑπερέκεινα** (2 Cor. 10:16), **ὑπερ ἐκ περισσοῦ** as well as **ὑπερεκ-**

[1] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 798. [2] Cf. K.-G., I, p. 551.

περισσοῦ (Eph. 3:20), ὑπὲρ λίαν as well as ὑπερλίαν (2 Cor. 11:5). Cf. ἔπειτα, ἐπάνω, ἐφάπαξ, and ἕως ἄρτι in 1 Cor. 15:6. Thus ἀπὸ πέρυσι (2 Cor. 9:2), ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω (Mk. 15:38), ἀπ' ἄρτι (Mt. 23:39), ἀπὸ μακρόθεν (Mt. 27:55), ἀπὸ πρωί (Ac. 28:23), ἅμα πρωί (Mt. 20:1), ἕως ἄρτι (Mt. 11:12), ἕως τρίς (Lu. 22:34), ἕως ἑπτάκις (Mt. 18:21 f.), ἕως ἔξω (Ac. 21:5), ἕως ἔσω (Mk. 14:54), ἕως πότε (Mt. 17:17), ἕως ὧδε (Lu. 23:5), etc. For this doubling of adverbs see ἐκτὸς εἰ μή (1 Cor. 14:5) in the realm of conjunctions. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 99) finds in the papyri ἐκ τότε, O.P. 486 (ii/A.D.), and note ἀπὸ πέρυσι, (Deissmann, *B. S.*, p. 221).

VII. The Pregnant Use of Adverbs. Just as the prepositions ἐν and εἰς are used each with verbs of rest and motion (and παρά, with locative or accusative), so adverbs show the same absence of minute uniformity. **Ποί**, for instance, is absent from both the LXX and the N. T., as is ὅποι. Instead we find ποῦ ὑπάγει (Jo. 3:8) and ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω (Jo. 13:33), but πόθεν ἔρχεται (Jo. 3:8) and ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον (Mt. 12:44). So also ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ (Jo. 18:3) like our "come here." But on the other hand in Ac. 22:5, ἄξων καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας, the usual word would be ἐκεῖ. But ἐκεῖσε is regular in Ac. 21:3. Winer[1] calls this an "abuse" of language, which putting it rather too strongly, since it is found in the best Greek. It is largely a matter of usage, for with ὧδε and ἐνθάδε the ideas of *hic* and *huc* had long coalesced, while ἐξωθεν, ἔσωθεν, κάτω mean both 'without' (Mt. 23:27) and 'from without' (Mk. 7:18), 'within' (Mt. 7:15) and 'from within' (Mk. 7:23), 'below' (Mt. 4:6) and 'from below' (Jo. 8:23). Cf. μετάβα ἔνθεν ἐκεῖ. (Mt. 17:20) and ἔνθεν--ἐκεῖθεν (Lu. 16:26). In Mt. 25:24, 26, συνάγων ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας, we have ἐκεῖθεν οὗ merged into ὅθεν by attraction. In οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας (Heb. 13:24) it is uncertain what standpoint the writer takes. With ἐκ we have not only the normal idiom like τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς (Ro. 4:12) and οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας (Ph. 4:22), but the pregnant use where Ev could have occurred. Thus ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας (Mt. 24:17) with which compare ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν (Mk. 13:16, ἐν in Mt. 24:18). Cf. ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ in Lu. 11:13, though some MSS.[2] do not have the second ὁ. The correlation of adverbs belongs to the chapter on Pronouns.

VIII. Adverbs as Marks of Style. Thus ἄρτι is not found in Mark, Luke, James, Jude nor Hebrews, though fairly often in Matthew, John and Paul. **Νῦν**, on the other hand, is frequent throughout the N. T. as a whole. Abbott[3] has an interesting dis-

[1] W.-Th., p. 472.
[2] Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 258.
[3] Joh. Cr., pp. 22 ff.

eussion of καὶ νῦν, in John and Luke. **Νυνί** is found only in Acts, Paul and Hebrews, the most literary portions of the N. T. Then again Mark has abundant use of εὐθύς, but not εὐθέως, while Matthew employs both. John uses each only three times. Abbott[1] notes that wherever Matthew uses εὐθύς it is found in the parallel part of Mark. **Εὐθέως** prevails in Luke (Gospel and Acts). Abbott insists on difference in idea in the two words, εὐθέως ('immediately'), εὐθύς ('straightway'). So in Matthew τότε is exceedingly common, while in 1 Cor. ἔπειτα is rather frequent, though the two words have different ideas. Then again ἐγγύς is more common in John than all the Synoptists together.[2] The context must often decide the exact idea of an adverb, as with ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως (Jo. 4:6). Cf. ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ (Mk. 4:36).

IX. The Adverb Distinguished from the Adjective.

(a) DIFFERENT MEANING. The adjective and the adverb often mean radically different things. Thus in Jo. 8:29, **οὐκ ἀφήκέν με μόνον**, the adjective **μόνον** means that 'he did not leave me alone.' As an adverb; if the position allowed it, it would be 'not only did he leave, but' etc., just the opposite. In 2 Tim. 4:11 **μόνος** means that Luke is *alone* with Paul. So in Lu. 24:18 **σὺ μόνος** may be contrasted with **μόνον πίστευσον**, (Lu. 8:50). The point is specially clear with πρῶτος and πρῶτον. Thus in Ac. 3:26 we have ὑμῖν πρῶτον ἀναστήσας, not ὑμῖν πρώτοις. It is not 'you as chief,' but 'the thing is done first for you.' So also Ro. 2:9 (**᾽Ιουδαίου τε** πρῶτον καὶ ῞Ελληνος). But in 1 Jo. 4:19 note **ἡμεῖς ἀγαπῶμεν, ὅτι** αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς. 'God is the first one who loves.' Cf. also ἦλθεν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον (Jo. 20:4) where John is the first one to come to the tomb. In Jo. 1:41 the MSS. vary between πρῶτος and πρῶτον (W. H.). One can but wonder here if after all πρῶτος is not the correct text with the implication that John also found his brother James. The delicate implication may have been easily overlooked by a scribe. Cf. also the difference between ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς (Mk. 7:35) and ἀνάστηθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὀρθός (Ac. 14:10). The English has a similar distinction in "feel bad" and "feel badly," "look bad" and "look badly." We use "well" in both senses. Cf. ἐδραῖος in 1 Cor. 7:37.

(b) DIFFERENCE IN GREEK AND ENGLISH IDIOM. But the Greek uses the adjective often where the English has the adverb. That is, the Greek prefers the personal connection of the adjective with the subject to the adverbial connection with the verb. So we have αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, (Mk. 4:28) and αὐτομάτη ἠνοίγη

[1] Ib., p. 20. [2] Ib., p. 19.

(Ac. 12:10). In Lu. 21:34 the same construction is found with ἐφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη. The ancient Greek idiom of the adjective rather than the locative of time appears in Ac. 28:13, δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν. So ὀρθριναί. (Lu. 24:22). The same use of the adjective rather than the adverb meets us in 1 Cor. 9:17, εἰ γὰρ ἑκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω –εἰ δὲ ἄκων, just as we see it in the ancient Greek. Cf. the Latin. *nolens volens*. See Ro. 8:20. In μέσος the Greek has an adjective that we have to use a phrase for. Thus μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει (Jo. 1:26), there stands in the midst of you.' Cf. a very different idea in ἡμέρας μέσης (Ac. 26:13), 'middle of the day.'

X. Adverbial Phrases.

(a) INCIPIENT ADVERBS. Some of these are practically adverbs, though they retain the case-inflection and may even have the article. Thus τὴν ἀρχήν, (Jo. 8:25), τὸ λοιπόν (Ph. 3:1), τουναντίον (Gal. 2:7), τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 12:16), τὸ πρότερον (Jo. 6:62), τὸ πλεῖστον (1 Cor. 14:27), τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν (Lu. 19:47), τοῦ λοιποῦ (Eph. 6:10), etc. These expressions are not technically adverbs, though adverbial in force. Cf. also the cognate instrumental like χαρᾷ χαίρει (Jo. 3:29). So O.P. 1162, 5 (iv./A.D.).

(b) PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES. These adjuncts have the substantial force of adverbs. Indeed there is little practical difference in structure between ἀπὸ πέρυσι (2 Cor. 9:2) and ὑπερλίαν (2 Cor. 11:5), ὑπεράνω (Eph. 4:10) and ἕως κάτω (Mk. 15:38). Since the uncial MSS. had no division between words, we have to depend on the judgment of the modern editor and on our own for the distinction between an adverb like παραχρῆμα (Lu. 1:64) and an adverbial phrase like παρὰ τοῦτο (1 Cor. 12:15). Cf. also ἐπέκεινα (Ac. 7:43), ὑπερέκεινα (2 Cor. 10:16), καθόλου (Ac. 4:18). In Ro. 7:13 καθ᾽ ὑπερβολήν is used with an adjective. Other examples are κατ᾽ ἰδίαν (Mt. 14:13), κατὰ μόνας (Mk. 4:10), κατὰ ἑκούσιον (Phil. 14), κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν (Heb. 10:1), ἐκ δευτέρου (Mk. 14:72), ἐκ ψυχῆς (Col. 3:23), ἐξ ἀρχῆς (Jo. 6:64), ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς (2 Th. 2:13), εἰς κενόν, (Ph. 2:16), ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (Mt. 22:16), ἐν πρώτοις (1 Cor. 15:3), ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (Ac. 17:31), ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας (Lu. 22:59), καθ᾽ ἡμέραν (Mk. 14:49), ἐν νυκτί, (1 Th. 5:2), ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ, (Ac. 26:7), ἀπὸ μέρους (Ro. 11:25), ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. 12:27. Cf. μέρος τι, 11:18), κατὰ μέρος (Heb. 9:5), ἀπὸ μιᾶς (Lu. 14:18), εἰς τὸ παντελές (Heb. 7:25). With μέσον we have quite a list, like ἀνὰ μέσον (Mt. 13:25), ἐκ μέσου (Mt. 13:49), εἰς τὸ μέσον (Mk. 6:47), διὰ μέσου (Lu. 4:30), διὰ μέσον (Lu. 17:11), εἰς τὸ μέσον (Lu. 5:19), εἰς μέσον (Mk. 14:60), κατὰ μέσον (Ac. 27:27), μέσον, (Ph. 2:15). In Mk. 14:30 adverb and phrase occur together, σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί. This is not a

complete list br any means, but it will suffice to illustrate the point under discussion. A striking example is found in 1 Cor. 12:31, καθ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι, where the adverbial phrase has practically the force of an adjective with ὁδον. Clearly, then, many of the adverbs grew out of these prepositional phrases like παραυτίκα (2 Cori 4:17), ἔκπαλαι (2 Pet. 2:3), etc. Cf. even νουν-εχῶς (Mk. 12:34).

(c) PARTICIPLES. Some participles come to be used adverbially. This is not merely true of adverbs made from participles, like ὄντως (Mk. 11:32), ὁμολογουμένως (1 Tim. 3:16), ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor. 11:23), but it also applies to τῷ ὄντι (Ro. 7:23), τὸ νῦν ἔχον (Ac. 24:25), τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6) and verbals like ἀναγκαστῶς (1 Pet. 5:2). Besides, the intensive use of the participle is adverbial in effect like εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε (Heb. 6:14). Then again a case like ψευδόμενοι (Mt. 5:11) is in point. Cf. θέλων in Col. 2:18. See also προσθεὶς εἶπεν (Lu. 19:11) which Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 258) compares with προσθεῖσα ἔτεκεν (Gen. 38:5). See chapter on Verbal Nouns.

(d) THE VERB USED ADVERBIALLY. This is, Of course, not true technically, but only in the result. The old Greek idiom with λανθάνω and φθάνω, where the participle expressed the chief idea and the verb was subordinate, occurs twice in the N. T. So ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες (Heb. 13:2) and προέφθασεν λέγων (Mt. 17:25). But it must be borne in mind that the Greek idiom is perfectly consistent in this construction, as ‘they escaped notice in entertaining,’ ‘he got the start in saying.’ Cf. λάθρᾳ elsewhere in N. T. It is not necessary Ac. 12:16, ἐπέμενεν κρούων, to take the verb as an adverb in sense. It is simply, 'he continued knocking.' The infinitive may likewise present the chief idea as in προέλαβεν μυρίσαι (Mk. 14:8), προσεθετο πέμψαι (Lu. 20:11 f.), like the Heb. לַיּוֹסֶף לִשְׁלֹחַ. But in Mk. 12:4 we have the regular Greek idiom[1] πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν. Cf. Ac. 12:3 προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν. This idiom is exceedingly common in the LXX.[2] In Lu. 6:48, ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν (‘he dug and went deep’), we have an idiom somewhat like our English vernacular "he went and dug," " he has gone and done it," etc. Cf. Ro. 10:20 ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει, Mt. 18:3 ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε. But I doubt if θέλω with the infinitive is to be taken in the N. T. either adverbially or as the mere expletive for the future tense. In Jo. 7:17 θέλῃ ποιεῖν means ‘is willing to do.’ So in Jo. 8:44, etc. The text is obscure in Col. 2:18 and

[1] W.-Th., p. 468.
[2] C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 97.

there **θέλων** may have an adverbial force. Blass[1] conceives that in Mt. 6:5, **φιλοῦσιν . . . προσεύχεσθαι**, we may translate ‘gladly pray.’ But what advantage has this over 'love to pray,' 'are fond of praying'?

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 258. Cf. W.-Th., p. 467.

CHAPTER XIII

PREPOSITIONS (**ΠΡΟΘΕΣΕΙΣ**)

I. The Name. As is often the case, so here the name describes a later development, not the original, nor the essential, idea.

(a) SOME POSTPOSITIVE. Prepositions may indeed be postpositive like the Latin *mecum*, the Greek **τούτου χάριν, τέκνων πέρι** (anastrophe). In the Turkish tongue[1] they are all postpositive. And Giles (*Manual*, p. 341) thinks that **ὀμμάτων ἄπο** is earlier than **ἀπὸ ὀμμάτων**.

(b) NOT ORIGINALLY USED WITH VERBS. Moreover, the name implies that they properly belong with verbs (*prae-verbia*, **προθέσεις**). But we now know that the use with verbs was a much later development. There are indeed in Greek no "inseparable" prepositions, which are used only in composition with verbs. In the Attic, outside of Xenophon, **σύν**, was used mainly in composition.[2] In the N. T. **ἀμφί** is found only with compound words like **ἀμφιβάλλω, ἀμφιέννυμι**. In the Sanskrit most of the verbal prefixes can be traced to adverbs with cases.[3]

(c) EXPLANATION. Hence the name must be explained. The later grammarians used the term for those adverbs which were used in composition with verbs and in connection with the cases of nouns. Both things had to be true according to this definition. But it will be seen at once that this definition is arbitrary. The use with verbs in composition was the last step, not the first, in the development. Besides, what is to be said about those adverbs that are used, not with verbs, but with cases, and no longer appear as mere adverbs? Take **ἄνευ**, for instance, with the ablative. It is not found in composition with verbs nor by itself

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 95.

[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 123, 147. Courtoz (Les Prefixes en Grec, en Lat. et en Francais, 1894, p. 51) says: "Outre les dix-huit prepositions que nous venons de passer en revue, it y a encore, en grec, quelques particules inseparabies, qui s'emploient comme prefixes dans les mots composes. Ces particules sont **ἀ, ἀρι** ou **ἐρι, δυσ, ζα** et **νη**." But these are not the "prepositions" under discussion.

[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 414.

apart from a noun. It is, of course, a preposition. The grammars call it an "improper" or adverbial preposition. It is only "improper" from the standpoint of the definition, not from that of the Greek language. The truth seems to be that by preposition one must mean a word used with cases of nouns and many of which came to be used in composition with verbs. The facts do not square with the other definition.

II. The Origin of Prepositions.

(a) ORIGINALLY ADVERBS. This is now so well recognised that it seems strange to read in Winer[1] that "prepositions e.g. often assume the nature of adverbs, and vice versa," even though he adds "that the prepositions are adverbs originally." Giles[2] puts the matter simply and clearly when he says: "Between adverbs and prepositions no distinct line can be drawn." Thus even in Homer ἀμφί περί, etc., appear still as adverbs.[3] Delbruck[4] goes a bit further and says that originally the prepositions were place-adverbs. Brugmann[5] qualifies that to "mostly," and he adds that we cannot draw a sharp line between the use as adverb and the use as pre-verb or preposition.[6]

(b) REASON FOR USE OF PREPOSITIONS. "The preposition is, therefore, only an adverb specialized to define a case-usage."[7] This definition gives the reason also. The case alone was enough at first to express the relation between words, but, as language developed, the burden on the cases grew heavier. The analytic tendency in language is responsible for the growth of prepositions.[8] The prepositions come in to help out the meaning of the case in a given context. The notion, therefore, that prepositions "govern" cases must be discarded definitely. Farrar[9] clearly perceived this point. "It is the *case* which indicates the meaning of the *preposition*, and not the preposition which gives the meaning to the case." This conception explains the use and the non-use of a preposition like ἐν, for instance, with the locative, ἀπό or παρά with the ablative, etc. In the Sanskrit the prepositions do not exist as a separate class of words, though a good many adverbs are coming to be used with the oblique cases (except the dative) to make clearer the case-idea.[10]

[1] W.-Th., p. 356.
[2] Man., etc., p. 341.
[3] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 659. Cf. Munro, Hom. Gr., p. 123.
[4] Ib., p. 659. Cf. Grundl., IV, p. 134.
[5] Griech. Gr., p. 429.
[6] lb., p. 430.
[7] Giles, Man., etc., p. 341.
[8] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 94.
[9] Ib.
[10] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 414.

(c) VARYING HISTORY. The adverbs that come to be used with the cases vary greatly in their history. Some cease to be used as adverbs, as σύν, for instance. Others continue (besides the use with cases and with verbs) to be employed occasionally as adverbs (ἀνὰ εἷς, Rev. 21:21; κατὰ εἷς, Mk. 14:19; ὕπερ ἐγώ, 2 Cor. 11:2). Some are used both with nouns, and in composition with Verbs, like **ἐν, περί** and the other seventeen "proper" classical prepositions. **᾽Αμφί** occurs only in composition. Others are not used in composition with verbs, but are no longer mere adverbs like **ἄνευ**. Others are employed both as adverb and with cases of noun's, like **ἄμα, ἔξω**, etc. Some occur both as preposition and conjunction, like **ἄχρι, μέχρι, ἕως, πλήν**. Some figure as substantive, adverb and preposition with case, like **χάριν**.

III. Growth in the Use of Prepositions.

(a) ONCE NO PREPOSITIONS. As already noted, in the Sanskrit there is no separate class of prepositions, though a number of adverbs are already coming to be used as prepositions, and verbs have some prefixes. Some adverbs in Greek are occasionally used with eases, like **ἀξίως** and the genitive, but are not prepositions. Here we see the use of prepositions started, tentatively at any rate. We may suppose a time further back in the history of the Judo-Germanic tongues when no adverbs were used with cases, when the cases stood All alone.

(b) THE PREPOSITIONS STILL USED AS ADVERBS IN HOMER. Not only do the "adverbial" prepositions have their usual freedom, but a considerable number of adverbs are found in composition with verbs. Homer marks a distinct advance over the Sanskrit in the increase of prepositions. There is in Homer a real class of prepositions. But in Homer the limitation of the preposition to cases of nouns aid composition with verbs is far from being established. **᾽Αμφί, ἐν,** etc., may be simply adverbs, ‘on both sides,’ 'inside.'[1] So common is the separation of the preposition from the verb that the term tmesis is used for it, but no strict line can be drawn between this usage and the ordinary adverb.[2]

(c) DECREASING USE AS ADVERBS AFTER HOMER. It is not common thereafter for the eighteen classical prepositions, those used in composition with verbs as well as with cases of nouns, to occur separately as adverbs. It is not common, but still possible. This list comprises **ἀμφί, ἀνα, ἀντί, ἀπό, διά, εἰς, ἐξ, ἐν, ἐπί, κατά, μετά, παρά, περί, πρό, πρός, σύν ὑπέρ, ὑπό**. Now these words were used with steady increase so that one of the marks of later

[1] Monro, Hom.. Cr., p. 123. [2] Ib., p. 124.

Greek is the abundance of compound verbs as well as the more extensive use of these prepositions with the various cases. Not only is this true, but continually new adverbs joined the already large list of adverbial prepositions employed with cases. In a word, as Blass[1] remarks, the use of a preposition with nouns was "a practice which in the course of the history of the language became more and more adopted in opposition to the employment of the simple case." The Emperor Augustus was noted for his excessive use of prepositions in his effort to speak more clearly (*quod quo facilius exprimeret,* Suetonius).[2] Other Latin writers show the same tendency.

(d) SEMITIC INFLUENCE IN N. T. The N. T. writers were once supposed to make such free use of prepositions because of the Hebrew and Aramaic. But the N. T. does not make abundant use of all the prepositions. **Ἀμφί** has dropped out entirely save in composition, and ἀνά, is nearly confined to the distributive use and ἀνὰ **μέσον**, a sort of compound preposition.[3] It occurs only 12 times, omitting the adverbial use in Rev. 21:21. **Ἀντί** appears 22 times, but as Moulton[4] explains, five of these are due to ἀνθ' ὧν. But ἀπό is very abundant in the N. T., as are **διά, εἰς, ἐκ, ἐν, ἐπί, κατά, μετά, πρός**. But **παρά, περί, πρό, σύν, ὑπέρ, ὑπό** are, like ἀνά already going the way of **ἀμφί**. Krebs has made a careful study of the prepositions in Polybius,[5] as Helbing has done for Herodotus[6] and Johannessohn for the LXX.[7] They show the same general tendency towards the increased use of some prepositions to the disuse of others. For the N. T., Moulton[8] has made a careful calculation which is worth reproducing. **Ἐν** and **εἰς** far outnumber any of the other prepositions in the N. T.[9] And **ἐν** leads **εἰς** by a good margin. Moulton takes **ἐν** as unity and finds the other N. T. prepositions ranging as follows: ἀνά .0045, **ἀντί** .008, ἀπό .24, διά .24, **εἰς** .64, **ἐκ** .34, **ἐπί** .32, **κατά** .17, **μετά** .17, **παρά** .07, **περί** .12, **πρό** .018, **πρός** .25, **σύν** .048, **ὑπέρ** .054, **ὑπό** .08. The three commonest prepositions in Herodotus 10 are **εἰς, ἐν** and **ἐπί** in this order. In Thucydides and Xenophon the order is **ἐν**,

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 121.
[2] Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 95; Egger, Gr. Comp., p. 195.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 100. [4] Ib.
[5] Die Prap. bei Polyb., 1882; cf. p. 3.
[6] Die Prap. bei Herod. und andern Hist., 1904.
[7] Johannessohn, Der Gebr. der Casus und der Prap. in der Sept., T1. I, 1910. Cf. also C. and S., p. 80 f.
[8] Prol., p. 98. [9] Ib., p. 62.
10 See Helbing, Prap. bei Herod., p. 8 f., for the facts here used.

εἰς and ἐπί. But Xenophon varies the order of frequency in his various books. In Polybius the three chief prepositions are κατά, πρός, εἰς; in Diodorus; εἰς κατά, πρός; in Dionysius ἐν ἐπί, εἰς; in Josephus (*War*) πρός, εἰς κατά, (*Ant*.) εἰς, ἐπί, πρός; in Plutarch ἐν, πρός, εἰς; in Dio Cassius ἐν εἰς, ἐπί. In the N. T. the three main ones, as seen above, are ἐν, εἰς, ἐκ, though ἐπί is not far behind ἐκ. In the literary κοινή it will be seen that the use of εἰς is nearly double that of ἐν, whereas in the N. T. its is ahead of ἐν only in Mark and Hebrews.[1] In the vernacular κοινή, ἐν makes a rather better showing. The large increase of the adverbial prepositions in the N. T., as in the κοινή, calls for special treatment a little later. It may be here remarked that they number 42, counting varying forms of the same word like ὄπισθεν, ὀπίσω.

(e) IN MODERN GREEK. The varying history of the eighteen prepositions goes still further.[2] Thus ἀντί(ς) survives in the vernacular as well as ἀπό (ἀπέ), διά (γιά), εἰς (ἐς, σέ, ’ς), μετά (μέ), κατά (κά) and ὡς. Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 100 if. The bulk of the old prepositions drop out in the mediaeval period. Their place is supplied largely by the later prepositional adverbs, as ἀνά by ἄνω, ἐξ by ἔξω, but partly also by a wider use of the remaining prepositions, as εἰς for ἐν and πρὸς, μέ for σύν. Then again all prepositions in the modern Greek use the accusative case as do other adverbs, and sometimes even with the nominative (γιὰ σοφός, 'as a sage').

In a sense then the Greek prepositions mark a cycle. They show the return of the accusative to its original frequency. They have lost the fine distinctions that the old Greek prepositions once possessed when they were used to help out the ideas of the cases. They drop out before the rise of other prepositions which more clearly exhibit the adverbial side of the preposition. The so-called improper prepositions are more sharply defined in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 107 ff.). But in the N. T. the prepositions have not gone So far in their history.

IV. Prepositions in Composition with Verbs.

(a) NOT THE MAIN FUNCTION. As has already been shown, this was not the original use of what we call prepositions, though this usage has given the name to this group of words. Besides it debars one technically from calling those numerous adverbs prepositions which are used with cases, but not used in composition with verbs. But no "inseparable" prepositions were developed

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 62.

[2] See Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 365 f., for careful comparison between anc. and mod. Gk. Cf. Hatz., Einl., p. 151.

in Greek,[1] apart from the similar use of ἀμφί already mentioned. In most dialects ἀμφί was obsolete (Buck, *Gk. Dialects,* p. 102). In modern Greek ἀνά--, παρά-- and ἐκ—(ξε) are used chiefly in composition (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 99), but ὀχ occurs with accusative.

(b) PREPOSITION ALONE. Sometimes indeed the preposition is used alone (ellipsis) and the verb has to be supplied, as in οὐκ ἔνι (Gal. 3:28) for οὐκ ἔνεστι. So ὕπερ ἐγώ in 2 Cor. 11:23. Cf. ἀλλ᾽ ἄνα ('but up!') in Homer. This ellipsis does not differ greatly from the common use of *tmesis* in Homer, where the preposition is regarded more as an adverb.

(c) INCREASING USE. The use of prepositions in composition increased with the history of the Greek language. One characteristic of the later Greek is the number of compound verbs employed.[2] This is a matter partly of impression and will remain so till one "χαλικέντερος grammarian" arrives "who will toil right through the papyri and the κοινή literature."[3] No one is anxious for that task, but Krebs[4] is able to say that verbs compounded with prepositions play a noteworthy role in the later Greek. This is not simply true of new compounds like ἐν-κακέω, etc., but there is a growing tendency to use the compounds, especially those with διά, κατά and σύν, to express what in the oldest Greek could be sufficiently indicated by the simplex."[5] The N. T. does not indeed show as lavish a use of compound verbs as does Polybius, the chief representative of the literary κοινή of his time. But these διπλᾶ belonged to the language of the people in Aristotle's time[6] and the papyri show a common use of compound verbs.[7] As compared with Polybius the N. T. makes less use of certain verbs, but the matter varies with different verbs and different Wiriters.[8]

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 123.

[2] The LXX in particular shows a great variety of uses of the prep. with verbs, partly clue to transl. from the Heb., partly to the κοινή. Cf. C. and S., p.88, for list. Cf. Johannessohn, Der Gebr. d. Casus and der Prap. in der LXX.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 118. Cf. W.-Th., p. 426.

[4] Zur Rect. der Casus in der spateren hist. Grac., III. Heft, p. 3.

[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 115. [6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 70.

[7] Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., pp. 486 ff. Kuhring (de praepositionum Graecarum in chartis Aegyptiis usu quaestiones selectae, 1906) and Rossberg (de praep. Grace. in chartis Aegypt. Ptol. aetatis usu, 1909) have both attacked the problems in the pap., as Geyer (Observationes epigraphicae de praep. Graec. forma et usu, 1880) has done for the inscr.

[8] Moulton, Prol., p. 116 f. The great work on prepositions is Tycho Mommsen's Beitr. zu der Lehre von den griech. Prap., 1895.

(d) REPETITION AFTER VERB. Sometimes the preposition is repeated afterverb, as in the older Greek. The prepositions most frequently repeated are **ἀπό, ἐξ, εἰς, ἐν, ἐπί**. This is partly because these prepositions are so common in the N. T. and partly because they emphasize the local notions of 'from,' 'in,' or 'upon,' and 'to' or 'into.' Perhaps also the preposition in composition is, a bit worn down. The papyri and inscriptions show the same repetition of the preposition, though hardly so frequently, if One may judge by his impressions. See **ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ** (Mk. 1:42). With **ἀπό** indeed Winer[1] finds that for the most part the preposition is repeated in the N. T. Thus we note also **ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν** (Mt. 9:15), **ἀφαιρεῖται ἀπ' ἐμοῦ** (Lu. 16:3, but not so in 10:42), **ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 12:58), **ἀπεθάνετε ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων** (Col. 2:20), **ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες** (Lu. 5:2), **ἀπέπεσαν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν** (Ac. 9:18), **ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν** (1 Th. 2:17), **ἀφορίσει ἀπ' ἀλλήλων** (Mt. 25:32), **ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν** (Lu. 22:41), **ἀποστρέψει ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ** (Ro. 11:26), **ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ** (Mt. 7:23), **ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ** (Lu. 13:27, but not 2:37).

Likewise **ἐκ** may be repeated as with **ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ** (Mt. 13:52), **ἐκ σοῦ ἐξελεύσεται** (Mt. 2:6), **ἐξαιρούμενος ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ** (Ac. 26:17), **ἐξελεξάμην ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου** (Jo. 15:19), **ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκόπης** (Ro. 11:24), **ἐξέπεσαν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν** (Ac. 12:7), **ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος** (Mt. 15:11), **ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου** (Ac. 19:16).

Verbs compounded with **εἰς** "uniformly repeat **εἰς**" (Winer-Thayer, p. 430). So, for instance, **εἰσήγαγον** (Lu. 22:54), **εἰσιέναι** (Ac. 3:3), **εἰσῆλθεν** (Mt. 2:21), **εἰσπορεύονται** (Mk. 1:21), **εἰσφέρεις** (Ac. 17:20), but see Ac. 28:30 (**εἰσ—πρός**).

With **ἐν** we observe the repetition in some verbs appears, though often **εἰς** occurs instead both where motion is implied and where the idea is simply that of rest (pregnant construction). As is well known, **ἐν** and **εἰς** are really the same word. Hence the rigid distinction between the two prepositions cannot be insisted on. There are two extremes about **εἰς** and **ἐν**, one to blend them entirely because of alleged Hebraism, the other to insist on complete distinction always. As a rule they are distinct, but **εἰς** frequently encroached on **ἐν**, where one has to admit the practical identity, like **εἰς οἶκόν ἐστιν** (Mk. 2:1, marg. in W. H.), **ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πτρός** (Jo. 1:18), etc. For the frequent LXX examples see Conybeare and Stock, p. 81. Still, for the sake of uniformity, only examples of **ἐν** are here given, like **ἐμβάψας ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ** (Mt. 26:23), **ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ** (Jo. 11:38), **ἐνγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς**

[1] W.-Th., p. 427.

καρδίαις (2 Cor. 3:2), ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι (2 Cor. 5:6), ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν (Ph. 2:13), ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ (Heb. 8:9), ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν (Col. 3:16), ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις (2 Pet. 2:13).

A number of verbs have ἐπί repeated, such as ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπί with accusative (Mt. 21:5), ἐπιβάλλει ἐπί with accusative (Lu. 5:36), ἐπῆρεν ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ (Jo. 13:18), ἐφαλόμενος ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς (Ac. 19:16), ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ (Lu. 1:35), ἔπιδε ἐπὶ τὰς κτλ. (Ac. 4:29) ἐπέκειτο ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ (Jo. 11:38), ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν κτλ. (Lu. 1:48), ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν (Lu. 1:12), ἐπ᾽ οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός (Ac. 8:16), ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν (1 Pet. 5:7), ἐπιτιθέασιν ἐπὶ τοὺς κτλ. (Mt. 23:4), ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν κτλ. (1 Cor. 3:12), ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ κτλ. (Eph. 2:20).

As to διά not many verbs have it repeated, but note διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων (Lu. 6:1), διεσώθησαν δι᾽ ὕδατος (1 Pet. 3:20), διέρχεται δι᾽ ἀνύδρων (Mt. 12:43), διήρχετο διὰ μέσον (Lu. 1:11).

A similar rarity as to repetition exists in the case of κατά, but we note κατηγορεῖτε κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ (Lu. 23:14), κατακαυχᾶσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας (Jas. 3:14).

Very seldom is παρά repeated as in παρελάβετε παρ᾽ ἡμῶν (1 Th. 4:1, cf. 1 Th. 2:13; 2 Th. 3:6).

Περί is repeated with more verbs than παρά. Thus περιαστράψαι περὶ ἐμέ (Ac. 22:6), περιεζωσμένοι περὶ τὰ κτλ. (Rev. 15:6), περίκειται περὶ τὸν κτλ. (Lu. 17:2), περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλήν (Lu. 10:40).

Πρό, like μετά, shows no example of repetition in the critical text, though some MSS. read προπορεύσῃ πρὸ προσώπου (for ἐνώπιον) in Lu. 1:76.

As examples of πρός repeated take προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν κτλ. (Eph. 5:31), προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς κτλ. (Mk. 7:25), προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς κτλ. (Ac. 13:36). It is seldom repeated.

As a lonely example of σύν repeated see συνεζωοποίησεν σὺν αὐτῷ (Col. 2:13).

We have no example of ὑπό repeated and but one of ὑπέρ in some MSS. (not the critical text) for Ro. 8:26 (ὑπερεντυγχάνει-ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν).

(e) DIFFERENT PREPOSITION AFTER VERB. Once more, a different preposition may be used other than the one in composition. This is, of course, true where the meaning differs radically, as in συνακολουθοῦσαι ἀπό (Lu. 23:49), but even when the prepositions do not differ very greatly. Thus εἰς frequently follows compounds of ἐν as ἐμβάντιεἰς πλοῖον (Mt. 8:23), ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν (Lu. 12:5), ἐμβαπτόμενος εἰς τὸ κτλ. (Mk. 14:20), ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὸ κτλ.

(Mt. 6:26), **ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς κτλ.** (Lu. 10:36), **ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ κτλ.** (Mt. 26:67), **ἐνεκεντρίσθης εἰς καλιέλαιον** (Ro. 11:24). here is little cause for comment here.

In general the varying of the preposition is pertinent and is to be noted. So, for instance, **ἀπό, ἐκ,** παρά. Here παρά calls attention to the fact that one is beside the place or person whence he starts; **ἀπό** merely notes the point of departure, while **ἐκ** distinctly asserts that one had been within the place or circle before departing. Cf. therefore Mt. 3:16 **ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατς** and Mk. 1:10 **ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος**. Thus **ἀπό** follows παραβαίνω in Ac. 1:25, παραλαμβάνω in 1 Cor. 11:23, παραφέρω in Mk. 14:36, and παρέρχομαι in Mt. 5:18. Verbs compounded with **ἐκ** (besides **ἐκ**) may have **ἀπό** as **ἐκκλίνω** in 1 Pet. 3:11, or παρά as **ἐξέρχομαι**, in Lu. 2:1, while **ἐκπορεύομαι** shows either **ἐκ** (Mt. 15:18), **ἀπό** (Mt. 20:29) or παρά (Jo. 15:26). So compounds of **κατά** use either **ἀπό** as **καταβαίνω** (Lu. 9:54) or **ἐκ** as *ib*. (Jo. 6:41). See further discussion under separate prepositions.

Compounds of **ἀνά** likewise are followed by **εἰς** as with **ἀναβαίνω** (Mt. 5:1), **ἀνάγω** (Lu. 2:22), **ἀναβλέπω** (Lu. 9:16), **ἀναλαμβανομαι** (Mk. 16:19), **ἀναπίπτω** (Lu. 14:10), **ἀναφέρω** (Lu. 24:51), **ἀνέρχομαι** (Gal. 1:18); or by **ἐπί** as **ἀναβαίνω** (Lu. 5:19), **ἀναβιβάζω** (Mt. 13:48), **ἀνακάμπτω** (Lu. 10:6), **ἀνακλίνομαι** (Mt. 14:19), **ἀναπίπτω** with accusative (Mt. 15:35) or genitive (Mk. 8:6). **ἀναφέρω** (1 Pet. 2:24); or by πρός as **ἀναβαίνω** (Jo. 20:17), **ἀνακάμπτω** (Mt. 2:12), **ἀναπέμπω** (Lu. 23:7). As a rule πρός refers to personal relations while **εἰς** and **ἐπί** differ in that **ἐπί** more distinctly marks the terminus. But the line cannot be drawn hard and fast between these prepositions, because **ἐπί** and πρός show a variation. Thus verbs compounded with **ἐπί** may be followed by **εἰς** as in **ἐπιβάλλω** (Mk. 4:37), **ἐπιβαίνω** (Ac. 20:18), **ἐραίρω** (Lu. 18:13), **ἐφικνέομαι** (2 Cor. 10:14). **ἐπιγράφω** is even followed by **ἐν** in Ac. 17:23. On the other hand, πρός may be followed by **ἐπί** as in **προστίθημι** (Mt. 6:27) or **ἐν** as in **προσμένω** (1 Tim. 1:3). And even **εἴσειμι** has πρός in Ac. 21:18 and **εἰσφέρω** has **ἐπί** (Lu. 12:11). **Διά**, in composition may be followed by **εἰς** as in διαβαίνω (Ac. 16: 9), πρός (Lu. 16:26) or **ἀνά** (1 Cor. 6:5), etc.

Compounds with **μετά** usually have **εἰς**, like **μεταβαίνω** (Lu. 10:7 both **ἐκ** and **εἰς), μεταλλάσσω** (Ro. 1:26), **μετανοέω** (Mt. 12:41), **μεταπέμπομαι** (Ac. 10:22), **μεταστρέφω** (Ac. 2:20), **μετασχηματίζω** (1 Cor. 4:6), **μετατίθημι** (Ac. 7:16), **μετατρέπω** (Jas. 4:9), **μετοικίζω** (Ac. 7:4). But **μεταδίδωμι** (Ro. 12:8) and **μεταλλάσσω** (Ro. 1:25) have **ἐν.**

Περιάγω is followed by **ἐν** in Mt. 4:23. As to **πρό** in Lu. 1:17 we have **προελεύσεται** followed by **ἐνώπιον**.

Verbs compounded with **σύν** may have **μετά** (cf. the displacing of **σύν** by **μετά**, in modern Greek) as in **συναίρω** (Mt. 25:19) **συλλαλῶ** (Mt. 17:3), **συμπέμπω**(2 Cor. 8:18), **συμφωνῶ** (Mt. 20:2) and even **συνκατεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἕνδεκα ἀποστόλων** (Ac. 1:26). But note **συνάγω εἰς** (Mt. 3:12), **ἐπί** (27:27) and **πρός** (Mk. 7:1), **ἐπί** (1 Cor. 11:20) and **εἰς** (11:33 f.).

For **ὑπερφορνεῖν παρά** see Ro. 12:3. Cf. **ὑπορβάλλω ἐπί** in 2 Cor. 9:14 and **ὑπεραίρομαι ἐπί** in 2 Th. 2:4.

With **ὑπό** we find a number of prepositions especially with **ὑπάγω**, as **μετά** (Mt. 5:41), **εἰς** (9:6), **ἀπό** (13:44), **πρός** (Jo. 13:3), **ἐν** (Jas. 2:16), with which compare **ὀπίσω** (Mt. 16:23) and **μεταξύ** (18:15). Cf. also **ὑποστρέφω** with **εἰς** (Lu. 1:56) and **ἐπί** (Ac. 8:28). Delicate shades of meaning will be found in all these prepositions without undue refinement. See Conybeare and Stock, p. 88, for different prepositions with verbs in the LXX.

(f) SECOND PREPOSITION NOT NECESSARY. But it is not always necessary for any preposition to follow the compound verb. Often the preposition with the verb may be followed by the case that is usual with the preposition without much regard to the verb itself. That is to say, the preposition in composition may be tantamount in result to the simple verb followed by that preposition. This is not always true, but it sometimes happens so. It is not necessary to give an exhaustive list. As examples we may note the following: **Ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ** (Mk. 3:10) with the dative may be compared with **τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε** (Gal. 5:4) with the ablative. Here the two prepositions and the cases correspond exactly. The instrumental case is illustrated by **συνχάρητέ μοι** (Lu. 15:6). Cf. also the ablative in Lu. 10:42 with **ἀφαιρεθήσεται**. As an example of the locative take **ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει** (Ac. 14:22). An example of the genitive is seen in **σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν** (Mt. 26:62. Cf. also Mt. 16:18) and of the accusative in **τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι** (Ac. 28:20) where a change of standpoint takes place, since the chain is around Paul. Cf. Heb. 12:1. In a case like **διεπορεύοντο τὰς πόλεις** (Ac. 16:4) one may either regard the accusative as loosely associated with the preposition (cf. **διὰ μέσον** in Lu. 17:11) or consider that the preposition has made an intransitive verb transitive (see next point). See ch. XI for further exx.

(g) EFFECT OF PREPOSITION ON MEANING OF THE VERB. Sometimes there is no effect at all. The preposition is merely local as in **ἐξέρχομαι**, 'go out.' The preposition may be "perfective" and

merely intensify the meaning of the verb, as in **κατεσθίω** ('eat up'), **καταδιώκω**) ('hunt down'). The preposition is sometimes weakened in idea as in **ἀποδέχομαι, ἀποκρίνομαι**. Prepositions in composition sometimes change the meaning of the verb and blend with it. A resultant meaning arises with a new construction. The use of **διά** alluded to above may be a case in point. Thus take **διαβαίνω** with accusative (Heb. 11:29), **διέρχομαι** (Lu. 19:1). The use of **διαπλέω** with the accusative in Ac. 27:5 is probably the result of the preposition in composition. See also **προάξω ὑμᾶς** in sense of 'go before' (Mt. 26:32). Cf. further **ἀποδεκατοῦν**, **μεταδίδωμι συγκλείειν**. These examples will suffice, though they could be multiplied easily.

(h) DROPPING THE PREPOSITION WITH SECOND VERB. Winer[1] denies that we have in the N. T. an instance of the old Greek idiom of using the preposition with the first verb and dropping it with the repeated verb though really retained in sense. But Moulton[2] seems to show that the N. T. does offer some examples of this construction, like the **κατῆγον, ἦγον, ἦγον**, of Euripides' *Bacchides*, 1065 (English 'pulled down, down, down,' Moulton).[3] He cites **παρέλαβον, ἔλαβον** (Jo. 1:11 f.); **προεγράφη, ἐγράφη** (Ro. 15:4); **ἐξηραύνησαν, ἐραυνῶντες** (1 Pet. 1:10 f.); **ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἐνδυσάμενοι** (2 Cor. 5:3); **ἀντιστῆναι, στῆναι** (Eph. 6:13); **κατέγαρον, ἔφαγον** (Rev. 10:10). These are certainly possible illustrations, though I have doubts about 2 Cor. 5:3 and Eph. 6:13. In Eph. 6:13 especially **στῆναι**, is stronger alone than with **ἀντί**. I do not agree that in 1 Cor. 12:2 we have an illustration in **ἤγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι**.

(i) INTENSIVE OR PERFECTIVE. There is still another very common use of the preposition in composition. It is that of mere adverb and intensifies or completes the idea of the verb. Sometimes the frequent use of the compound form tends to obscure this adverbial idea. Thus in **ἀποκρίνομαι** the force of **ἀπό** has largely faded and in **ἀποθνήσκω** it is quite obscure. Doubtless 'die off' was the original idea for the one, as 'answer back' for the other. The appeal to the original usage will explain the force of the preposition. But in most instances the idea is very clear, as in **συνκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους** (Lu. 15:6), 'calls his friends together.' This common function of the preposition in all the Indo-Germanic tongues was probably the original use with verbs. At any rate it is common enough in English, though we usually separate verb and preposition. We say "up-set" as well as "setup," but they

[1] W.-Th., p. 433. [2] Prol., p. 115, [3] Ib.

mean different things. We all see the adverbial force in "come home," "come back," "come away," etc., but it is the adverb just as truly in "fore-close," "pre-clude," etc. Indeed, prepositions when compounded are etymologically pure adverbs. The English may be compared with the Homeric Greek in the separateness of the adverb from the verb.[1] In German the compound use of the preposition is very extensive, but later Greek and Latin illustrate it abundantly.[2] The German prepositions are either inseparable or detachable. As applied to the meaning of the verb the term "perfective" is used for the force of the preposition, but it is not a very happy designation, since one is at once reminded of the perfect tense with which it has nothing to do.[3] Moulton gives a number of luminous examples such as **θνήσκω** 'to be dying,' **ἀποθανεῖν**, 'to die (off) '; **φεύγειν** 'to flee,' **διαφυγεῖν** 'to escape (flee clean through) '; **διώκω** 'to pursue,' **καταδιώκω** 'to hunt down'; **τηρεῖν** 'to watch,' **συντηρεῖν** 'to keep safe'; 'to work,' **ἐργάζεσθαι** 'to work,' **κατεργάζεσθαι** 'to work out (down to the end),' etc. The preposition in this "perfective" sense does have a bearing on the present and aorist tenses of any given verb, but that phase of the matter belongs to the discussion of the tenses. Indeed, not all of the N. T. verbs by any means show examples of this "perfective" use of the preposition. Moulton[4] notes this absence, as compared with Polybius, in the case of **ἄρχομαι, θεάομαι, θεωρέω, λογίζομαι, κινδυνεύω, μέλλω, ὀργίζομαι, πράσσω** He finds that the papyri support this "perfective" use of the preposition as between simplex and compound. N. T. illustrations are interesting. Thus **σπάομαι** (Mk. 14:47) is used of Peter's drawing his sword (note voice), but **διασπασθῇ** (Ac. 23:10) expresses the fear that Paul may be drawn in two. So **ἐργάζομαι** is a common verb for doing work (as Mk. 14:6), but **κατεργάζομαι** accents the carrying of the work through as in Ph. 2:12, and in verse 13 **ἐνεργεῖν** is used for the idea of in-working as contrasted with the out-working or development taught by **κατεργάζεσθαι**. Cf. also **μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους** (2 Th. 3:11) where the whole idea turns on **περί**, 'doing nothing but doing about' is a free rendering. The same distinction is seen between **ἐσθίω** 'to eat' (Mt. 15:2) and **κατεσθίω** 'to eat up (down)' in Lu. 20:47. Cf. also **ἔφαγον** (Mt. 6:25) and **κατέφαγον** (Mt. 13:4). As one further illustration note **ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους** (1 Cor. 13:12) and **τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην** (*ib.*). In general, on the whole subject of prepositions in composition see Delbruck, Ver-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 112.
[2] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 815.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 111.
[4] Prol., p. 116.

gleichende Syntax, I, pp. 660 ff. Cf. also Brugmann, *Griech. Gr*., p. 431 f. See also ch. XVIII for further remarks.

(j) DOUBLE COMPOUNDS. It is always interesting to note the significance of both prepositions. As noted in chapter V, Word Formation, iv, (c), these double compounds are frequent in the κοινή and so in the N. T. The point to emphasize here is that each preposition as a rule adds something to the picture. There are pictures in prepositions if one has eyes to see them. For instance, note ἀντι-παρ-ῆλθεν (Lu. 10:31 f.), συν-αντι-λάβηται (10:40. Cf. Ro. 8:26. First known in LXX, but now found in papyrus and inscriptions third century B.C. Cf. Deissmann, *Light*., p. 83), ὑπερ-εν-τυγχάνει, (Ro. 8:26), ἀντ-ανα-πληρῶ (Col. 1:24), συν-παρα-λαβεῖν (Ac. 15:37), προσ-ανα-πληρῶ, (2 Cor. 9:12), ἀντι-δια-τίθεμαι, (2 Tim. 2 : 25), etc.

V. Repetition and Variation of Prepositions. A few words are needed in general on this subject before we take up the prepositions in detail.

(a) SAME PREPOSITION WITH DIFFERENT CASES. Sometimes the same preposition is used with different cases and so with a different resultant idea. Take διά, for instance. In 1 Cor. 11:9 we have; οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴνγυναῖκα, while in verse 12 we read ἀνὴρ δια τῆς γυναικός. In Heb. 2:10 the whole point turns on the difference in case, δι᾽ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα. In Heb. 11:29 the verb with διά in composition has the accusative while διά alone has the genitive, διέβησαν τὴν ᾽Ερυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς. Cf. διὰ μέσου (Lu. 4:30) and διὰ μέσον (Lu. 17:11). But the resultant idea is here the same. ᾽Επί is a pertinent illustration. In Rev. 5:1 we find ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν and ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, while in Rev. 11:10 observe ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς. Cf. also Rev. 14: 6. So again in Mt. 19:28 note ἐπί θρόνου and ἐπὶ θρόνους and in Mt. 24:2 ἐπὶ λίθον, but λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ in Lu. 21:6. Cf. ἐπί τοῦ and ἐπὶ τὴν in Rev. 14:9. So ἐλπίζω ἐπί with dative in 1 Tim. 4:10 and accusative in 5:5. This is all in harmony with the ancient Greek idiom.

For an interesting comparison between the Synoptic and the Johannine use of prepositions and the varying cases see Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary,* pp. 357-361. The variation is especially noticeable in διά, ἐπί and παρά. The LXX shows abundant use of the preposition after verbs. Cf. Conybeare and Stock, *Selections from the LXX*, p. 87 f., and Johannessohn, *Der Gebrauch* etc. In some stereotyped formulm one notes even in modern Greek ἀπὸ καραδίας, μετὰ βίας, κατὰ διαβόλου (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 103 ff.).

(b) REPETITION WITH SEVERAL NOUNS. When several nouns are used with the same preposition the preposition is repeated rather more frequently than in the earlier Greek.[1] Winer[2] thinks that the repetition occurs only when the two or more substantives do not come easily under the same category. Within limits this is true (cf. repetition of the article), but there is rather more freedom in the later Greek on this point. In Jo. 4:23 we do have a similar idea in the phrase ἐν πνέματι κὰ ἀληθείᾳ as in ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας in Lu. 21:26 Cf. ἐν Λύστροις καὶ Ἰκονίῳ (Ac. 16:2), but in verse 1 observe καὶ εἰς Δέρβην καὶ εἰς Λύστραν, where perhaps the double conjunction plays some part. Indeed with καὶ — καί or τε — καί the preposition is commonly repeated. Thus καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ (Ac. 26:29), ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ (Ph. 1:7). With disjunctive conjunctions the repetition is usual also, as ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων (Mt. 7:16). With antithesis the repetition is the rule, as μὴ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀλλ᾽ ἐν δυνάμει (1 Cor. 2:5. Cf. also verse 4). But one cannot properly insist on any ironclad rule when he considers a case like ἀπὸ Μωυσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν (Lu. 24:27), πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον (Jo. 20: 2), ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ (1 Th. 1:5). In a comparison again the preposition is repeated, as ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς—ὥσπερ καὶ ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς (Ac. 11:15). But even with disjunctive conjunctions the preposition is not always repeated, as ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισίν (Heb. 10:28). In Ac. 26:18 ἀπό is not repeated, though εἰς occurs in one member of the sentence and ἐπί in the other. In Jo. 16:8 περί is repeated for rhetorical reasons, περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως. Cf. Eph. 6:12 where the repetition occurs without a conjunction, πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας, etc. Cf. also Jo. 17:9.

(c) REPETITION WITH THE RELATIVE. The preposition is not always repeated with the relative. Usually the classic authors did not repeat the preposition with the relative when the antecedent had it.[3] So the N. T. shows similar examples, as ἐν ἡμέραις αἷς ἐπεῖδεν (Lu. 1:25), εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι (Ac. 13:2), ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν (Ac. 13:39), etc. But the repetition is seen in such examples as εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην, εἰς ἣν (Ac. 7:4); ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας, ἀφ᾽ ἧς (Ac. 20:18). In Jo. 4:53, ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐν ᾗ the preposition occurs with the relative, but not with the antecedent. However, there is very little difference between the mere locative case and ἐν added. Especially noticeable[4] is a case where the antecedent is

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 158.
[2] W.-Th., p. 420.
[3] W.-Th., p. 422.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174.

not expressed and the relative has the preposition of the antecedent. So **περὶ ὧν** (ii, in Jo. 17:9 is equal to **περὶ τούτων οὓς δέδωκάς μοι**. Cf. **εἰς ὅν** (Jo. 6:29).

(d) CONDENSATION BY VARIATION. Once more, the variation of the preposition is a skilful way of condensing thought, each preposition adding a new idea. Paul is especially fond of this idiom. Thus in Ro. 3:22 we note **δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας**. Cf. verses 25 f. A particularly striking example is **ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα** (Ro. 11:36). Cf. also Col. 1:16 **ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα – δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται**. Cf. **ἐπί, διά, ἐν**, in Eph. 4:6. In Gal. 1:1 Paul covers source and agency in his denial of man's control of his apostleship by the use of **ἀπό** and **διά**. See Winer-Thayer, p. 418 f. Cf. also **ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου** (Mt. 1:22) for mediate and intermediate agent. One should not make the prepositions mere synonyms. Cf. **ὑπέρ** (Ro. 5:6), **ἀντί** (Mt. 20:28), and **περί** (Mt. 26:28) all used in connection with the death of Christ. They approach the subject from different angles.

VI. The Functions of Prepositions with Cases.

(a) THE CASE BEFORE PREPOSITIONS.[1] Both in time and at first in order. In the Indo-Germanic tongues at first the substantive was followed by the preposition[2] as is still seen in the Greek **ἕνεκεν, χάριν**, etc. The Greek, however, generally came to put the preposition before the substantive as with compound verbs.

(b) NOTION OF DIMENSION. The prepositions especially help express the idea of dimension and all the relations growing out of that,[3] but they come to be used in various abstract relations also. Indeed it was just the purely "local" cases (ablative, locative and instrumental) that came to lose their independent forms (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 60 f.), due partly to the increase in the use of prepositions.

(C) ORIGINAL FORCE OF THE CASE. The case retains its original force with the preposition and this fundamental case-idea must be observed. The same preposition will be used with different cases where the one difference lies in the variation in case as already noted. Take **παρά**, for instance, with the ablative, the locative or the accusative. The preposition is the same, but the case varies and the resultant idea differs radically.[4]

[1] K.-G., I, p. 448. "La preposition ne fait que confirmer, que preciser une idee exprimee par un cas employe adverbialement." Riem. and Cucuel, Synt. Grec., 1888, p. 213.

[2] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 653. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 433 f.

[3] K.-G., I, p. 451. Cf. Delbruck, Grundl. etc., p. 134.

[4] K.-G., I, p. 450.

(d) THE GROUND-MEANING OF THE PREPOSITION. This must always be taken into consideration.[1] It is quite erroneous to say that παρά, for instance, means now 'from,' now 'beside,' now 'to.' This is to confuse the resultant meaning of the preposition, case and context with the preposition itself. It is the common vice in the study of the prepositions to make this crucial error. The scientific method of studying the Greek preposition is to begin with the case-idea, add the meaning of the preposition itself, then consider the context. The result of this combination will be what one translates into English, for instance, but he translates the total idea, not the mere preposition. It is puerile to explain the Greek prepositions merely by the English or German rendering of the whole. Unfortunately the Greeks did not have the benefit of our English and German. Kuhner-Gerth[2] well observe that it is often impossible to make any translation that at all corresponds to the Greek idiom.

(e) THE OBLIQUE CASES ALONE WITH PREPOSITIONS. See also ch. XI. The vocative was obviously out of the question, and the nominative only appeared with pure adverbs like ἀνὰ εἷς (Rev. 21:21). Cf. Mk. 14:19; Ro. 12:5, καθ' εἷς. But not all the six oblique cases were used with equal freedom with prepositions. Certainly in the original Indo-Germanic tongues the dative was not used with prepositions.[3] The dative is not originally a "local" case and expresses purely personal relations. Delbruck thinks that the Greek dative did come to be used sometimes with ἐπί in Homer, ἐπὶ **Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι**.[4] Indeed some N. T. examples of ἐπί may naturally be datives like ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς (Mt. 14:14), **μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοί** (Mt. 18:26). But usually even with ἐπί the case is locative, not dative. We do have two examples of ἐγγύς with the dative, as Ac. 9:38; 27:8. Originally again the genitive was not used with prepositions,[5] but the Greek undoubtedly uses the genitive, though not a "local" case, with some prepositions like **ἀντί, διά, ἐπί.**

(f) ORIGINAL FREEDOM. That is to say, most of the prepositions could be used with ablative, locative, accusative and some with the genitive or instrumental. But the three first mentioned ('whence,' 'where,' 'whither' cases) called upon most of the prepositions. The dialect inscriptions give many proofs of this matter. Thus ἀπό and ἐξ both appear in the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects

[1] K.-G., I, p. 451. [2] Ib.
[3] Delbruck, Grundl. etc., pp. 130, 134. Cf. also Monro, Hom, Gr. p. 125.
[4] Ib., p. 130. [5] Ib., p. 134.

with the locative as well as the ablative.[1] **Ἀμφί** originally occurred with locative, accusative and genitive. The same thing was true of **ἐπί, μετά περί** and **ὑπό** (possibly with ablative, not genitive). Indeed **περί** once used the ablative also. **Παρά** and **πρός** were used with locative, accusative or ablative. It is possible indeed that **πρός** may have been used with five cases, adding true dative and true genitive to the above.[2] In the case of four cases occur (Delbruck) since it apparently used the dative also. Other prepositions once were used with two cases, as **ἀνά** and **ἐν** with locative and accusative (even the gen. with **ἐν** and **εἰς** like **εἰς ᾅδου**), whereas **κατά** seems to use accusative, genitive, ablative. **Πρό** originally had locative as well as ablative, while **ὑπέρ** had ablative (genitive?) and accusative and **διά**, accusative and genitive. **Ἀντί** has only genitive, while **σύν** has only instrumental. **Ἀμφί** still occasionally occurs in the papyri as a free preposition.

(g) NO ADEQUATE DIVISION BY CASES. It is very difficult, therefore, to make any adequate division of the prepositions by the cases. There were indeed in early Greek two with only one case, eight with two, and eight with three cases. But the point to observe is that the usage varies greatly in the course of the centuries and in different regions, not to say in the vernacular and in the literary style. Besides, each preposition had its own history and every writer his own idiosyncrasies. For the detailed comparison of the prepositions see Helbing,[3] and for the history of the cases with the prepositions see Krebs.[4] But in the Ptolemaic times prepositions are more and more used with the accusative to the corresponding disappearance of the other oblique cases.[5] In particular one must note (cf. ch. XI) the disappearance of the locative, instrumental and dative before the accusative and the genitive, until in the modern Greek **εἰς** and the accusative have superseded **ἐν** and the locative and the dative proper also. Even **σύν** and the instrumental disappear in the modern Greek vernacular before **μέ** (**μετά**) and the accusative.[6]

(h) SITUATION IN THE N. T. But in the N. T. the matter has not developed that far and the cases are not so much blurred,

[1] Delbruck, Grundl., p. 129. Cf. Hadley and Allen, pp. 252-260.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 449 f.
[3] Die Prap. bei Herod., p. 8 f. Cf. Abbott, Joh. Voc., etc., pp. 357 ff., for prep. in the Gospels.
[4] Die Prap. bei Polyb., p. 6 f.
[5] Mullach, Gr. Volg., pp. 376 ff.; Volker, Pap. Graec. Synt., p. 30.
[6] Cf. Geldart, Guide to mod. Gk., p. 247; Thumb, Handb., pp. 100ff.

though the range of the prepositions in the matter of cases is greatly limited. The seventeen "proper" prepositions (**ἀμφί**, drops out) in the N. T. use the cases as will be now shown.

1. *Those with One Case.* **Ἀνά, ἀντί, ἀπό, εἰς, ἐκ, ἐν, πρό, σύν** use only one case, eight as opposed to two in the early Greek (**ἀντί** and **σύν**). The cases used are not the same (accusative with **ἀνά** and **εἰς**; genitive with **ἀντί**; ablative with **ἀπό, ἐκ** and **πρό**; locative with **ἐν** instrumental with **σύν**), but nearly half of the prepositions have come to one case in the N. T. In the modern Greek all the prepositions occur usually with the accusative (or even the nom.). The use of the genitive (abl.) is due to literary influence. The common proper prepositions in modern Greek are **εἰς, ἀπό, μέ, γιά,** and less commonly **κατά, παρά, ἀντίς**, and in dialects **πρός** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 98). This tendency towards case simplification is well illustrated by the so-called improper prepositions which use only one case (abl., gen. or dat.), though they do not feel the movement towards the accusative.

2. *Those with Two Cases.* Five (as opposed to eight) use two cases: **διά, μετά, περί, ὑπέρ, ὑπό**. The cases used are genitive and accusative each with **διά, μετά, περί**; ablative and accusative with **ὑπέρ** and **ὑπό**. In the case of **περί** some of the examples can be explained as ablative (from around), while **ὑπό** seems, like **ὑπέρ**, to use the ablative (cf. Latin *sub*) and possibly the genitive also.

3. *Those with Three Cases*. Only four prepositions (as against eight) retain three cases: **ἐπί, κατά παρά, πρός**, unless **περί, ὑπέρ** and **ὑπό** have both ablative and genitive. **Κατά** in Mt. 8:32, **ὥρμησεν κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ**, is used with the ablative. **Πρός** indeed only has the ablative once (Ac. 27:34) and that is due to the literary influence on the N. T.[1] If **πρός** drops out, only three prepositions still use three cases, barring **περί, ὑπέρ** and **ὑπό**. Of these **παρά** is not very common (gen. 78, acc. 60, loc. 50), still less **κατά**, while **ἐπί** is still frequent (acc. 464, gen. 216, loc. 176).

4. *Possibly Four with* **ἐπί**. In the case of **ἐπί** indeed we may have to admit four cases, if there are examples of the pure dative like Mt. 18:26, **μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοί**. But at any rate **ἐπί** and **παρά** alone show the old freedom in the use of the cases.

(i) EACH PREPOSITION IN A CASE. Like other adverbs the prepositions are fixed case-forms, some of which are still apparent. Thus **ἀντί**, is in the locative case, like **ἐν(ί), ἐπί, περί.** Cf. also **προτί** (**πρός**). The forms **διαί** and **ὑπαί** occur also (datives). The old dative **παραί** occurs, while **παρά** is instrumental. So **ἀνά, διά, κατά, μετά** are

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 106.

in the instrumental case. What **ὑπό** is we do not know. But the case in which the preposition may be itself has no necessary bearing on the case with, which it is used. It is just a part of the word's own history, but still it is always worth observing.

VII. Proper Prepositions in the N. T.

(a) **Ἀνά**. The case of ἀνά is not clear. Originally it was ἄνα and may be the same as the Lesbian, Thessalian and Cyprian **ὄν.** Cf. English "on." It may be compared with the Old Persian and Gothic *ana*, the Latin and German *an*. One may compare the Greek ἄν and Sanskrit *ana*.[1] The fundamental idea seems to be "on," "upon," "along," like German *auf*, and this grows easily to "up" like ἄνω in contrast with **κατά** (**κάτω**). Homer uses the adverb ἄνα as an ellipsis to mean "up." The locative was once used with ἀνά, but in the N. T. only the accusative occurs. The distributive use may be up and down a line or series, and MSS. give **κατά** in several of these instances (a common use of **κατά** also). While ἀνά is very common in composition with verbs in the N. T. (over ten pages of examples in Moulton and Geden's Concordance), only thirteen examples of the preposition alone occur in the N. T. One of these (Lu. 9:3) is absent from W. H. (Nestle retains it), while in Rev. 21:21 (**ἀνὰ εἷς**) the word is merely adverb (cf. Homer), not preposition.[2] Of the remaining eleven instances, four are examples of **ἀνὰ μέσον** with the genitive, a sort of compound prepositional phrase with the idea of "between" (like Mt. 13:25), similar to the modern Greek ἀνάμεσα, and found in the LXX, Polybius, etc. One (1 Cor. 14:27, **ἀνὰ μέρος**, means 'in turn,'[3] while the remaining six are all examples of the distributive use, like **ἀνὰ δύο** (Lu. 10:1). The distributive use is in Xenophon. For examples in papyri and inscriptions see Radermacher, p. 15. Cf. our "analogy." In Ac. 8:30, **γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις**, the point turns on ἀνα—, but it is not clear how ἀνα— turns "know" to "read." See Ac. 10:20 **ἀναστὰς κατάβηθι** for contrast between ἀνά, and **κατά**. Abbott, *Johannine Gr.*, pp. 222 ff., argues at length to show that the one example in John (2 : 6) is distributive. **Ἀνά** does not survive in modern Greek vernacular (Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 366). In the papyri ἀνά shows some new compounds not in the N. T., like **ἀναπορεύομαι** (Mayser,

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 436; K.-G., I, p. 473. On the N. T. prep. see also Tycho Mommsen, Beitr. zu d. Lehre von d. griech. Prap. (1895).

[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 178, cites some late Gk. exx. of ἀνά, as adv. Clearly not a Hebraism. Deiss., B. S., p. 139.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 122, cites Polyb.

Gr. d. Griech. Pap., p. 486). Delbruck, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, p. 734, considers ἀνά, like ἀντί, one of the "proethnic" prepositions. It is rare in the papyri and the inscriptions (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 115). But ἀναστατοῖ με, 'he upsets me' (P. Oxy. 119, ii/iii A.D.), is strangely like Ac. 17:6; οἱ τὴν οἰκ. ἀναστατώσαντες.

(b) This preposition is in the locative case of ἄντα. Cf. Sanskrit *anti*, Latin *ante*, Lithuanian *ant,* Gothic *and*, German *ant (-ent)*, Anglo-Saxon *andlang, and-swerian* ('answer'). The root-idea is really the very word "end." Brugmann (*Griech. Gr*., p. 437) thinks it may mean "front." If so, "in front of " would be the idea of the word in the locative. Cf. *ante-room*, ἀντίος, ἀντάω (ἀπ-, ὑπ--), ἐναντίος, 'at the end' (ἀντί). Suppose two men at each end of a log facing each other. That gives the etymological picture, "face to face." The case used with it was originally the genitive and naturally so, though in modern Greek the accusative has displaced it.[1] It is obviously the real adnominal genitive and not ablative (cf. Sanskrit adverb *anti*) that we have with ἀντί and is like the genitive with the adverbs ἄντα, ἀντίον, ἀντία, and the adjective ἀντίος, etc.[2] In Homer indeed ἀντί has just begun to be used in composition with verbs so that it barely escapes the list of the "improper" prepositions.[3] Blass[4] calls it "one of the prepositions that are dying out," but as a matter of fact it survives in modern Greek. In the N. T. it is used in composition with twenty-two verbs (single compounds) and occurs twenty-two times also with nouns and pronouns. It is not therefore very flourishing in the N. T. It does not occur often in the indices to the papyri volumes, and Mayser[5] gives papyri support for some of the N. T. compounds like ἀνθομολογέω, ἀντίκειμαι, ἀντιλαμβάνομαι. It is absent from the inscriptions of Magnesia and Pergamon (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 115). In some of the compounds the original idea of the preposition comes out finely. Thus in ἀντ-οφθαλμεῖν τῷ ἀνέμῳ (Ac. 27:15) the preposition merely carries on the idea of the ὀφθαλμός. The boat could not *look* at ('eye, face to face') or face the wind. This root-idea is always present in ἀντί and is the basis from which to discuss every example. It is equally plain in a word like ἀντι-παρ-ῆλθεν (Lu. 10:31 f.). The priest and Levite passed along *on the other side of the road,* facing (ἀντί) the wounded traveller. Note ἀντι-βάλλετε in Lu. 24:17, where the two dis-

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 368. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 740.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 437; Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 126, 149 f.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 150.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gr., p. 124.
[5] Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 487.

ciples were exchanging words (casting them from one to the other as they faced each other, **ἀντί**) with one another, an intimate and vivid picture of conversation. Cf. also the contrast between **ἀντί** and **κατά ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται**, ('cleave to,' 'cling to,' 'hold one's self face to face with') **καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει** (Mt. 6:24). In the double compound **συν-αντι-λαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν** (Rom. 8:26; cf. Lu. 10:40) the fundamental meaning is obvious. The Holy Spirit lays hold of our weakness along with (**σύν**) us and carries his part of the burden facing us (**ἀντί**) as if two men were carrying a log, one at each end. Cf. **ἀντι-λαμβάνεσθαι** in Ac. 20:35. The English word "antithesis" preserves the idea also. Note **κατηντήσαμεν ἄντι-κρυς Χίου** (Ac. 20:15) where in both verb and preposition the idea of face-to-face appears. So **ἀπ-αντήσει** (Mk. 14:13), **ἀντί-περα** (Lu. 8:26), **ἐν-αντί-ον** (20:26). Now the various resultant ideas grow out of this root-idea because of different contexts. Take the notion of opposition (against). The word does not mean that in itself. The two disciples were talking in a friendly mood (**ἀντι-βάλλετε**), but if a man makes himself king he **ἀντι-λέγει τῷ Καίσαρι** (Jo. 19:12) in a hostile sense. It is the atmosphere of rivalry that gives the colour of hostility. We see it also in the word **ἀντί-χριστος** (1 Jo. 2:18) **ἀντι-πίπετε τῷ πνεύματι** (Ac. 7:51). In Lu. 21:15 three instances occur: **ἀντι-στῆναι, ἀντ-είπεῖν, ἀντι-κείμενοι**. Cf. **ἀντί-δικος** (Mt. 5:25). There is no instance of the uncompounded preposition in this sense. The idea of "in the place of " or "instead" comes where two substantives placed opposite to each other are equivalent and so may be exchanged. The majority of the N. T. examples belong here. In **ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ**, (Mt. 5:38; cf. also **ἀντὶ ὀδόντος**) there is exact equivalence like "tit for tat." So also **κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ** (Ro. 12:17; 1 Th. 5:15; 1 Pet. 3:9), **λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας** (1 Pet. 3:9). None the less does the idea of exchange (cf. **ἀντ-άλλαγμα**, Mk. 8:37) result when a fish and a snake are placed opposite each other, **ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν** (Lu. 11: 11) or one's birthright and a mess of pottage (Heb. 12:16). In Mt. 17:27, **ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ**, there is a compression of statement where the *stater* strictly corresponds to the tax due by Christ and Peter rather than to Christ and Peter themselves. But in **λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν** (Mt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45) the parallel is more exact. These important doctrinal passages teach the substitutionary conception of Christ's death, not because **ἀντί** of itself means "instead," which is not true, but because the context renders any other resultant idea out of the question. Compare also **ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων** by Paul (1 Tim. 2:6) where both **ἀντί** and **ὑπέρ** combine with **λύτρον**

in expressing this idea. Cf. ἀντί-τυπος (Heb. 9:24). In Mt. 2:22 ἀντὶ τοῦ πατρός the substitution takes the form of succession as son succeeds father on the throne. Cf. ἀνθ-ύπατος (Ac. 13:7). In Jas. 4:15 ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν the result is also substitution, the points of view being contrasted. In Heb. 12:2 the cross and the joy face each other in the mind of Jesus and he takes both, the cross in order to get the joy. The idea of exchange appears also in 1 Cor. 11:15 ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαίου. Blass[1] considers χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος (Jo. 1:16) as "peculiar," but Winer[2] rightly sees the original import of the preposition. Simcox[3] cites from Philo χάριτας νέας ἀντὶ παλαιοτέρων ἐπιδίδωσιν as clearly explaining this "remarkable" passage. But really has not too much difficulty been made of it? As the days come and go a new supply takes the place of the grace already bestowed as wave follows wave upon the shore. Grace answers (ἀντί) to grace. The remaining examples are five of ἀνθ' ὧν in the sense of 'because' ('therefore'), when two clauses or sentences correspond to each other, one the reason for the other. This is indeed classical enough (LXX also). Similar is ἀντὶ τούτου, (Eph. 5:31) where the LXX (Gen. 2:24), which Paul does not quote, has ἕνεκεν τούτου (cf. Mk. 10:7; Mt. 19:4). There is yet another idea that comes out in composition like ἀντ-ἀπο-δίδωμι (Lu. 14:14) where ἀπό has the meaning of 'back' and ἀντί of 'in return' (cf. "in turn"). Cf. ἀντ-απο-κρίνομαι (Lu. 14:6) and ἀνθ-ομολογέω (Lu. 2:38). In Col. 1:24, ἀντ-ανα-πληρόω, Paul uses ἀντί in the sense of 'in his turn' (answering over to Christ). As Christ, so Paul fills up the measure of suffering. One may remark that prepositions in composition often best show their original import.

(c) **Ἀπό**. The etymology of this preposition is very simple. We note the Sanskrit *apa*, Latin *ab*, Gothic *af*, English *of, off*. Some of the older dialects used the form ἀπύ, (Arcad., Cypr., Thess.) and the ἀπαί is to be noted.[4] We may compare ἄψ (ἀπ-ς) with Latin *aps* (*ab*; cf. **ἐκ, ἐξ**). The case of ἀπό cannot be determined, but observe ἀπαί, above. In the Arcadian and Cyprian eoni is found with the locative, but in the literary Greek only the ablative is used with ἀπό, a case in perfect harmony with the meaning of the word. The nominative ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν in Rev. 1:4 is,

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 124. [2] W.-Th., p. 364.

[3] Lang. of the N. T., p. 137. Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 225 f. The vague word ἀντίλημψις (1 Cor. 12:28) is frequent in petitions to the Ptolemies (pap.). Cf. P. Par. 26 (B.C. 163-2).

[4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 437. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, pp. 666 ff.

of course, for a theological purpose, to accent the unchangeableness of God. It is one of the most tenacious of the prepositions, being extremely frequent in the N. T. both with nouns and in composition with verbs. Jannaris[1] gives an interesting sketch of the history of **ἀπό** in the later Greek. In the modern Greek it is used with the accusative (the ablative only in set phrases). This accusative usage is found as early as Hermas.[2] **Ἐκ** finally vanished before **ἀπό** (cf. **ἐν** before **εἰς**), but in the modern Greek **ἀπό** also supplants to some extent **ἀνά, πρός,** and **ὑπό**. The explanation of **ἀπό** is somewhat complicated therefore[3] since the increase of its use is due partly to the general tendency regarding prepositions (cf. **ἀπό** with ablative instead of the "partitive genitive") and partly to its supplanting other prepositions like **ἐκ, παρά, ὑπό**.

1. *Original Significance*. It can be easily perceived in the N. T. It is clear enough in **ἀπο-κόπτω**, for instance, 'to cut *off*,' as **ἀπ-έκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὠτίον** (Jo. 18:26). Cf. **ἀπο-καλύπτω**, 'to take the veil off,' 'unveil' (cf. Mt. 10:26 for contrast between **καλύπτω** and **ἀποκαλ.**). So **ἀπο-θήκη**, 'a treasure-house for putting things away' (Mt. 3:12). Cf. **ἀπ-εδήμησεν** (Mt. 21:33) for 'a man off from home.' So **ἀπ-έβλεπεν** in Heb. 11:26 and **ἀφ-ορῶντες** in 12:2. It is needless to multiply examples from the compound words[4] like **ἀπο-χωρέω**. Moulton[5] seems right against Blass[6] in considering **ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε** (Jo. 11:18) not a real Latinism, but a mere accidental parallel to a *millibus passuum duobus*. The same idiom occurs in Jo. 21:8 and also in Rev. 14:20. It is indeed rather late Greek (Strabo, Diodorus and Plutarch), but it is not such a manifest Latinism as Jannaris[7] supposes. It is not the meaning of airs that is unusual here, but merely the position. We say ten miles off, not off ten miles. Cf. **ἀπὸ ὥρας θ'**, 'at 9 o'clock,' P. Oxy. 523 (ii/A.D.). The idea of "off " or "away from" is enough to explain the bulk of the N. T. passages. The context as a rule does not alter this simple idea. Thus **ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας** (Mt. 3:13), **ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος** (3:16), **ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν** (2:1), **βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ**, (5:29), **ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ** (6:13), **ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου**, (Lu. 24:2), **ἀπ' ἐμοῦ** (Mt. 7:23), **κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων** (Heb. 4:4), **ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης** (Mt. 9:22), **ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν** (Mt. 1:21), **ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν** (Lu. 24:31), **ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Rom. 9:3). Here the ablative case and

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 369 ff. [2] Ib., p. 373.
[3] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 137. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 369.
[4] Cf. Mayser, Gr. d. griech. Pap., p. 487. [5] Prol., p. 102.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 95. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 227, also sees Lat. influence here. [7] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 371.

the root-idea of the preposition make all clear. The question of place, time, person or abstract relations cuts very little figure in the matter. Wherever the ablative case is natural in Greek, there ἀπό may appear to make clearer the case-idea of source or separation. Conybeare and Stock (p. 84) consider the idiom ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἕως Δαυείδ (Mt. 1:17) a Hebraism. The construction is in the LXX, but there is nothing un-Greek about it. For ἀπό in expressions of time take ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας (Col. 1:9). In Mt. 7:16, ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε, the notion of source is the real idea. Cf. διελέξατο αὐτοῖς ἀπό τῶν γραφῶν, (Ac. 17:2). In Ac. 16: 33, ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν, it seems at first as if the stripes were washed from Paul and Silas and not, as here, Paul and Silas washed from the stripes. Winer[1] suggests the addition in thought of "and cleansed." Cf. καθρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ, (2 Cor. 7:1), which idiom Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 216) illustrates from the inscriptions, and on p. 227 he further cites from the inscriptions three examples of λούομαι ἀπό in illustration of Ac. 16:33. Cf. ἀπ-ενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας (Mt. 27:24). In Ac. 15:38, τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας, no difficulty should be found in the threefold use of ἀπὸ, since the Greek, unlike the English, loves to repeat words in varying relations. Here we have ἀπό in composition, with persons, with place. See Ἀθῷος ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος (Mt. 27:24). Certainly there was never any reason for thinking καθαρὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος (Ac. 20:26) a Hebraism, since it is the pure ablative idea, and the usage is continuous from Demosthenes to late Greek writers and papyri.[2] We even find πλατὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων, Pap. Par. 10, 20 (Radermacher, p. 116). The *Pastor Hermae* shows ἀπό after ἐγκαρατεύομαι, καθαρίζομαι, παύομαι, φυλάσσομαι, (Radermacher, p. 113). Many similar examples of this simple use of ἀπό occur in the N. T. Cf. the mere ablative with ἀφίστατο (Lu. 2:37) and then with ἀπό (4:13). Cf. ἀπεθάνετε ἀπό (170 (Col. 2: 20), μετανόησον ἀπό (Ac. 8:22), etc. Like other prepositions ἀπό may occur with adverbs, like ἀπὸ τότε (Mt. 4:17).

2. *Meaning 'Back.'* We see it clearly in ἀπο-δίδωμι, 'give back' (Mt. 16:27). But even here the point of view is simply changed. The giver gives *from* himself *to* the recipient. In the case of a debt or reward from the recipient's point of view he is getting *back* what was his due. This idea appears in ἀπολαμβάνω as in Lu. 6:34. A particularly good example is found in ar-

[1] W.-Th., p. 372.

[2] Deiss., B. S., p. 196, for numerous exx.; Moulton, Prol., p. 102. Cf. Kuhring, De Praep. in Usu, p. 54.

ἐχουσιν τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν (Mt. 6:2). Cf. ἀπ-έχει (Mk. 14:41). This notion of receipt in full is common ("in countless instances," Deissmann) for ἀπέχω in the ostraca, papyri and inscriptions. Cf. Deissmann, *Light fr. the Anc. East,* pp. 110 ff. Cf. τὰν τειμὰν ἀπέχω πᾶσαν (i/A.D., Delphi Inscr., Bull. de Corr. Hell., 22, p. 58), 'I have received the whole price' for the slave's manumission. Cf. ἀπέλαβεν τὰ τροφεῖα, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49). Cf. ἐξεδόμην τὴν ἀποδοχήν, P. Oxy. 1133,16 (A.D. 396). This idiom seems to be confined to composition (cf. ἀπό-κριμα, 2 Cor. 1:9) and ἀπ-αρχή (Ro. 8:23).

3. *"Translation-Hebraism"* in **φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό**. Cf. Lu. 12:4.[1] In Mt. 10:28, **φοβεῖσθε τὸν δυν.**, we have the usual accusative, and in verse 26 we even see **φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς**; but verse 28 again shows **φοβεῖσθε ἀπό**. In Lu. 12:1, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης, we have the usual ablative as above. Cf. βλέπω ἀπό in Mk. 8:15. **Ἀπό** in the LXX was used to translate the Hebrew מִן[2] but not all the examples in the LXX are necessarily pure Hebraisms, as Conybeare and Stock imply.[3] Besides, the papyri show βελέπε σατὸν ἀπὸ τῶν **Ἰουδαίων**, B.G.U. 1079 (A.D. 41), the first reference to the Jews as money-lenders. Some of the N. T. examples are merely for the so-called "partitive genitive." Thus ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα (Lu. 6:13), ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων (Jo. 21:10), ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος (Ac. 2:17), ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων (Mt. 15:27), πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος (Lu. 22:18), τίνα ἀπὸ τῶν δύο (Mt. 27:21), etc. The point is not that all these phrases occur in the older Greek, but that they are in perfect harmony with the Greek genius in the use of the ablative and in the use of ἀπό to help the ablative. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 246) cites ὦ ἀπὸ τῶν **Χριστιανῶν**, *Pelagia* (Usener, p. 28) as fairly parallel with **οὐαὶ** — ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων (Mt. 18:7). The partitive use of the ablative with ἀπό does come nearer to the realm of the genitive (cf. English *of* and the genitive), but the ablative idea is still present. One may note τὸν ἀπὸ **Κ**ελτῶν **φ**όβον in Polybius XVII, 11, 2 (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.,* p. 116). Cf. ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν (Mt. 3:4) with the old genitive of material.

4. *Comparison with* **ἐκ.** But ἀπό needs to be compared more particularly with **ἐκ** which it finally displaced save[4] in the Epirot ἀχ or ὀχ. But the two are never exactly equivalent. **Ἐκ** means 'from within' while ἀπό is merely the general starting-point. **Ἀπό** does not deny the "within-ness"; it simply does not assert it as ἐκ does. Thus in Mk. 1:10 we read ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος when

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 102.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 126.
[3] Sel., etc., p. 83.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 102.

the assertion is made by ἐκ that Jesus had been in the water (cf. κατά — εἰς, ἀνά — ἐκ in Ac. 8:38 f.). But in Mt. 3:16 we merely read ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, a form of expression that does not deny the ἐκ of Mark. The two prepositions are sometimes combined, as ἐξελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῆς (Ac. 16:18) and ἀφοριοῦσιν ἐκ μέσου (Mt. 13:49). Even with the growth in the use of ἀπό it still falls behind ἐκ in the N. T.[1] Both ἀπό and ἐκ are used of domicile or birthplace, but not in exactly the same sense.[2] Thus in Jo. 1:44 see ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ Βηθσαιδά, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου, where ἀπό corresponds closely with the German *von* and French *de* which came to be marks of nobility. So in verse 45, Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, where (in both verses) no effort is made to express the idea that they came from within Nazareth. That idea does appear in verse 46, ἐκ Ναζαρέτ. In Lu. 2:4 both airs and k are used for one's home (ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ). Indeed ἐκ in this sense in the N. T. seems confined to πολις.[3] Both appear again in Jo. 11:1. Cf. also Jo. 7:41 f., ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἀπὸ Βηθλεέμ, where the two prepositions are reversed. The Latin versions render both ἀπό and ἐκ here by α.[4] Cf. ἀπὸ Ἁριμαθαίας (Jo. 19:38). Abbott[5] is clear that John does not mean to confuse the two prepositions, but uses each in its own sense, though situ is not found in the older writers for domicile. The sense of variety, as in English, may have led to the use of now one, now the other, since at bottom either answers. So Luke in Ac. 23:34 has ἐκ ποίας ἐπαρχείας, but ἀπὸ Κιλικίας. Cf. Ac. 1:4. Blass[6] notes that outside of John the N. T. writers use ἀπό for one's country. So even Luke in Ac. 24:18, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας. The MSS. indeed vary in some instances between ἀπό and ἐκ as in Ac. 16:39 with τῆς πόλεως. Cf. MS. variation between ἀπό and παρά in Mk. 16:9. Cf. also Ac. 13:50 for ἐκ—ἀπό. In a case like of οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας (Heb. 13:24) the preposition does not determine whether the persons are still in Italy or are outside of Italy. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 237. But Deissmann (*Light*, etc., p. 186) thinks that ἀπό here means 'in,' like ἀπὸ Φμοῦ in an ostracon from Thebes, A.D. 192. Cf. τῶν ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως, P. Oxy. 38, A.D. 49. Ἀπό is also, like ἐκ (Ac. 10:45, etc.), used for members of a party in Ac. 12:1, τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, an un-Attic usage. But on the whole the two prepositions can be readily distinguished in the N. T.

5. *Comparison with* παρά. As to παρά, it suggests that one has

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 102.
[2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 227 f.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 125.
[4] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 228.
[5] Ib., p. 229.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 125.

been by the side of the one from whom he comes. In relation to God we find **ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον**, (Jo. 8:42), **παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον** (16:27), **ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες** (16:30). Cf. **πρὸς τὸν θεόν** (Jo. 1:1). It would he overrefinement to insist on a wide and radical difference here between **ἀπό, ἐκ** and **παρά**; and yet they are not exactly synonymous. In the older Greek **παρά** was the common preposition for the conscious personal departure.[1] But in N. T. **ἀπό** occurs also with persons. So **ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ** (1 Jo. 1:5), **μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν** (Gal. 3:2), **παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου** (1 Cor. 11:23). One must not, however, read too much into **ἀπό**, as in Gal. 2:12, where **τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰσκώβου** does not mean 'with the, authority of James,' though they doubtless claimed it. Cf. Mk. 15:45; 1 Th. 3:6. One doubts if we are justified in insisting on a radical distinction between **παρὰ τοῦ πατρός** (Jo. 10:18) and **ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου** (1 Cor. 11:23) save as etymology throws light on the matter.[2]

6. *Compared with* **ὑπό**. The MSS. of ancient writers,[3] as of the N. T., varied often between **ἀπό** and **ὑπό**. As instances of this variation in the N. T. take Mk. 8:31; Ac. 4:36; 10:17; Ro. 13:1. The MSS. often vary where **ἀπό** is the correct text. The use of **ἀπό** with the agent is not precisely like though one has only to compare **ἀπό** with Latin *ab* and English *of* to see how natural it is for **ἀπό** to acquire this idiom. Observe **κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου** (Ac. 20:9). So in Jas. 1:13, **ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι**, we translate 'tempted of God.' The temptation, to be sure, is presented as coming from God. Cf. also **ὁ μισθὸς ὁ ἀφυστερημένος ἀφ' ὑμῶν**, (Jas. 5:4), where the keeping back of the reward is conceived as coming from you. Cf. Ac. 4:36. In Mt. 16:21, **παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων**, 'at the hands of,' is a free rendering of the idea of agency or source. In Lu. 16:18, **ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρός**, note the repetition of **ἀπό**. This idea of removal is present in **ἰαθῆναι ἀπό** (Lu. 6:17) and in **ἐνοχλούμενοι ἀπό** (6:18) it is agency. There may be a zeugma in the last clause. In Lu. 9:22, **ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων,** we have the same construction as in 16:18 above (cf. 17:25). Cf. **ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ** (Rev. 12:6) and Ac. 2: 22 **ἀποδεδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ**. The use of **ἀπό** after substantives throws some light on this matter. Thus **τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν** (Ac. 23:21), **ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον**, (Mt. 12:38). This use of **ἀπό** after passive verbs came to be the rule in the later writers. Cf. Wilhelm, 1. G. XII. 5, 29.

But it is not alone a form of agency that **ἀπό** comes to express.

[1] W.-Th., p. 370. Cf. Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 125.
[2] Cf. W.-Th., p. 370.
[3] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 138.

It may also be used for the idea of cause, an old usage of ἀπό. For instance, take ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ὑπάγει (Mt. 13:44), ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν (14:26), οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων (18:7), κοιμωμένους ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης (Lu. 22:45), οὐκέτι ἴσχυον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους (Jo. 21:6), οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης (Ac. 22:11). Cf. further Lu. 19:3; 24:41; Ac. 12:14; 20:9; Heb. 5:7, etc. The LXX gives abundant illustration of the same idiom,[1] the causal use of ἀπό. As a matter of sound see ἐφ᾽ ὅν and ἀφ᾽ ἧς in Heb. 7:13.

(d) Διά. Delbruck[2] says: "Of the origin of διά I know nothing to say." One hesitates to proceed after that remark by the master in syntax. Still we do know something of the history of the word both in the Greek and in other Indo-Germanic tongues. The form διά may be in the instrumental case, but one must note διαί (dative) in the lyric passages of AEschylus, not to say the Thessalian δίε.[3] But there is no doubt about διά being kin to δύο, δίς. Sanskrit *dva, dvi* (cf. *trayas, tri*), *dvis*; Latin *duo, bis* (cf. Sanskrit *dvis*, Greek δίς, b= υ or υ); German *zwei*; English *two* (fem. and neut.), *twain* (masc.), *twi-ce, twi-light, be-tween, two-fold,* etc.

1. *The Root-Idea*. It is manifest in δια-κόσιοι, δισ-χίλιοι, δί-δραχμα, δι-πλοῦς (cf. ἁ-πλοῦς). The etymology of the word is 'two,' δύο, as shown in these three words as well as in δίς, δι-πλόω, all of which occur in the N. T. Thus it will be seen how persistent is the etymological force in the word. Cf. Mk. 6:37; Rev. 18:6; Mk. 5:13. See also δὶς μυριάδες (Text. Rec., δύο μ. Rev. 9:16), δί-λογος (1 Tim. 3:8), δί-στομος (Heb. 4:12), δί-ψυχος (Jas. 1:8), δί-δραχμον (Mt. 17:24), Δί-δυμος (Jo. 11:16). Cf. ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο (Mt. 27:51).

2. *'By Twos' or 'Between*.' But the preposition has advanced a step further than merely "two" to the idea of by-twain, be-tween, in two, in twain. This is the ground-meaning in actual usage. The word δι-θάλασσος originally meant 'resembling two seas' (cf. Euxine Sea, Strabo 2, 5, 22), but in the N. T. (Ac. 27:41) it apparently means lying between two seas (Thayer). The notion of *interval* (be-tween) is frequent in the N. T. both in composition and apart from composition. Thus in ἡμερῶν δια-γενομένων τινῶν (Ac. 25:13), 'some days came in *between'* (διά). Cf. δια-γνώσομαι τὰ καθ᾽ ὑμᾶς (Ac. 24:22) with Latin *di-gnosco, dis-cerno* and Greek-English *dia-gnosis* (διά-γνωσιν, Ac. 25:21). Δια-θήκη is an arrangement or covenant between two (Gal. 3:17). See δι-αιροῦν, (1 Cor. 12:11); δια-δίδωμι, (Lu. 11:22) 'divide'; οὐθὲν δι-έκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν (Ac. 15:9) where μεατξύ explains διά. Cf. διά- κρισις (Heb. 5:14), dis-

[1] C. and S., p. 83. [2] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 759.
[3] K.-B1., II, p. 250. Cf. καταί, παραί, ὑπαί.

crimination'; δια-λείπω (Lu. 7:45), 'intervals of delay'; δια-λύω (Ac. 5:36), 'dis-solve'; δια-μερίζω (Ac. 2:45), 'dis-tribute'; δια-ρήγνυμι (Lu. 8:29), 'rend asunder'; δια-σκορπίζω (Jo. 11:52), opposed to συν-άγω, 'di-sperse'; δια-σπάω (Mk. 5:4), 'rend in two'; δια-σπέρω (Ac. 8:1)—'scatter abroad'; δια-σπορά (Jo. 7:35), 'dispersion'; δια-στέλλω (Heb. 12:20), 'divide'; διά-στημα (Ac. 5:7), 'distance' or 'interval'; δια-στολή (1 Cor. 14:7), 'distinction'; δια-τίθεμαι (Lu. 22:29), 'dispose'; δια-φέρω (Ac. 27:27, Mt. 6:26), 'bear apart,' 'differ'; διά-φορος (Ro. 12:6), 'different'; δι-χάζω (Mt. 10:35), 'set at variance' ('cleave asunder'). These numerous examples ought to be sufficient to show what the real meaning of the word in itself is. A particularly noticeable instance appears in Lu. 24:51, where we have δι-έστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

The N. T. preserves this notion of interval in expressions of time and so it is hardly "peculiar only to literary style."[1] Thus in Mk. 2:1 δι' ἡμερῶν, means 'interval of days,' 'days between,' 'after some days,' though surely no one would think that διά really means 'after.' Cf. Mt. 26:61, διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν (cf. ἐν 27: 40); δι' ἐτῶν πλειόνων, Ac. 24:17; Gal. 2:1, διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν, Cf. Ac. 5:7. In Ac. 1:3, δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσεράκοντα ὀπτανόμενος, the appearance of Jesus was at intervals within the forty days. But see opposition to this idea in Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 255 f. In the phrase διὰ νυκτός (Ac. 5:19; 16:9, etc.), 'by night,' διά adds little to the genitive itself. It is the real adnominal genitive. The preposition is very common in the N. T., especially with the genitive (gen. 382, acc. 279),[2] though the accusative becomes dominant later.

3. *'Passing Between' or 'Through.'* The idea of interval between leads naturally to that of passing between two objects or parts of objects. 'Through' is thus not the original meaning of διά, but is a very common one. The case is usually the genitive, though in Homer[3] the accusative is common also, as we find it once in the N. T. (Lu. 17:11), διά μέσον σαμαρίας (cf. διὰ μέσου, 4:30), and even here note the genitive after μέσον. Some MSS. in Jo. 8:59 read also διὰ μέσου. Blass[4] wrongly calls the accusative an "inadmissible reading" in view of Homer and the growing use of the accusative in the vernacular with all prepositions (cf. modern Greek). This use of 'through' or 'thorough' is common in composition and sometimes has a "perfective" idea ('clear through') as in δια-καθαριεῖ τὴν ἅλωνα (Mt. 3:12), 'will thoroughly cleanse.' Cf. also δια-βαίνω

[1] Jann., Hist. Gr. Gk., p. 374.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 105.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 145.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 132.

(Heb. 11:29), δια-βλέπω (Mt. 7:5), δι-αγγέλλω (Lu. 9:60), δια-γρηγορέω (Lu. 9:32), δι-άγω (1 Tim. 2:2), δια-δέχομαι, (Ac. 7:45), δια-κατε-λέγχομαι (Ac. 18:28), δια-μάχομαι (Ac. 23:9), δια-μένω (Lu. 1:22), δια-νυκτεύω (Lu. 6:12), δι-ανύω (Ac. 21:7), δια-παρατριβή (1 Tim. 6:5); δια-σείω (Lu. 3:14), δια-σώζω (Lu. 7:3), δια-φυλάσσω (4:10). This sense of διά is used with words of place, time, agent or abstract word. In all of these relations the root-idea of the preposition is easily perceived. Thus in Mt. 12:43, διέρχεται δι᾽ ἀνύδρων **τόπων,** διὰ ξηρᾶς (Heb. 11:29), διὰ **τῆς Σαμαρίας** (Jo. 4:4), διὰ **πυρὸς** (1 Cor. 3:15), δι᾽ **ἐσόπτρου** (1 Cor. 13:12). Cf. Ac. 13:49; 2 Cor. 8:18. In Ro. 15:28, ἀποελεύσομαι δι᾽ **ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν**, Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 378) takes δι᾽ **ὑμῶν** to be 'through you,' i.e. 'through your city,' 'through the midst of you.' In all these examples the idiom runs just as in the older Greek. The use of διά with expressions of time was never very common and gradually was transferred[1] to **εἰς**. But some examples occur in the N. T. like δι᾽ **ὅλης νυκτός** (Lu. 5:5), which may be compared with διὰ παντὸς **τοῦ ζῆν** (Heb. 2 : 15) and the common phrase διὰ παντός (Mk. 5:5). Here the idea of through is applied to time. Rouffiac (*Recherches*, p. 29) cites διὰ **τοῦ χειμῶνος ὅλου** from inscriptions of Priene 112, 98 and 99 (i/s.c.). The agent may also be expressed by διά. This function was also performed in the ancient Greek, though, when means or instrument was meant, the instrumental case was commonly employed.[2] **Διά** is thus used with inanimate and animate objects. Here, of course, the agent is conceived as coming in between the non-attainment and the attainment of the object in view. One may compare γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς **αὐτῶν** (Ac. 15:23) with **δύο ἐπιστολὰς, διὰ Νηδύμου μίαν, διὰ Κρονίου μαχαιροφόρου μίαν,** B.U. 1079, A.D. 41 (Milligan, *Greek Pap*., p. 39). So **οὐ** θέλω διὰ **μέλανος καὶ καλάμου** σοι γράφειν (3 Jo. 13), διὰ γλώσσης (1 Cor. 14: 9), **τὰ διὰ τοῦ** σώματος (2 Cor. 5:10), διὰ **τῶν ὅπλων** (2 Cor. 6:7), **μήτε διὰ πνεύματος μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι᾽ ἐπιστολῆς** (2 Th. 2:2). In 2 Pet. 3:5 note the difference between **ἐξ ὕδατος** and **δι᾽ ὕδατος**. Abstract ideas are frequently so expressed, as **σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως** (Eph. 2:8), διὰ **θελήματος θεοῦ** (Eph. 1:1), διὰ **τοῦ εὐαγγελίου** (1 Cor. 4:15), διὰ **νόμου** (Ro. 3:27), δι᾽ **ἀποκαλύψεως** (Gal. 1:12). Cf. 1 Cor. 6:14. When διά occurs with the personal agent, he is regarded as the intermediate agent. Sometimes the immediate agent is also expressed by **ὑπό**. So **ὑπό Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου** (Mt. 1:22, etc.). Cf. also διὰ **τῆς γυναικός – ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ** (1 Cor. 11:12), where source and mediate agent are distinguished. In Gal. 1:1, ἀπ᾽ ἀνθρώπων

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 374. [2] Ib., p. 375.

δι᾽ ἀνθρώπου, Paul takes pains to deny both ideas. In 1 Cor. 8:6, ἐξ **οὗ--**δι᾽ **οὗ**, the first refers to God the Father as the source of all things and the second refers to Jesus as the mediate agent by whom all things come into existence. Cf. Col. 1:16. Indeed God himself may be regarded as source, mediate agent, and ultimate object or end, as Paul does in his noble doxology in Ro. 11:36, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα. There are other instances also where God is looked upon as the intervening cause or agent. So δι᾽ **οὗ** (Heb. 2:10; 1 Cor. 1:9). But διά is often used with Christ in regard to our relation to God (cf. Paul's use of ἐν). Thus Ro. 1:8; 5:1, etc. Cf. δι᾽ ἐμοῦ in Jo. 14:6, διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων (2 Tim. 2:2), δι᾽ ἀγγέλων (Heb. 2:2). The intermediate idea of διά appears well in 1 Cor. 3:5 διάκονοι δι᾽ ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε, Heb. 3:16 διὰ **Μ**ωυσέως, Ro. 5:5 διὰ πνεύματος. In 1 Th. 4:2, τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου **Ἰ**ησοῦ the matter seems turned round, but, as Paul was the speaker, he conceives Jesus as also making the commands. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 236, rightly argues in favour of 'through him' (not 'it ') in Jo. 1:7. It is important to note διὰ **Ἰ**ησοῦ **Χ**ριστοῦ (Eph. 1:5), pregnant with meaning. Cf. Schettler, *Die paulinische Formel "Durch Christus*," pp. 28 ff. This use of διά occurs in the papyri (Wenger, *Die Stellvertretung im Rechte der Papyri,* 1906, p. 9 f.). Christ is conceived as our representative (Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 340). It is not far from the notion of means like διὰ πίστεως to that of manner like διὰ παραβολῆς (Lu. 8:4). Indeed the two shade off into one another as δι᾽ ὁράματος (Ac. 18:9). Note also δι᾽ ἀγάπης (Gal. 5:6), δι᾽ ἐπαγγελίας (Gal. 3:18), διὰ βραχέων (Heb. 13:22), δι᾽ ὀλίγων (1 Pet. 5:12), δι᾽ ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος (1 Jo. 5:6), διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς (Ro. 2:27), διὰ προσκόμματος (14:20), διὰ δόξης (2 Cor. 3:11), δι᾽ ὑπομονῆς (Heb. 12:1), διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων (2 Cor. 2:4). Cf. Rom. 2:27. But here also the notion of between is always present. This is true even in a case like διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 12:1). Cf. also διὰ τῆς χάριτος in Ro. 12:3 with διὰ τὴν χάριν in 15:15.

4. *'Because of.*' With the accusative διά comes to be used with the idea of 'because of,' 'for the sake of,' 'on account of.' The notion of between is still present. Take Mt. 27:18, διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν. Envy is the reason that prompted the betrayal and so came in between and caused the act. The accusative (extension) is natural and helps also to distinguish this idiom from the others. For instance, in Heb. 2:10, δι᾽ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι᾽ **οὗ** τὰ πάντα**,** the two ideas are distinguished entirely by means of the

cases. One may note also διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα and διὰ τῆς γυναικός (1 Cor. 11:9, 12). Cf. διὰ τὴν χάριν above. In Ro. 8:11 the MSS. vary between διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν and διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος (MT. H., Nestle). Note also the difference between διὰ πίστεως and διὰ τῆν πάρεσιν in Ro. 3:25. Cf. also the common διὰ τὸ ὄνομα (Mt. 10:22), διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην (Eph. 2:4), διὰ τὸν λόγον (Jo. 15:3), διὰ τὸν χρόνον (Heb. 5:12). Cf. Heb. 5:14; Rev. 12:11. The personal ground is common also as in ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα (Jo. 6:57), δι' οὕς (Heb. 6:7), etc. Cf. 1 Jo. 4:9 ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ. The aim (usually expressed by ἕνεκα) may be set forth by διά also. So τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρπως διὰ τὸ σάββατον in Mk. 2:27. Cf. also δι' ἐμέ and δι' ὑμᾶς in Jo. 12:30. Cf. Mk. 13:20; Ph. 3:7. Moulton (Prol., p. 105) cites ἵνα διὰ σὲ βασιλεῦ τοῦ δικαίου τύχω and 20 (iii/B.c.), in illustration of Jo. 6:57. The Pauline phrase διὰ Ἰησοῦν (2 Cor. 4:5) is illustrated by διὰ τὸν **Κύριον** in a Berlin Museum papyrus letter (ii/A. D.) which Deissmann (*Light*, pp. 176 ff.) thinks curiously illumines the story of the Prodigal Son in Lu. 15. In the modern Greek **γιά (διά)** this notion of aim or purpose with the accusative is the usual one.[1] A common idiom in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Greek[2] is the use of διὰ τό and the infinitive in the sense of ἵνα. It is practically equivalent in the N. T. to ὅτι and the indicative and is frequent. In Jo. 2:24 f. we have both constructions parallel, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας, καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν. In the modern Greek we actually have γιὰ νά (διὰ ἵνα) with the subjunctive. Cf. English "for that." The use of διὰ τί does not differ practically from τί alone.

(e) **Ἐν**. Inasmuch as **εἰς (ἐν-ς)** is merely a later variation of ἐν[3] it will be treated after ἐν. There is an older form ἐνί (locative case), gill, and in Homer εἰνί or εἰν for metrical reasons. But some of the dialects (Arcadian, Cretan) wrote iv like the Latin in. But compare Latin *en-do*, Umbrian *en*, (Latin *inter*), German *in (ein)*, English *in (en–)*.

1. *Old Use of ἐν with Accusative or Locative.* Originally ἐν was used with either locative or accusative, not to say genitive in a case like εἰν **Ἄ**ΐδαο which Brugmann[4] does not consider mere ellipsis. He cites also ἐμποδών as being really ἐν ποδῶν. But there is no manner of doubt as to the accusative and the locative. The inscriptions of many of the dialects show abundant illustrations of ἐν

[1] Thumb, Handb., p. 104.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 374. [3] K.-G., I, p. 468.
[4] Griech. Gr., p. 439. Cf. Brug., Furze vergl. Gr., II, p. 465.

with the accusative such as the Thessalian, Boeotian, Northwest Greek, Arcadian, etc.[1] Cf. ἐν τάγμα, ἐν ὁπλίτας, etc.[2] So ἰν τὰ ἔργα,[3] etc. Indeed in Cypriote Greek ἐν usually has the accusative.[4] In North Arcadian ἐν alone appears (not ἐν-ς, εἰς) and with either locative or accusative like Latin *in*.[5] Besides in Homer we have ἐν-ῶπα, not to mention the common compound verbs like ἐμ-βάλλω, ἐμ-βαίνω, where one might look for εἰς. Cf. ἐμβάντι εἰς πλοῖον (Mt. 8:23), ὁ ἐμβάψας ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ (Mt. 26:23). This so-called pregnant use of ἐν seems very natural after all. It is only in composition that the old usage is preserved in the N. T. or a case like ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ above after a verb of motion where εἰς might at first seem more natural. Cf. Lu. 9:46; 1 Cor. 11:18; Ro. 1:25. In Ro. 1:24 ἐν occurs with παρέδωκεν, but εἰς in verse 26. Indeed (Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 130) we find ἐν with δίδωμι, ἵστημι and τίθημι. Remnants of this early usage survive in the N. T., as διδόντι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (2 Cor. 8:16), δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρί (Jo. 3:35), ἀπέθετο ἐν φυλακῇ (Mt. 14:3). Cf. the spurious verse Jo. 5:4 κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ; Par. P. 10, 2 (iii/A.D.) ἀνακεχώρηκεν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρέᾳ; Epict. (I, 11, 32) ἀνέρχῃ ἐν Ῥώμῃ; Tob. 5:5 πορευθῆναι ἐν Ῥάγοις. Cf. Blass-Debrunner, p. 131. The LXX shows similar examples. Cf. Conybeare and Stock, p. 83. But it was only by degrees that ἐν came to be associated exclusively with the locative case and εἰς with the accusative as a result of the triumph of the Ionic-Attic Greek.[6] In Homer indeed ἐν appears as an adverb.[7] In origin therefore we are not to associate ἐν primarily with the locative any more than in Latin, though ultimately that came to be true. Other examples of ἐν in composition in the N. T. with verbs of motion are ἐμβατεύω (Col. 2:18), ἐμβιβάζω (Ac. 27:6), ἐμπίπτω (Lu. 10:36 followed by εἰς). The word therefore evidently expresses the idea of 'within,' whether of rest or of motion depending on the context. Compare vernacular English, "Come in the house." Note in Ac. 26:20 that ἐν is not repeated with Ἱεροσολύμοις.

2. Ἐν *Older than* εἰς. It seems certain that originally ἐν stood alone without its, whereas in the modern Greek vernacular ἐν

[1] Ib., p. 438. [2] Meister, Die griech. Dial., Bd. I, p. 284.
[3] Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae, p. 4.
[4] Meister, Gr. Dial., Bd. II, p. 283 f.
[5] Hoffmann, Gr. Dial., Bd. II, p. 591. Boeotian also knows only ἐν with either loc. or ace. Cf. Claflin, Synt. of Boeotian Dial. Inscr., p. 56 f. Pindar shows ἐν, with acc.
[6] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 438. [7] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 147.

has entirely disappeared before εἰς which uses only the accusative.[1] There is once more unity, but not exactly on the same terms. In the Greek N. T. this process of absorption is going steadily on as in the κοινή generally. There is rarely much doubt as to the significance of ἐν, whereas εἰς has already begun to resume its old identity with ἐν, if indeed in the vernacular it ever gave, it up.[2] We may compare ἐν τῷ ἀγρῳ in Mt. 24:18 with εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν in Mk. 13:16. Cf. ἐπέσχεν χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν (Ac. 19:22), τηρεῖσθαι εἰς Καισαρίαν (25:4), εἰς οἰκόν ἐστιν (some MSS. in Mk. 2:1). Cf. Jo. 1:18.

In the N. T. ἐν is so frequent (2698 instances) that it is still the most common preposition. Indeed Moulton[3] thinks that its ultimate. disappearance is due to the fact that it had become too vague as "a maid of all work."

3. Place. The simplest use is with expressions of place, like ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ (Mt. 20:3), ἐν δεξιᾷ (Heb. 1:3), ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ (Rev. 3:21), ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ (Mt. 4:21), ἐν τῇ πόλει (Lu. 7:37), ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ (Mt. 3:6), ἐν ὕδατι (3:11), ἐν τῇ ἀμέλῳ (Jo. 15:4). Cf. also ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ (Lu. 7:17) and ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ (Jo. 8:20). For the "pregnant" construction of ἐν after verbs of motion cf. chapter XI, x, (i). Cf. examples given under 1. In these and like examples ἐν indeed adds little to the idea of the locative case which it is used to explain. See also ἐν τοῖς (Lu. 2: 49) in the sense of 'at the house of' (cf. εἰς τὰ ἴδια, Jo. 19:27) for which Moulton[4] finds abundant illustration in the papyri. Cf. ἐν τοῖς Ἀπολλωνίου, R.L. 38 2 (iii/B.C.). The preposition in itself merely states that the location is within theounds marked by the word with which it occurs. It does not mean 'near,' but 'in,' that is 'inside.' The translation of the resultant idea may be indeed *in, on, at,* according to the context, but the preposition itself retains its own idea. There is nothing strange about the metaphorical use of ἐν in expressions like ἐν βασάνοις (Lu. 16:23), ἐν τῷ θνάτῳ (1 Jo. 3:14), ἐν δόξῃ (Ph. 4:19), ἐν μυστηρίῳ (1 Cor. 2:7), etc.

4. *Expressions of Time*. Ἐν may appear rather oftener than the mere locative. Cf. ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in Jo. 6:44, but τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ in 6:54, while in 6:40 the MSS. vary. By ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις (Jo. 2:19) it is clear that Jesus meant the resurrection

[1] V. and D., Mod. Gk., p. 109 f. [2] Sirncox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 142.

[3] Prol., p. 103. In the Ptol., papyri, Rossberg (Prap., p. 8) finds 2245 examples of. iv and it is the most common preposition.

[4] Prol., p. 103. On the retreat of ἐν before εἰς see Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 380.

will take place *within* the period of three days. Cf. **τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ** (never with **ἐν** in the N. T.) in Mt. 16:21.[1] More common expressions are **ἐν σαββάτῳ** (Mt. 12:2), **ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ** (Jo. 11:9), **ἐν τῇ νυκτί** (11:10), **ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ** (Ac. 7:13), **ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς** (Lu. 8:1), **ἐν τῷ μεταξύ** (Jo. 4:31), **ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις** (Mt. 3:1), **ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ**, (1 Th. 2:19), **ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει** (Mk. 12:23), **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως** (Mt. 10:15), **ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι** (1 Cor. 15:52), etc. Cf. Lu. 1:7. Another temporal use of **ἐν** is **ἐν ᾧ** in the sense of 'while' (Mk. 2:19). Cf. also **ἐν οἷς** in Lu. 12:1. The frequent use, especially in Luke (cf. **ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέγειν**, 8:40), of **ἐν τῷ** with the infinitive calls for a word. Examples of this idiom occur in the ancient Greek (16 in Xenophon, 6 in Thucydides, 26 in Plato)[2] and the papyri show it occasionally.[3] Cf. **ἐν τῷ λογίζεσθαι** Par. P. 63 (ii/B.C.). But in the LXX it is a constant translation of בְּ and is much more abundant in the N. T. as a result of the LXX profusion.

5. *'Among*.' With plural nouns **ἐν** may have the resultant idea of 'among,' though, of course, in itself it is still 'in,' 'within.' Thus we note **ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν** (Mt. 11:11), **ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν** (Ac. 2:29), **ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς** (4:34), **ἐν ὑμῖν** (1 Pet. 5:1), **ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα** (Mt. 2:6). This is a common idiom in the ancient Greek. Not very different from this idea (cf. Latin *apud*) is the use **ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν** (Mt. 21:42), like Latin *coram*. One may note also **ἐν ὑμῖν** in 1 Cor. 6:2. Cf. **ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**, (Gal. 1:16). See also 2 Cor. 4:3; 8:1.

6. *'In the Case of,' 'in the Person of' or simply 'in.'* A frequent use is where a single case is selected as a specimen or striking illustration. Here the resultant notion is 'in the case of,' which does not differ greatly from the metaphorical use of with soul, mind, etc. Cf. Lu. 24:38. Thus with **ἀποκαλύπτω** note **ἐν ἐμοί** (Gal. 1:16), **εἰδὼς ἐν ἑαυτῷ** (Jo. 6:61), **γένηται ἐν ἐμοί** (1 Cor. 9:15), **ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται** (Lu. 23:31), **ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε** (1 Cor. 4:6), **ἐν τῇ κλάσει** (Lu. 24:35). One may note also **ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν** (1 Cor. 15:22), **ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ καταγγέλλειν** (Ac. 4:2), **ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ** (Ro. 15:16), **ἡγίασται ἐν τῇ γυναικί** (1 Cor. 7:14), etc. Paul's frequent mystical use of **ἐν κυρίῳ** (1 Cor. 9:1), **ἐν Χριστῷ** (Ro. 6:11, 23, etc.) may be compared with Jesus' own words, **μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν** (Jo. 15:4). Cf. also **ἐν τῷ**

[1] See especially Field's valuable note on this verse showing how impossible it is for the resurrection to have occurred on the fourth day. Cf. also Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 255 f.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 215. [3] Ib., p. 14. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 379.

θεῷ in Col. 3:3. The LXX usage is not quite on a par with this profound meaning in the mouth of Jesus and Paul, even if "extremely indefinite" to the non-Christian.[1] But Moulton[2] agrees with Sanday and Headlam (Ro. 6:11) that the mystic indwelling is Christ's own idea adopted by Paul. The classic discussion of the matter is, of course, Deissmann's *Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"* (1892), in which by careful study of the LXX and the N. T. he shows the depth and originality of Paul's idea in the use of **ἐν Χριστῷ**. Moulton[3] doubts if even here the N.T. writers make an innovation, but the fulness of the Christian content would amply justify them if they did have to do so. See ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (Col. 1:16). As further examples cf. Ro. 9:1; 14:14; Ph. 3:9; Eph. 4:21.

7. *As a Dative?* One may hesitate to say dogmatically that in 1 Cor. 14:11, **ὁ** λαλῶν **ἐν ἐμοὶ** βάρβαρος, we have **ἐν** used merely as the dative (cf. **εἰς** in modern Greek). But **τῷ** λαλοῦντι βάβαρος in the same verse looks that way,[4] and Moulton[5] cites **τοῖς ἐν** θεῷ **πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις** (Ju. 1) and reminds us of the common ground between the locative and dative in Sanskrit where the locative appears with verbs of speaking. Cf. also **ἐν ἐμοί** in Ph. 1:26. Note also **ἐν ἐμοὶ κύριε** in late LXX books (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 14). One may compare **ἐποίησαν ἐν** αὐτῷ (Mt. 17:12). There seems no doubt that **ὁμολογέω ἐν** (Mt. 10:32= Lu. 12:8) is due[6] to literal translation of the Aramaic. The use of **ἐν** with **ὀμνύναι** (Mt. 5:34) is similar to the Hebrew בְּ.

8. *Accompanying Circumstance*. It is needless to multiply unduly the various uses of **ἐν**, which are "innumerable" in the LXX [7] where its chief extension is due to the imitation of the Hebrew בְּ.[8] But by no means all these uses are Hebraic. Thus **ἐν** for the idea of accompanying circumstance is classical enough (cf. **ἐν ὅπλοις εἶναι**, Xen. *Anab*. 5. 9, like English "The people are up in arms"), though the LXX abounds with it. It occurs also in the papyri. Cf. Tb.P. 41 (119 B.C.). Here **ἐν** draws close to **μετά** and **σύν** in

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 131. Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 144, considers this an "extra-grammatical" point.

[2] Prol., p. 103. With this cf. **ποιέω ἐν** (Mt. 17:12; Lu. 23:31), an idiom paralleled in the LXX. Cf. **ἐξελέξατο ἐν ἐμοί** (1 Chron. 28:4), **ᾑρέτικα ἐν** αὐτῷ (1 Chron. 28:6).

[3] Prol., p. 103.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 131.

[5] Prol., p. 103.

[6] Ib., p. 104.

[7] C. and S., Sel., etc., p. 82. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 47, for the frequent use of iv of accompanying circumstance in the LXX.

[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 130.

usage. Note, for instance, ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν ὑπαντῆσαι (Lu. 14:31), ἦλθεν ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ (Ju. 14), ἐν πᾶσιν ἀναλαβόντες (Eph. 6:16), ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν (Mk. 12:38), ἔρχονται ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων (Mt. 7:15), ἐν λευκοῖς καθεζομένους (Jo. 20:12), μετεκαλέσατο—ἐν ψυχαῖς (Ac. 7:14), εἰσέρχεται ἐν αἵματι (Heb. 9:25), ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι (1 Jo. 5:6), ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω (1 Cor. 4:21), ἐν πληρώματι (Ro. 15:29), ἐν κελεύσματι (1 Th. 4:16), περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις (Rev. 3:5; cf. Mt. 11:8). Note also ἐν μυστηρίῳ λαλοῦμεν (1 Cor. 2:7) where 'in the form of ' is the idea. These examples show the freedom of the preposition in this direction. Somewhat more complicated is a passage like ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (Mk. 1:23), which Blass[1] properly compares with πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει. (Mk. 3:30), and the double use in Ro. 8:9, ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν (followed by πνεῦμα **Χριστοῦ** οὐκ ἔχει. The notion of manner is closely allied to this idiom as we see it in ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (Ac. 17:31), ἐν παρρησίᾳ (Col. 2:15), ἐν τάχει (Lu. 18:8, cf. ταχύ and ταχέως). Cf. Mt. 6:18 and Jo. 18:20.

9. *'Amounting to,' 'Occasion,' 'Sphere.'* Moulton[2] considers Mk. 4 : 8, ἔφερεν εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν (note similarity here between εἰς and ἐν), as showing that ἐν sometimes is used in the sense of 'amounting to.' Cf. also Ac. 7:14 (LXX). The idiom is present in the papyri. Moulton cites προῖκα ἐν δραχμαῖς ἐννακοσίαις, B.U. 970 (ii/A.D.), τὴν πρώτην δόσιν ἐν δραχμαῖς τεσσαράκοντα, O.P. 724 (ii/B.C.). He (Prol., p. 76) quotes Hb. P. 42 (iii/B.C.), δώσομεν ἐν ὀφειλήματι, as "predicative" use of ἐν. He compares Eph. 2:15, ἐν δόγμασιν, '*consisting in* decrees.' Certain it is that in Rev. 5:9 ἠγόρασας ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου we have price[3] indicated by ἐν. Cf. Ro. 3:25; Ac. 20:28. In a few examples ἐν gives the occasion, as ἔφυγεν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ (Ac. 7:29), ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται (Mt. 6:7), ἐν τούτῳ (Jo. 16:30). Note also λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ (Ro. 1:9) where the second ἐν suggests 'in the sphere of.' Cf. ἐν μέτρῳ (Eph. 4:16), ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι (1 Tim. 4:15), ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον (Ro. 2:12). In simple truth the only way to know the resultant meaning of ἐν is to note carefully the context. It is so simple in idea that it appears in every variety of connection.

10. *Instrumental Use of* **ἐν.** See previous discussion under Cases. Blass[4] considers it due to Hebrew influence as does Jan-

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 131. [2] Prol., p. 103.
[3] Rare and possibly Hebraistic. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 380.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 130.

naris.[1] The ancient Greek writers did use ἐν with certain verbs, as the N. T. καίω ἐν πυρί (Rev. 17:16, some MSS.), ἀποκαλύπτω ἐν πυρί (1 Cor. 3:13), ἁλίζω ἐν τίνι (Mt. 5:13), μετρέω ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ (Mt. 7:2).[2] The construction in itself is as old as Homer.[3] Cf. ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς *F*ιδέσθαι (Il. i. 587), ἐν πυρὶ καίειν (Il. xxiv. 38). It is abnormally frequent in the LXX under the influence of the Hebrew בְּ,[4] but it is not so common in the N. T. Besides, the papyri show undoubted examples of it.[5] Moulton finds Ptolemaic examples of ἐν μαχαίρῃ, Tb.P. 16 al.; διαλυόμεναι ἐν τῷ λιμῷ Par. P. 28 (ii/B.C.), while 22 has τῷ λιμῷ διαλυθῆναι and note τοὺς ἐνεσχημένους ἔν τισιν ἀγνοήμασιν, Par. P. 63 (ii/B.C.). We can only say, therefore, that the LXX accelerated the vernacular idiom in this matter. The Aramaic probably helped it on also. The blending of the instrumental with the locative in form facilitated this usage beyond a doubt,[6] and the tendency to use prepositions abundantly helped also.[7] But even so one must observe that all the N. T. examples of ἐν can be explained from the point of view of the locative. The possibility of this point of view is the reason why ἐν was so used in the beginning. I pass by examples like βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι, βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί (Mt. 3:11) as probably not being instances of the instrumental usage at all. But there are real instances enough. Take Lu. 22:49 εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ; Here the smiting can be regarded as located in the sword. To be sure, in English, we translate the resultant idea by 'with,' but ἐν in itself does not mean 'with.' That resultant idea can only come in the proper context. So ἐν τῷ Βεεζεβοὺλ ἄρχοντι τῶν διαμονίων ἐκβάλλει (Mt. 12:24). Here the casting out is located in the prince of demons. Cf. κρίνω ἐν ἀνδρί (Ac. 17:31), ἐν βραχίονι (Lu. 1:51), ἐν δόλῳ (Mk. 14:1), ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρης (Heb. 11:37). The Apocalypse has several examples, like πολεμήσω ἐν τῷ ῥομφαίᾳ (2:16), ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν θανάτῳ (6:8), ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτενεῖ (13:10). In Rev. 14:15, κράζων ἐν φωνῇ, we do not necessarily have to explain it in this manner. Cf. Ro. 2:16; 2:28; 1 Jo. 2:3; Jas. 3:9. On the whole there is little that is out of harmony with the vernacular κοινή in the N. T. use of ἐν, though Abbott[8] thinks that the ex-

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 379. But see Deiss., B. S., p. 119 f.
[2] W.-Th., p. 388.
[3] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 144.
[4] C. and S., p. 82; Thack., p. 47.
[5] Moulton, Prol., pp. 12, 61, 104, 234 f.
[6] Ib., p. 61.
[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 379.
[8] Joh. Gr., p. 256.

amples of Deissmann and Moulton do not exactly parallel the mental use. For repetition of ἐν see 2 Cor. 6:4 ff.

(f) Εἰς. There is nothing to add to the etymology of εἰς as compare that of ἐν save that εἰς is known to be really as we find it in the inscriptions of Argos, Crete, etc. So ἐνς ᾽Αθαναίαν.[1] This ς seems to have been added to ἐν by analogy to ἐξ.[2] Usually with the disappearance of ν the form was εἰς, but Thucydides, like the Ionic and Doric writers and the poets, preferred is which was current in the inscriptions before 334 B.C.[3] So is appears in a Phrygian Christian inscription.[4] But the AEolic εἰς gradually drove out all the other forms.[5] Originally, therefore, ἐν alone existed with either locative or accusative, and εἰς appears nowhere else save in the Greek. The classic use of εἰς **Ἅΐδου** (some MSS. in Ac. 2:27, 31 and reading in Is. 14:15) is the true genitive, according to Brugmann (*Griech Gr*., p. 439), 'in the sphere of Hades.'

1. *Original Static Use.* In Homer εἰσ-κεῖσθαι means merely to lie within. But, though εἰς really means the same thing as ἐν, it was early used only with the accusative, and gradually specialized thus one of the usages of ἐν. The locative with ἐν, however, continued to be used sometimes in the same sense as the accusative with εἰς. The accusative indeed normally suggests motion (extension), and that did come to be the common usage of εἰς plus the accusative. The resultant idea would often be 'into,' but this was by no means always true. **Εἰς** is not used much in composition in the N. T. and always where motion is involved save in the case of εισ-ακούω where there seems little difference between εἰς and ἐν (cf. 1 Cor. 14:21; Mt. 6:7). In itself εἰς expresses the same dimension relation as ἐν, viz. *in*.[6] It does not of itself mean *into, unto,* or *to*. That is the resultant idea of the accusative case with verbs of motion. It is true that in the later Greek this static use of εἰς with the idea of rest (in) is far more common than in the earlier Greek. This was naturally so, since in the vernacular εἰς finally drove ἐν out entirely and did duty for both, just as originally ἐν did. The only difference is that εἰς used the one case (accusative), whereas ἐν used either ac-

[1] Solmsen, Inscr. Graecae, p. 46.

[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 438. He treats ἐν, and εἰς together.

[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 376.

[4] Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, II, p. 525. Cf. also Psichari, Etudes de Philol., 1892, p. v.

[5] Cf. H. W. Smyth, p. 80, Transactions of Am. Philol. Assoc. for 1887. J. Fraser (Cl. Quarterly, 1908, p. 270) shows that in Cretan we have ἐνς ὀρθόν (before vowel), but ἐς τόν (before consonant).

[6] K.-G., I, p. 468.

cusative or locative. But[1] then the accusative was once the only case and must be allowed large liberty. And even, in the classic writers there are not wanting examples. These are usually explained[2] as instances of "pregnant" construction, but it is possible to think of them as survivals of the etymological idea of εἰς (ἐν-ς) with only the general notion of the accusative case. Certainly the vernacular laid less stress on the distinction between εἰς and ἐν than the literary language did. Though εἰς falls behind ἐν in the N. T. in the proportion of 2 to 3, still, as in the papyri[3] and the inscriptions and the LXX,[4] a number of examples of static εἰς occur. Some of these were referred to under ἐν, where the "pregnant" use of ἐν for εἰς occurs. Hatzidakis gives abundant examples of ἐν as εἰς and εἰς as ἐν. Cf. εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειάν ἐστι, B.U. ii. 385; εἰς τύνβον κεῖμαι, Kaibel Epigr. 134; κινδυνεύσαντος εἰς θάλασσαν, B.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). Deissmann (*Light*, p. 169) notes Paul's κινδύνοις ἐν θαλάσσῃ and that the Roman soldier in the last example writes "more vulgarly than St. Paul." In these examples it is not necessary nor pertinent to bring in the idea of 'into.' Blass[5] comments on the fact that Matthew (but see below) has no such examples and John but few, while Luke has most of them. I cannot, however, follow Blass in citing Mk. 1:9 ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην as an example. The idea of motion in βαπτιζω suits εἰς as well as ἐν in Mk. 1:5. Cf. νίψαι εἰς (Jo. 9:7). But in Mt. 28:19, βαπτίζοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, and Ro. 6:3 f., εἰς Χριστόν and εἰς τὸν θάνατον, the notion of sphere is the true one. The same thing may be true of βαπτισθήτω εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (Ac. 2:38), where only the context and the tenor of N. T. teaching can determine whether 'into,' 'unto' or merely 'in' or 'on' ('upon') is the right translation, a task for the interpreter, not for the grammarian. One does not need here to appeal to the Hebrew טָבַל בְּשֵׁם as Tholuck does (*Beitrage zur Spracherkleirung des N. T.*, p. 47 f.). Indeed the use of ὄνομα for person is common in the papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies,* p. 196 f.). Deissmann gives examples of its εἰς ὄνομα, ἐπ' ὀνόματος, and the mere locative ὀνόματι, from the papyri. The static use of εἰς is seen in its distributive use like ἐν in Mk. 4:8, εἰς τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν. But there are undoubted examples where only 'in,' 'on' or 'at' can be the idea. Thus

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 376.

[2] Ib., p. 377. Cf. Mullach, Gr. d. griech. Vulgarsp., p. 380. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 123, calls it a "provincialism." Cf. further Hatz., Einl., p. 210 f.; Moulton, Prol., p. 234 f.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 62 f.

[4] C. and S., Sel., p. 81.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 122.

κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγάς (Mk. 1:39) where there is some excuse for the "pregnant" explanation because of ἦλθεν. So ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς πόλιν (Mt. 2:23; 4:13), but note only παρῴκησεν εἰς γῆν (Heb. 11:9) and εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον (Ac. 8:40). Cf. καθημένου εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Mk. 13:3), ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν (Mk. 13:16), τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον (Lu. 9:61), εἰς τὴν κοίτην εἰσίν (Lu. 11:7), ἐγκαταλείψεις εἰς ᾅδην (Ac. 2:27; cf. verse 31), τοῖς εἰς μακράν (2:39), εἰς χολήν –ὄντα (Ac. 8:23), ἐπέσχεν χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν (Ac. 19:22), ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, (Ac. 21:13), εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι (Ac. 23:11), τηρεῖσθαι εἰς Καισαρίαν (Ac. 25:4), ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον (Jo. 1:18), οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν (1 Jo. 5:8), εἰς ἣν στῆτε (1 Pet. 5:12). Nor is this quite all. In some MSS. in Mk. 2:1 we have εἰς οἶκόν ἐστιν (ℵBDL ἐν οἴκῳ). In Ac. 2:5 the MSS. vary between εἰς and ἐν as in Mk. 10:10. Another instance is found in Eph. 3:16, κραταιωθῆναι εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον. Cf. Jo. 20:7; Mk. 13:9. But in ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον (Jo. 20:19, 26) we have motion, though ἔστη εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν (Jo. 21:4) is an example of rest. Jo. 17:23 is normal. In Mt. 10:41 f., εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου (μαθητοῦ, δικαίου) one can see little difference between εἰς and ἐν. Certainly this is true of Mt. 12:41, μετενόησαν εἰς κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, where it is absurd to take εἰς as 'into' or 'unto' or even 'to.' See also συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα (Mt.18:20).

2. *With Verbs of Motion.* But the usual idiom with εἰς was undoubtedly with verbs of motion when the motion and the accusative case combined with εἰς ('in') to give the resultant meaning of 'into,' 'unto,' 'among,' to,' 'towards' or 'on,' 'upon,' according to the context. This is so common as to call for little illustration. As with ἐν so with εἰς, the noun itself gives the boundary or limit. So εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν (Mt. 2:11), as εἰς τὸ ὄρος (5:1), εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον (27:27), εἰς θάλασσαν (17:27), εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (Rev. 10:5), εἰς ἔθνη (Ac. 22:21), εἰς πειρασμόν (Mt. 6:13), εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον (Jo. 11:38), εἰς τὴν ὁδόν (Mk. 11:8), εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς (Lu. 6:20), εἰς τοὺς λῃστάς (Lu. 10:36), εἰς κλίνην (Rev. 2:22), εἰς τὰ δεξιά (Jo. 21:6), εἰς τὴν κεφαλήν (Mt. 27:30), εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας (Lu. 2:28), εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον (Mk. 14:9), εἰς ὑμᾶς(1 Th. 2:9). These examples fairly illustrate the variety in the use of εἰς with verbs of motion. For idea of 'among' see Jo. 21:23. It will be seen at once, if one consults the context in these passages, that the preposition does not of itself mean 'into' even with verbs of motion. That is indeed one of the resultant meanings among many others. The metaphorical uses do not differ in principle, such as εἰς θλῖψιν (Mt. 24:9), συνάγειν εἰς ἕν, (Jo. 11:52), εἰς τὴν ζωήν (Mt. 18:8), εἰς κρίσιν (Jo. 5:24), εἰς ὑπακοήν (2 Cor.

10:5), εἰς χεῖρας (Mt. 17:22), etc. For many interesting examples of ἐν and εἰς see Theimer, *Die Prapositionen εἰς, ἐν, ἐκ im N. T.*, *Beitreige zur Kenntnis des Sprachgebrauches im N. T* 1896.

3. *With Expressions of Time*. Here εἰς marks either the limit or accents the duration expressed by the accusative. Thus in 2 Tim. 1:12 we find φυλάξαι εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν where 'until' suits as a translation (cf. 'against'). Cf. Ph. 1:10, εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ. Not quite so sharp a limit is εἰς τὸ αὔριον (Mt. 6:34). Cf. 1 Pet. 1:11. There is little that is added by the preposition to the accusative in such examples as as εἰς τὸ μέλλον (Lu. 13:9), εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (Mt. 21:19), εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεάς (Lu. 1:50), εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (Heb. 7:3), etc. Cf. Lu. 12:19. But a more definite period is set in cases like εἰς τὸν καιρόν (Lu. 1:20), εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον (Ac. 13:42).

4. *Like a Dative*. It is not strange to see εἰς used where disposition or attitude of mind is set forth. Indeed already εἰς and the accusative occur where the dative alone would be sufficient. This is especially true in the LXX, but the papyri show examples also. Cf. οἱ εἰς Χριστόν (*Mart. Pauli,* II). Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 246) cites Tb. P. 16, οὐ λήγοντες τῇι [εἰς] αὐτοὺς αὐθαδίᾳ, "where as actually stands for the possessive genitive." One must remember the complete disappearance of the dative in modern Greek[1] vernacular. Note τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους (1 Cor. 16:1), πλουτῶ εἰς πάντας (Ro. 10:12), πλεονάζω εἰς (Ph. 4:17), ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος (Ac. 24:17), λειτουργὸν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη (Ro. 15:16), ἀποβλέπω εἰς (Heb. 11:26), λέγει εἰς (Ac. 2:25), ὀμνύω εἰς (Mt. 5:34 f.), τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους (Ro. 12:16), πιστεύειν εἰς (Mt. 18:6), χρηστὸς εἰς (Eph. 4:32), ἀγάπην εἰς (Ro. 5:8), etc. If one entertains hostile feelings the resultant idea with εἰς will be 'against,' though the word does not of itself mean that. So in Lu. 12:10 εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (cf. κατά in Mt. 12:32) and εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι, βλάσφημα εἰς (Ac. 6:11), ἐπιβουλὴ εἰς (Ac. 23:30), ἁμαρτάνειν εἰς (Lu. 15:18), etc. As a matter of fact all that εἰς really accentuates here is the accusative case (with reference to) which happens to be in a hostile atmosphere. But that is not true of such examples as ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς (Lu. 7:30), εἰς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 4:20), etc. For ὄψονται εἰς in Jo. 19:37 see Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 245. In the modern Greek εἰς has displaced the dative in the vernacular.

5. *Aim or Purpose*. Sometimes indeed εἰς appears in an atmosphere where aim or purpose is manifestly the resultant idea.

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 63; C. and S., p. 82; W.-Th., p. 396 f.

Thus we may note **ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρῳάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον** (2 Cor. 2:12). Here the second **εἰς** suggests the purpose of his coming. Cf. also **τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν** (1 Cor. 11:24), where **εἰς** does not mean 'for,' though that is clearly the resultant idea. So with **εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς** (Mt. 8:4). Take Ro. 11:36, for instance, where **εἰς αὐτόν** is set over against **ἐξ αὐτοῦ**. Cf. again **εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ** in Ph. 1:11, **εἰς φόβον** in Ro. 8:15, **εἰς ἔνδειξιν** in Ro. 3:25, **εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον** in Jo. 6:27. One may not doubt also that this is the idea in Mt. 26:28, **τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν**. But it by no means follows that the same idea is expressed by **εἰς ἄφεσιν** in Mk. 1:4 and Ac. 2:38 (cf. Mt. 10:41), though that may in the abstract be true. It remains a matter for the interpreter to decide. One must not omit here also the frequent use of **εἰς τὸ** and the infinitive to express design. Cf. **εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι** in Mt. 20:19, **εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι** in 26:2. See chapter on Verbal Nouns for further discussion. Cf. also **εἰς τοῦτο** (Mk. 1:38), **εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο** (2 Cor. 5:5), **ἀγοράζω εἰς** (Jo. 13:29), **εἰς ἀπάντησιν** (Mt. 25:6), **εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ** (Jo. 12:13).[1] Cf. **ξύλων εἰς ἐλαιῶνάς μου** (Fay. P., 50 A.D.), 'sticks for my olive-gardens' (Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 157), **εἰς ἵππον ἐνοχλούμενον** (P. Fl.-Pet., xxv, 226 B.C.), 'for a sick horse' (Deissmann, *B. S.*, p. 118). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 112) cites **ᾠκοδόμησεν—εἰς ἑαυτόν** (83 N. Chr. Wadd. Inscr., 2614).

6. *Predicative Use.* But there remains one more use of **εἰς** which, though good **κοινή**, was greatly accelerated by the influence of the LXX.[2] This is where **εἰς** occurs in the predicate with **εἰμί** or **γίνομαι, κτλ.** Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 16 f.) quotes **ἵνα μὴ εἰς ψωμίον γένηται,** P. Fay. 119, 276 (100 A.D.); Heliod., *AEthiop*. VI, 14, **τὴν πήραν εἰς καθέδραν ποιησαμένη**; and even the Attic author AEneas 114, **γυναῖκας ὁπλίσαντες ὡς ἐς ἄνδρας**. Thus in Lu. 3:5, **ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείας** (Is. 40:4). So **ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας** (2 Cor. 6:18, LXX); **ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν** (Mt. 19:5; cf. Gen. 2:24); **ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται** (Jo. 16:20). Cf. Lu. 13:19. As already remarked, this predicate use of **εἰς** appears in the papyri[3] and in the Apostolic Fathers,[4] but not with

[1] This can no longer be called a Hebraism, since the pap. have it. Moulton, Prol., p. 14. Cf. **εἰς ἀπάντησιν**, Tb. P. 43 (ii/B.C.). Rouffiac (Recherches, p. 28) finds **εἶναι εἰς φυλακήν** in inscr. of Priene 50, 39 (ii/B.C.). [2] C. and S., p. 81 f.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 71 f. Cf. K.P. 46 (ii/A.D.) **ἔσχον παρ᾽ ὑμῶν δά (νειον) σπέρματα**, 'for a loan.' Cf. our "to wife." Moulton (Prol., p. 67) cites M. Aurelius, VI, 42.

[4] C. and S., p. 81. Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 143, cites an ex. from Theogn.

the frequency that we find it in the LXX. Cf. pp. 481 f. Blass[1] credits ἐις in ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην (Mk. 5:34) to the Hebrew through the LXX (cf. 1 Sam. 1:17). Cf. also εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων (Ac. 7:53) where εἰς is much like ἐν. In general therefore, as with ἐν so with εἰς we must hark back to first principles and work out to the resultant idea by means of the context and the history.

7. *Compared with* ἐπί, παρά *and* πρός. The growth in the use of εἰς is shown by its appearance where ἐπί or πρός would be expected in the older Greek. Cf. ἔρχεται εἰς πόλιν (Jo. 4:5), where the point is not 'into,' but 'to.' So 11:31, ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. In 11:38 D has ἐπί, not εἰς. So in Mk. 3:7, ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, DHP have εἰς. Cf. Mk. 2:13, א has εἰς for παρά and in 7:31 אBD have εἰς, not πρός.

(g) Ἐκ (ἐξ). The etymology of this word is simple. Cf. Latin *ex* (e), Gallic *ex*, Old Irish *ess*, Cymric *eh*. In the Greek the form varies thus ἐκ before vowels), ἐγ (assimilation), ἐ (Locrian, cf. Latin e), ἐς or ἐσ like Old Irish (Arcadian, Boeotian, Thessalian). The original form was ἐξ, then ἐκ like Latin *ex, e*. Cf. Brugmaim, *Griech Gr.*, p. 147.

1. *Meaning*. The word means 'out of,' 'from within,' not like ἀπό or παρά. It stands in contrast to ἐν (ἐν-ς).[2] In the modern Greek vernacular ἀπό has displaced ἐκ except in the Epirot ἀχ or ὀχ.[3] But in the N. T. ἐκ is still ahead of ἀπό. The indifference of the scribes[4] as to which they used is shown in the MS. variations between ἐκ and ἀπό as in Mt. 7:4; 17:9; Mk. 16:3. The writings of John (Gospel, Epistles, Revelation) use ἐκ more frequently than any other N. T. books.[5] In the late Greek (eighth century A.D.) we find the accusative with ἐκ, and this was the last usage to survive.[6] Brugmann[7] indeed thinks that ἐκ may even rarely use the genuine genitive besides the ablative, but I doubt this. But it is certain that ἐκ used the locative in Arcadian, Cypriotic and Pamphylian dialects after analogy of ἐν (Buck, *Greek Dialects*, p. 101f).[8]

2. *In Composition.* It is very common and sometimes with the "perfective" idea. So we note ἐξ-απορούμενοι contrasted with ἀπορούμενοι in 2 Cor. 4:8.[9] Cf. also ἐκ-δαπανάω (2 Cor. 12:15),

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk. [2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 440.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 102. On p. 246 he cites Psichari as saying that ἐκ τόν is still "une forme vivante."

[4] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 145. [6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 381.

[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 126. [7] Griech. Gr., p. 440.

[8] Delbruck, Die Grunell., p. 129; Meister, Griech. Dial., I, pp. 285, 307.

[9] Moulton, Prol., P. 237.

ἐκ-διηγέομαι (Ac. 13:41), **ἐκ-θαμβέω** (Mk. 9:15), **ἐκ-θαυμάζω** (Mk. 12:17), **ἐκ-καθαίρω** (2 Tim. 2:21), **ἐξ-εραυνάω** (1 Pet. 1:10). The other uses in composition follow the root-idea of the word closely, meaning 'out of,' 'away,' etc., like **ἐξέρχομαι, ἐκβάλλω**, etc. **Ἐκ** has a causative force in composition sometimes as in **ἐξαμαρτάνω**, 'cause to sin' (LXX), and **ἐκφοβεῖν** (2 Cor. 10:9).

3. *Place*. The preposition naturally is common with expressions of place. The strict idea of *from within* is common, as in **φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν** (Mt. 3:17), **ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ** (Lu. 6:42), **ἐκ τῶν μνημείων** (Mt. 8:28), etc. Often it appears in contrast with **εἰς** as in **ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν** (Jo. 4:47), **τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ φῶς** (1 Pet. 2:9), where the metaphorical follows the literal usage. In Lu. 6:42 **ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ** is set in opposition to **ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ**. In Ac. 8:38 f. we have both **εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ** and **ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος**. So in Mk. 1:10 **ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος** a previous presence **ἐν τῷ ὕδατι** is implied. In a case like **καταβαινόντων ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους** (Mt. 17:9; parallels in Mk. and Lu. 6. **ἀπό** we are not to suppose that they had been in a cave, but merely up in the mountain (cf. English idiom), the term "mountain" including more than the earth and rock. Cf. **εἰς τὸ ὄρος** in Mt. 5:1. But in Mt. 8:1 we merely have **ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους**. Note likewise **θρὶξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς** (Lu. 21:18), **ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν** (Ac. 12:7). Thus we explain also **κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ** (Ac. 28:4), **ἐκ δεξιῶν** (Mt. 20:21), **ἐξ ἐναντίας** (Mk. 15:39), etc. It is not necessary to record all the verbs with which **ἐκ** occurs. In Lu. 5:3 **ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου** the teaching is represented as proceeding out of the boat (Jesus was in the boat). One may compare with this **ἐγείρεται ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου** (Jo. 13: 4), **ἀναλύσῃ ἐκ τῶν γάμων** (Lu. 12:36), **ἀπολυλίειν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας** (Mk. 16:3), **διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης** (Ac. 28:4).

4. *Time*. With expressions of time **ἐκ** gives the point of departure, like **ἐκ νεότητος** (Mk. 10:20), **ἐξ ἀρχῆς** (Jo. 6:64), **ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων** (Lu. 23:8), **ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος** (Jo. 9:32), **ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν** (Ac. 24:10), **ἐκ τούτου** (Jo. 6:66). In cases where succession is involved the point of departure is really present. Thus with **ἐκ δευτέρου**, (Jo. 9:24), **ἐκ τρίτου** (Mt. 26:44), **ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας** (2 Pet. 2:8). Other adverbial phrases have a similar origin as with **ἐκ μέρους** (1 Cor. 12:27), **ἐκ μέτρου** (Jo. 3:34), **ἐξ ἀνάγκης** (2 Cor. 9:7), **συμφώνου** (1 Cor. 7:5). Cf. **ἐκ πάλαι**.

5. *Separation*. The use of **ἐκ** for the idea of separation is merely the fuller expansion of the ablative. Thus with **ἐλεύθερος ἐκ πάντων** (1 Cor. 9:19), **ἀναπαήσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων**, (Rev. 14:13), **ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς** (Jo. 12:32), **ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς ἐντολῆς** (2 Pet. 2:21), **ἄρῃς ἐκ**

τοῦ κόσμου (Jo. 17:15). Cf. Jo. 17:6. Abbott[1] doubts if in the LXX and John ἐκ always implies previous existence in the evils from which one is delivered when used with σώζω and τηρέω. Certainly in Jo. 17 ἐκ occurs rather frequently, but τηρήσῃς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ (17:15) may still imply that the evil one once had power over them (cf. Jesus' prayer for Peter). Certainly in Jo. 12:27, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης, Jesus had already entered into the hour. Cf. δυνάμενον σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου (Heb. 5:7) where ἐκ may accentuate the power of God (δυνάμενον), though he had not yet entered into death. In Rev. 3:10 τηρήσω ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ we seem to have the picture of general temptation with the preservation of the saints. Cf. ἔκβασις in 1 Cor. 10:13. So in Mt. 13:41 συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας the idea is 'out from among,' just as cheat or cockle grows in among the wheat in the same field. The two kingdoms coexist in the same sphere (the world). The notion of separation is common with a number of verbs like ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ (Ac. 3:23), ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν (Jo. 12:1), ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ ἐκ νεκρῶν (Lu. 20:35); ἐξελεξάμην ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (Jo. 15:19), etc. This all seems simple and clear. Not quite so apparent is νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου (Rev. 15:2). Thayer and Blass both take it like τηρέω ἐκ, 'victorious over' (by separation). Cf. μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶ ν ἔργων (Rev. 16:11) and Jo. 3:25, ζήτησις ἐκ.

6. *Origin or Source*. Equally obvious seems the use of ἐκ for the idea of origin or source. Thus ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρός (Jo. 16:28), οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (17:14, 16), ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα (Mt. 3:9. Naturally this usage has a wide range. Cf. ἐκ Ναζαρέτ (Jo. 1:46 f.), ἐκ πόλεως (Jo. 1:44), ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρίας (Jo. 4:7), Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων (Ph. 3:5), ἐκ τῆς γῆς (Jo. 3:31), ἐκ θεοῦ (Ph. 3:9), ἐξ ἐθνῶν (Gal. 2:15), ἐκ πλαήνης (1 Th. 2:3), ἐκ πολλῆς θλίψεως (2 Cor. 2:4), τῇ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγάπῃ (2 Cor. 8:7). Cf. Lu. 12:15. This list is by no means exhaustive, but it is at least suggestive. One may note here στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν (Mt. 27:29), where the material is expressed by

7. *Cause or Occasion*. Closely allied to the above is the notion of cause or occasion which may also be conveyed by ἐκ. Thus note τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν in Ro. 12:18, ἐμασῶντο ἐκ τοῦ πόνου (Rev. 16:10), δικαιωθέντας ἐκ πίστεως (Ro. 5:1), ἐξ ἔργων (Gal. 3:10), ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν (1 Cor. 9:14), ἐξ ἀσθενείας (2 Cor. 13:4), ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ (Lu. 16:9). Cf. also ἀπέθανον ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων (Rev. 8:11). Perhaps here belongs ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς (Jo. 12:3). Cf. γεμίζω ἐκ in Jo. 6:13 (Abbott, *Johannine Gr.*, p. 253). At any rate a

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 251 f.

number of verbs use ἐκ in this general sense like ὠφελέω (Mk. 7:11), ζημιοῦσθαι (2 Cor. 7:9), ἀδικεῖσθαι (Rev. 2:11), πλουτέω (Rev. 18:3), χορτάζεσθαι (Rev. 19:21), καοπιάζω (Jo. 4:6), ζάω (Ro. 1:17), etc. Cf. ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν θεὸν ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς (Rev. 16:21). Indeed ἐκ with the notion of price does not differ radically from this idiom. Thus ἠγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν ἀγρόν (Mt. 27:7), ἐτήσατο ἐκ μισθοῦ (Ac. 1:18), συμφωνήσας ἐκ δηναρίου (Mt. 20:2). **Ἐκ διαταγῆς**, 'by order,' was a regular formula in the papyri (Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 87). Deissmann, *Bible Studies,* p. 248, finds the idiom ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων (Mk. 13:27) in the papyri as well as in Zech. 11:6.

8. *The Partitive Use of* ἐκ. It is not infrequent, marking an increase over the earlier idiom.[1] Thus in Jo. 16:17 ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν is even used as the subject of εἶπαν. Cf. Ac. 21:16 without ἐκ. See also Jo. 7:40. John is specially fond of the partitive use of ἐκ (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 115) and the inscriptions and papyri have it also. Cf. ἀνὴρ ἐκ τῶν πρωτευόντων, Petersen-Luschan, Reisen, p. 113, xviii. A. 5. Further examples are ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων (Jo. 3:1), μή τις ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων (Jo. 7:48), ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀκούσαντες (Jo. 7:40), θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν (Lu. 21:16), ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε (Mt. 23:34), βλέπουσιν ἐκ τῶν λαῶν (Rev. 11:9), διηκόνουν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων (Lu. 8:3), ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ (Jo. 6:50), ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος δέδωκεν (1 Jo. 4:13), πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος (Jo. 4:13), οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν (Jo. 17:12), etc.[2] In Heb. 13:10 it is what is on the altar that is eaten. The use of ἐκ with a class or for a side or position may as well be mentioned here also. Thus ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας (Jo. 18:37), οἱ ἐκ νόμου (Ro. 4:14), ὁ ἐκ πίστεως (Ro. 3:26), οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς (Ac. 11:2), οἱ ἐκ ἐριθίας (Ro. 2:8), etc. The partisan use is allied closely to the partitive. Cf. Ph. 4:22 **οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας.** See further ch. XI, Cases.

9. **Ἐκ** *and* **ἐν.** A word in conclusion is needed about the so-called blending of ἐκ with ἐν. Blass[3] doubts if this classic idiom appears in the N. T. The passages that seem to have it are μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ (Mt. 24:17) where ἐν might indeed have been employed, but ἐκ coincides in idea with ἆραι. . . Cf. Mk. 13:15, where ἐκ does not have τά before it. In Lu. 11: 13 ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον W. H. bracket ὁ before ἐξ, and with ὁ the sending of the Holy Spirit by the Father has

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 145.

[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 100.

[3] Ib., p. 258. Cf. also Field, Ot. Norv., Pars III, Mk. 5:30, on τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν.

caused ἐξ to displace ἐν which would otherwise have been regular. In Jo. 3:13 some MSS. add ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ to ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθώπου, thus making Jesus in heaven at that moment when he was speaking to Nicodemus. In Col. 4:16, τὴν ἐκ Λαοκικίας, the ἐκ assumes, of course, that an Epistle had been sent to Laodicea, and suggests that the Colossians get it from (ἐκ) them. Cf. Ro. 3:25 f. for examples of διά, ἐν, εἰς, πρός, ἐκ. See ἀπό and παρά.

(h) Ἐπί. See Sanskrit *api* (locative case), Zend *aipi*, Latin *ob*, Lithuanian *pi*.

1. *Ground-Meaning.* It is 'upon' as opposed to ὑπό. It differs from ὑπέρ in that ἐπί implies a real resting upon, not merely over.[1] But the very simplicity of this idea gives it a manifoldness of resultant uses true of no other preposition. Sometimes indeed in the causal and ethical usages the root-idea seems dim,[2] but none the less it is there. The only safety consists in holding on to the root-idea and working out from that in each special context. It marks a delicate shade of difference from ἐν is seen in ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς (Mt. 6:10). For ἐν cf. Lu. 8:15.

2. *In Composition in the N. T.* It is very common, always retaining the root-idea (cf. ἐπ-ἐν-δύω, 2 Cor. 5:2), though sometimes the perfective idea is clear. Thus with ἐπ-αιτέω in Lu. 16:3, ἐπι-γινώσκω in 1 Cor. 13:12,[3] ἐπί-γνωσις in Col. 1:9, ἐπι-τελέω in 2 Cor. 8:11.

3. *Frequency in N. T.* In the N. T. ἐπί is still in constant use, though it ultimately dropped out of the vernacular[4] before ἐπάνω Note ἕως ἐπὶ διαλο[ογισ] μός, P. Oxy. 294 (A.D. 22) like ἀνὰ εἷς, etc. But in the N. T. it is the one preposition still used freely with more than two cases (acc. 464, gen. 216, dat. and loc. 176).[5] Most of the examples called dative in the lexicons and grammars are really locatives, but some of them are possibly true datives.[6] So then ἐπί really has four cases still in the N. T. In Homer ἐπί often stands alone for ἔπ-εστιν. Farrar,[7] quoting Donaldson, finds in the locative with ἐπί the idea of absolute superposition, while the genitive expresses only partial superposition and the accusative implies motion with a view to superposition and the dative would be superposition for the interest of one. There is some truth in this distinction and the case-idea must always be observed. But

[1] K.-G., I, p. 495. [2] Ib. [3] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 113.
[4] Jann., Mist. Gk. Gr., p. 383; Mullach, Vulg., p. 381.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 107.
[6] K.-G., I, p. 495; Delbruck, Grundl., p. 130; Vergl. Synt., I, p. 676 f.
[7] Greek Synt., p. 102.

the growth of the accusative in the later language at the expense of the other cases caused some confusion in the usage according to the standard of the earlier Greek. Simcox[1] considers it "almost a matter of indifference" whether in the N. T. one uses locative, genitive or accusative. This is somewhat true, but even so it does not follow that there was no difference in the cases. The locative accentuated mere location, the genitive brought out rather the kind or genus, while the accusative would present the general idea of extension modified by the fact that the accusative tended to absorb the other cases without insisting on the distinct case-idea. Thus sometimes either case with **ἐπί** would give substantially the same idea, though technical differences did exist. For instance, in Ac. 5:9 note **ἐπί τῇ θύρᾳ**, while in verse 23 we have **ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν**. So compare **ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις** (Mk. 13:29) with **ἕστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν** (Rev. 3:20). Here the notion of rest exists with all three cases, though in Rev. 3:20 **καὶ κρούω** may have some effect on the presence of the accusative. Once more observe **καθίσῃ ἐπὶ θρόνου** and **καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους** in Mt. 19:28. Rev. 4:2 gives us **ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καθήμενος**, verse 9 (marg. of W. H., text of Nestle) **τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ**, while verse 10 has **ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου**, three cases with the same verb. It would be over-refinement to insist on too much distinction here. But the cases afford variety of construction at any rate. In Rev. 14:9 the single verb **λαμβάνει** has **ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ** (cf. Ac. 27:44). Compare also **λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον** in Mt. 24:2 with **λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ** in Lu. 21:6. In Ph. 2:27 the MSS. vary between **λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην** and **λύπην ἐπὶ λύπῃ**. Cf. also **ἐπ᾽ ὀλίγα** and **ἐπὶ πολλῶν** in Mt. 25:21. The use of **πιστεύω ἐπί** with locative or accusative has already been discussed. The accusative suggests more the initial act of faith (intrust) while the locative implies that of state (trust). We find **εἰς** also used with this verb as well as dative (both common in John). Once we have **πιστεύω ἐν** (Mk. 1:15). See Moulton, *Prol*., p. 68. But, after all is said, the only practical way to study **ἐπί** is from the point of view of the cases which it supplements.

4. *With the Accusative.* As already noted, it is far in excess of the other, cases combined. It is hardly necessary to make minute subdivision of the accusative usage, though the preposition with this case follows the familiar lines. With expressions of place it is very common and very easy to understand. So **ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα** (Mt 14:28), **περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα** (14:29), **ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ**

[1] Lang. of the N. T., p. 146.

τῆν γῆν (Mt. 15:35), σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τῆν γῆν (Mt. 27:45), πορεύου ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδόν (Ac. 8:26), ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν (Mt. 26:50), ἀναπεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος (Jo. 13:25). The metaphorical use is in harmony with this idiom. Thus φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν (Lu. 1:12), κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα (Heb. 2:7), βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον (Lu. 1:33), ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 12:9). Cf. 2 Cor. 1:23, ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπί τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν. But not all the accusative uses are so simple. In a case like Mt. 7:24, ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, some idea of motion may be seen. But that is not true of Mt. 13:2, πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν ἱστήκει. Cf. also καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον (Mt. 9:9) and others given above. So ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων (Mk. 4:38), πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτὸν (Lu. 2:25), ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν (Jo. 1:32), ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὸν πυλῶνα (Ac. 10:17), ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται (1 Pet. 4:14), κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν κεῖται (2 Cor. 3:15), ἔσονται ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (Lu. 17:35). Here it is hard to think of any idea of 'whither.'[1] Sometimes indeed ἐπί seems not to imply strictly 'upon,' but rather 'as far as.' So with ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον (Mk. 16:2), κατέβησαν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (Jo. 6:16), ἦλθον ἐπὶ τι ὕδωρ (Ac. 8:36). The aim or purpose is sometimes expressed by ἐπί as ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα (Mt. 3:7), ἐφ' ὃ πάρει (Mt. 26:50). It may express one's emotions as with πιστεύω ἐπί (Ro. 4:24), ἐλπίζω ἐπί (1 Pet. 1:13), σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπί (Mt. 15:32). Cf. ἐφ' ὃν γεγόνει in Ac. 4:22 and the general use of ἐπί in Mk. 9:12 γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. In personal relations hostility is sometimes suggested, though ἐπί in itself does not mean 'against.' Thus ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθατε (Mt. 26:55). In Mt. 12:26 ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη is used side by side with μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς in the preceding verse. Cf. also Mk. 3:26, etc. Abbott[2] notes that John shows this usage only once (19:33). For ἐπί with the idea of degree or measure see ἐφ' ὅσον (Ro. 11:13). Cf. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in the sense of 'all together' (Ac. 1:15). With expressions of time ἐπί may merely fill out the accusative, as with ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία (Lu. 4:25, marg. of W. H.), ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους (Ac. 13:31), ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον (Ro. 7:1), or a more definite period may be indicated, as with ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς (Ac. 3:1),[3] ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον (Lu. 10:35). It is common with adverbs like ἐφ' ἅπαξ, ἐπὶ τρίς, etc.

5. *With the Genitive*. The genitive with ἐπί has likewise a wide range of usages. Usually the simple meaning 'upon' sat-

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 136. For LXX ex. of rest see C. and S., p. 85.
[2] Joh. Gr., p. 259.
[3] A postclassical usage, Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 147.

isfies all reqUirements, as in **ἐπὶ κλίνης** (Mt. 9:2), **ἐφ᾽ οὗ ᾠκοδόμητο** (Lu. 4:29), **κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων** (Mt. 10:27), **ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ νεφελῶν** (Mt. 24:30), **ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ** (Jo. 19:19), **καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος** (Ac. 12:21), **ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς** (Jo. 20:7), **ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης** (Rev. 5:13) **ἐπὶ ξύλου** (Ac. 5:30). In Mk. 12:26, **ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου** an ellipsis in thought occurs "in the passage about the bush." Sometimes, indeed, as with the accusative, so with the genitive, **ἐπί**, has the idea of vicinity, where the word itself with which it is used has a wide meaning. Thus in Jo. 21:1 **ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης** seems to mean 'on the sea-shore,' and so 'by the sea.' So with **ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ**, (Mt. 21:19), the fig-tree being not on the path, but on the edge of the road. Abbott[1] notes how Matthew (14:25 f.) has **ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν** which is not ambiguous like the genitive in Jo. 6:19. Cf. Ac. 5:23 **ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν**. The classic idiom with **ἐπί** and the genitive in the sense of 'towards' is not so common in the N. T., though it has not quite disappeared as Simcox[2] thinks. Cf. **ἐγένετο τὸ πλοῖον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** (Jo. 6:21), **καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** (Ac. 10:11), **βαλουσα τὸ μύρον ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος** (Mt. 26:12), **ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** (Mk. 14:35), **γενόμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου** (Lu. 22:40), **πὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον** (Heb. 6:7), **πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** (Mk. 9:20). In these examples we see just the opposite tendency to the use of the accusative with verbs of rest. Cf. **πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν** (Mt. 10:29) with Mk. 9:20 above and **βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν** (Mt. 10:34) with Mk. 4:26. With persons **ἐπί** and the genitive may yield the resultant meaning of 'before' or 'in the presence of.' Thus **ἐπί ἡγεμόνων** (Mk. 13:9), **κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων** (1 Cor. 6:1), **ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων** (1 Tim. 5:19), **ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου** (1 Tim. 6:13), **ἐπὶ σοῦ** (Ac. 23:30), **ἐπ᾽ ἐμοῦ** (25:9). Blass[3] observes how in Ac. 25:10 **ἑστὼς ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρος** the meaning is 'before,' while in verse 17 the usual idea 'upon' is alone present (**καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος**). Cf. **ἐπὶ Τίτου** in 2 Cor. 7:14. With expressions of time the result is much the same. Thus **ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν χρονων** (1 Pet. 1:20) where **ἐπί** naturally occurs (cf. Ju. 18). With **ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου**) (Ro. 1:10) we have period of prayer denoted simply by **ἐπί**. Cf. **ἐπεύχομαι ἐπί**, (Magical papyrus, Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 252). There is no difficulty about **ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας** (Mt. 1:11). With persons a fuller exposition is required, since **ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου** (Ac. 11:28) is tantamount to 'in the time of Claudius' or 'during the reign of Claudius.' Cf. also **ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα** (Lu. 3:2), **ἐπὶ Ἐλιασαίου** (4:27), **ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως** (Mk.

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 261.
[2] Lang of the N. T., p. 147.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 137.

2:26). Cf. ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς in Heb. 7:11. The idea of basis is a natural metaphor as in ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας (Lu. 4:25), ἃ ἐποίει ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων (Jo. 6:2), ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν (Gal. 3:16), ἐπὶ στόματος (Mt. 18:16). One of the metaphorical uses is with the resultant idea of 'over,' growing naturally out of 'upon.'[1] Thus καταστήσει ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας (Lu. 12:42), though in Mt. 25:21, 23 both genitive and accusative occur. Cf. also βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων (Rev. 17:18), ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, (Ro. 9:5), etc.

6. *With the Locative.* Here ἐπί is more simple, though still with a variety of resultant ideas. Blass[2] observes that with the purely local sense the genitive and accusative uses outnumber the locative with ἐπί. But still some occur like ἐπὶ πίνακι (Mt. 14:8), ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ (Jo. 4:6), ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ (Mt. 9:16), ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω (Mt. 16:18; cf. some MSS. in Mk. 2:4, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ κατέκειτο), ἐπὶ τοῖς κραβάττοις (Mk. 6:55), ἐπὶ τῷ χόρτῳ (Mk. 6:39), ἐπ᾽ ἐρήμοις τόποις (Mk. 1:45), ἐπέκειτο ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ (Jo. 11:38), ἐπί σανίσιν (Ac. 27:44; cf. also ἐπί τινων). In Lu. 23:38, ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ, the resultant idea is rather that of 'over,' Mt. 27:37 having ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ. As with the accusative and genitive, so with the locative the idea of contiguity sometimes appears, as in ἐπὶ θύραις (Mt. 24:33), ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ (Jo. 5:2), ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ (Ac. 3:11). Here the wider meaning of the substantive makes this result possible. Cf. also ἐπὶ τῷ ποταμῷ (Rev. 9:14). **Ἐπί** is used very sparingly with the locative in expressions of time. Cf. ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων (Heb. 9:26). The use of ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν (Ph. 1:3), οὐ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις (Mk. 6:52), θερίζειν ἐπὶ εὐλογίαις (2 Cor. 9:6) wavers between occasion and time. Cf. also ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ (Heb. 9:15). The notion of ἐπὶ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν (Heb. 10:28) is rather 'before,' 'in the presence of.' Cf. ἐπὶ νεκροῖς (Heb. 9:17). All these developments admit of satisfactory explanation from the root-idea of ἐπί, the locative case and the context. There are still other metaphorical applications of ἐπί. Thus in Mt. 24 47, ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, 'over' is the resultant meaning. So in Lu. 12:44 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι. The notion of basis is involved in ἐπ᾽ ἄρτῳ μονῳ in Mt. 4:4, ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί σου in Lu. 5:5, ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου in Mt. 24 : 5, ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι in Ac. 2:26, etc. Ground or occasion likewise may be conveyed by ἐπί. Thus note ἐπὶ τούτῳ in Jo. 4:27 and in particular ἐφ᾽ ᾧ, like ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι, in Ro. 5:12 and 2 Cor. 5:4. Cf. ἐφ᾽ ᾧ ἐφρονεῖτε (Ph. 4:10) where 'whereon' is the simple idea. See

[1] For ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου in Prol. to Sirach see Deiss., B. S., p. 339 f.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 137.

also ἐπὶ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν (Eph. 4:26), cf. 2 Cor. 9:15. The idea of aim or purpose seems to come in cases like ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς (Eph. 2:10), ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήμφθην (Ph. 3:12). Note also Gal. 5:13, ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ; 1 Th. 4:7, οὐκ ἐπ' ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, (cf. ἐν ἁγιασμῷ), ἐπί καταστροφῇ (2 Tim. 2:14). Cf. ἐπ' ἐλευθερίαι inscr. at Delphi ii/B.C. (Deissm., *Light*, p. 327). The notion of model is involved in ἐκάλουν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι (Lu. 1:59) and ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι (Ro. 5: 14). Many verbs of emotion use ἐπὶ with the locative, as ἔχαιρεν ἐπὶ πᾶσι (Lu. 13:17), θαυμάζοντες ἐπί (Lu. 2:33), etc. But some of the examples with these verbs may be real datives, as is possibly the case with the notion of addition to, like προσέθηκεν καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσιν (Lu. 3:20).

7. *The True Dative*. As we have seen, it was probably sometimes used with ἐπί. The N. T. examples do not seem to be very numerous, and yet some occur. So I would explain διὰ την ὑπερβάλλουσαν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐφ' ὑμῖν (2 Cor. 9:14). This seems a clear case of the dative with ἐπί supplementing it. The same thing may be true of ἐφ' ὑμῖν in 1 Th. 3:7 and Ro. 16:19. Cf. also πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς in Lu. 18:9 and μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοί in Mt. 18:26 f. So Lu. 1:47 ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ. In Lu. 12:52 f., τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσίν, δύο ἐπὶ τρισίν, υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί (cf. also ἐπὶ θυγατέρα), the resultant sense is 'against.' Cf. also προφητεῦσαι ἐπὶ λαοῖς in Rev. 10:11. In Jo. 12:16, ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα, and Ac. 5:35, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις the idea is rather 'about' or 'in the case of.' Cf. also τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ (Ac. 11:19). Here the personal relation seems to suit the dative conception better than the locative. The notion of addition to may also be dative. Cf. Lu. 3:20 above and Col. 3:14, ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις; Heb. 8:1, ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις. In Eph. 6:16 the best MSS. have ἐν. It is possible also to regard the use of ἐπί for aim or purpose as having the true dative as in 1 Th. 4:7.

(i) **Κ**ατά. There is doubt about the etymology of this preposition. In *tmesis* it appears as κάτα, and in Arcadian and Cypriote Greek it has the form κατύ. It is probably in the instrumental case,[1] but an apparently dative form καται survives a few times. Brugmann[2] compares it with Old Irish *cet*, Cymric *cant,* Latin *com–*, though this is not absolutely certain.

1. *Root-Meaning.* Brugmann[3] thinks that the root-meaning of the preposition is not perfectly clear, though 'down' (cf. ἀνά) seems to be the idea. The difficulty arises from the fact that we

[1] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 342.
[2] Grieci. Or., p. 443. Cf. also Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 759 f. [3] Ib.

sometimes find the ablative case used when the result is down from, then the genitive down upon, and the accusative down along. But 'down' (cf. κάτω) seems always to be the only idea of the preposition in itself. In the N. T. three cases occur with κατά.

2. *Distributive Sense.* **Κ**ατά came to be used in the distributive sense with the nominative, like ἀνά and σύν, but chiefly as adverb and not as preposition.[1] Hence this usage is not to be credited to the real prepositional idiom. Late Greek writers have it. So εἷς κατὰ εἷς in Mk. 14:19 (and the spurious Jo. 8:9), τὸ καθ' εἷς in Ro. 12:5. The modern Greek uses καθείς or καθένας as a distributive pronoun.[2] Deissmann, *Bible Studies,* p. 138 f., considers also εἷς καθ' ἕκαστος (A Lev. 25:10) merely the adverbial use of κατά. But see καθ' ἕνα in 1 Cor. 14:31, σκατὰ δὲ ἑορτήν (Mt. 27:15).

3. κατά *in Composition*. It is true to the root-idea of 'down,' like κατέβη in Mt. 7:25, καταγαγεῖν in Ro. 10:6. But the various metaphorical uses occur also in composition. Often κατά occurs with "perfective" force.[3] So, for instance, observe καταρτίσει (1 Pet. 5:10), κατηγωνίσαντο (Heb. 11:33), κατεδίωξεν (Mk. 1:36), καταδουλοῖ (2 Cor. 11:20), κατακαύσει (Mt. 3:12), καταμάθετε (Mt. 6:28), κατανοήσατε (Lu. 12:24), κατέπαυσαν (Ac. 14:18), καταπίνοντες (Mt. 23:24), κατασκευάσει (Mk. 1:2), κατεργάζεσθε (Ph. 2:12), κατέφαγεν (Mt. 13:4), καθορᾶται (Ro. 1:20). This preposition vies with διά and σύν in the perfective sense. **Κ**ατέχω in Ro. 1:18 is well illustrated by ὁ κατέχων τὸν θυμόν from an ostracon (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 308). In the magical texts it means to 'cripple' or to 'bind,' 'hold fast.' But in Mk. 14:45, κατεφίλησε the preposition seems to be weakened, though the A. S.V. puts "kissed him much" in the margin. Cf. Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, Nov., 1907, p. 220.

4. *With the Ablative*. This construction is recognised by Brugmann,[4] Monro,[5] Kuhner-Gerth,[6] ck.7 There are some examples of the ablative in the N. T., where 'down' and 'from' combine to make 'down from.' Thus, for instance, is to be explained ἔβαλεν κετ' αὐτῆς ἄνεμος τυφωνικός (Ac. 27:14), where αὐτῆς refers to **Κ**ρήτην, and the meaning (cf. American Standard Revision) is manifestly ' down from' Crete. In 1 Cor. 11:4, προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων, we have 'down from' again, the veil hanging

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 178.
[2] Ib.; Moulton, Prol., p. 105.
[3] Cf. ib., pp. 115 ff.
[4] Griech. Gr., p. 443.
[5] Hom. Gr., p. 145.
[6] I, p. 475.
[7] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 760.

down from the head. In Mk. 5:13 we find **ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ** (Mt. 8:32= Lu. 8:33) where 'down from the cliff' is again the idea.

5. *With the Genitive*. It is more usual with **κατά** than the ablative in the N. T. as in the earlier Greek.[1] The idea is 'down upon,' the genitive merely accenting the person or thing affected. A good example of this sense in composition followed by the genitive appears in **κατακυριεύσας ἀμφοτέρων** (Ac. 19:16). Some MSS. in Mk. 14:3 have **κατά** with **τῆς κεφαλῆς**, but without it **κατέχεεν** means 'pour down on' the head. In 2 Cor. 8:2, **ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία**, the idea is 'down to' depth. But with the genitive the other examples in the N. T. have as resultant meanings either 'against, throughout' or 'by.' These notions come from the original 'down.' Luke alone uses 'throughout' with the genitive and always with **ὅλος**. The earlier Greek had **καθ' ὅλου** (also alone in Luke in the N. T., Ac. 4:18), though Polybius employed **κατά** in this sense. Cf. in Lu. 4:14 **καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου**; Ac. 9:31 **καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας** (so 9:42; 10:37). The older Greek would have used the accusative in such cases. But cf. Polyb. iii, 19, 7, **κατὰ τῆς νήσου διεσπάρησαν**. The notion of 'against' is also more common[2] in the **κοινή**. But in the modern Greek vernacular **κατά** (**κά**) is confined to the notions of 'toward' and 'according to,' having lost the old ideas of 'down' and 'against' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 105 f.). Certainly the preposition does not mean 'against.' That comes out of the context when two hostile parties are brought together. Cf. English vernacular "down on" one. This **κατά** then is 'down upon' rather literally where the Attic usually had and accusative.[3] Among many examples note **κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν** (Mk. 14:55), **νύμφην κατὰ πενθερᾶς** (Mt. 10:35), **κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος** (Mt. 12:32), **κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου** (Ac. 24:1), etc. Cf. no. 8:33. Sometimes **μετά** and **κατά** are contrasted (Mt. 12:30) or **κατά** and **ὑπέρ** (Lu. 9:50; 1 Cor. 4:6). The other use of **κατά** and the genitive is with verbs of swearing. The idea is perhaps that the hand is placed down on the thing by which the oath is taken. But in the N. T. God himself is used in the solemn oath. So Mt. 26:63, **ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ**. Cf. Heb. 6:13, 16. In 1 Cor. 15:15 **ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ**, may be taken in this sense or as meaning 'against.'

6. *With the Accusative*. But the great majority of examples

[1] Delbruck, ib., p. 761.
[2] Jebb, in V. and D., Handb., etc., p. 313.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 133.

in the N. T. use the accusative. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 116) notes the frequency of the accusative in the papyri where περί would appear in the older Greek. Farrar[1] suggests that κατά with the genitive (or ablative) is perpendicular ('down on' or 'down from') while with the accusative it is horizontal ('down along'). Curiously enough John has only some ten instances of κατά and several of them are doubtful.[2] On the whole, the N. T. use of the accusative with κατά corresponds pretty closely to the classic idiom. With a general horizontal plane to work from a number of metaphorical usages occur. But it appears freely in local expressions like ἀπῆλθε καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων (Lu. 8:39), διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας (Lu. 9:6), κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν (Lu. 10:4), ἐγένετο λιμὸς κατὰ τὴν χώραν (Lu. 15:14), κατὰ τὴν **Κ**ιλικίαν (Ac. 27:5), βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα (Ac. 27:12), κατὰ μεσημβρίαν (Ac. 8:26), κατὰ πρόσωπον (Gal. 2:11), κατ' ὀφθαλμούς (Gal. 3:1), κατὰ σκοπόν (Ph. 3:14). The notion of rest may also have this construction as κατ' οἶκον (Ac. 2:46). Cf. τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν (Col. 4:15). Cf. Ac. 11:1. In Ac. 13:1 a rather ambiguous usage occurs, κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφῆται. But this example may be compared with τῶν κατὰ **Ἰ**ουδαίους ἐθῶν (Ac. 26:3), οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιηταί (Ac. 17:28, some MSS. καθ' ἡμᾶς), νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς (Ac. 18:15). This idiom is common in the literary κοινή and is one of the marks of Luke's literary style.[3] But this is merely a natural development, and κατά with the accusative always expressed direction towards in the vernacular.[4] Schmidt (*de eloc. Joseph.*, p. 21 f.) calls κατά a sort of periphrasis for the genitive in late Greek. Cf. τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (Ph. 1:12). It is more than a mere circumlocution for the genitive[5] in the examples above and such as τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν (Eph. 1:15), τὸ κατ' ἐμέ (Ro. 1:15), τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (Ro. 9:5), τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (Eph. 6:21; cf. Ac. 25:14), ἀνδράσιν τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχήν (Ac. 25:23; cf. par excellence). **Κ**ατά is used with expressions of time like κατ' ἐκεινον τὸν καιρόν (Ac. 12:1), κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον (Ac. 16:25), καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν (Heb. 3:13), κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον (Ac. 13:27). The notion of distribution comes easily with κατά, as in κατὰ πόλιν (Lu. 8:1), κατὰ τὰς συναγωγάς (Ac. 22:19), κατ' ἔτος (Lu. 2:41), καθ' ἡμέραν (Ac. 2:46), καθ' ἕνα πάντες (1 Cor. 14:31), κατ' ὄνομα (Jo. 10:3), etc. See Mt. 27:15 = Mk. 15:6. Cf. κατὰ δύο, P. Oxy. 886 (iii/A.D.). As a standard or rule of measure κατά is very common

[1] Gk. Synt., p. 100. [2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 266.
[3] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 149; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 133.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 384.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 133.

and also simple. So **κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον** (Ro. 16:25) with which compare the headings[1] to the Gospels like **κατὰ Μαθθαῖον**, though with a different sense of **εὐαγγέλιον**. Here the examples multiply like **κατὰ νόμον** (Lu. 2:22), **κατὰ φύσιν** (Ro. 11:21), **κατὰ χάριν** (Ro. 4:4), **κατὰ θεόν** (Ro. 8:27), **κατὰ τὴν πίστιν** (Mt. 9:29), **κατὰ δύναμιν** (2 Cor. 8:3), **καθ' ὑπερβολήν** (Ro. 7:13), **κατὰ συνγνώμην** (1 Cor. 7:6), etc. Various resultant ideas come out of different connections. There is no reason to call **κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν**, (Mt. 19:3) and **κατὰ ἄγνοιαν** (Ac. 3:17) had Greek. If there is the idea of cause here, so in 1 Tim. 6:3, **κατ' εὐσέβειαν,** the notion of tendency or aim appears. We must not try to square every detail in the development of **κατά** or any Greek preposition with our translation of the context nor with classic usage, for the N. T. is written in the **κοινή**. This preposition is specially common in Acts and Hebrews. **Κατ' ἰδίαν** (Mt. 14:13) is adverbial. But **κατὰ πρόσωποιν** is not a mere Hebraism, since the papyri have it (Deissmann, *Bible Studies,* p. 140). As a sample of the doubling up of prepositions note **συνεπεστη κατ' αὐτῶν** (Ac. 16:22).

(j) **Μετά**. Most probably **μετά** has the same root as **μέσος**, Latin *medius*, German *mit* (*midi*), Gothic *mils*, English *mid* (cf. *a-mid*). Some scholars indeed connect it with **ἅμα** and German *samt.* But the other view is reasonably certain. The modern Greek uses a shortened form **μέ**, which was indeed in early vernacular use.[2] Some of the Greek dialects use **πέδά**. So the Lesbian, Boeotian, Arcadian, etc. **μετά** seems to be in the instrumental case.[3]

1. *The Root-Meaning.* It is (‘mid’) 'midst.' This simple idea lies behind the later developments. Cf. **μεταξύ** and **ἀνάμεσα**. We see the root-idea plainly in **μετεωρίζω** (from **μετ-έωρος**, in ‘mid-air’). In the N. T. we have a metaphorical example (Lu. 12:29) which is intelligible now in the day of aeroplanes and dirigible balloons. The root-idea is manifest also in **μέτ-ωπον** (Rev. 7:3), 'the space between the eyes.'

2. *In Composition*. The later resultant meanings predominate in composition such as "with" in **μεταδίδωμι** (Ro. 12:8), **μεταλαμβάνω** (Ac. 2:46), **μετέχω** (1 Cor. 10:30); "after" in **μεταπέμπω** (Ac. 10:5); or, as is usually the case, the notion of change or transfer is the result as with **μεθίστημι** (1 Cor. 13:2), **μεταβαίνω** (Mt. 8:34), **μεταμορφόω** (Ro. 12:2), **μεταμέλομαι** (Mt. 27:3), **μετανοέω** (Mt. 3:2).

3. *Compared with* **σύν**. **Μετά** is less frequent in composition than

[1] Ib. [2] Jann., Hist. Gr. Gk., p. 388; Hatz., Einl., p. 153.
[3] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 342.

σύν, though far more common as a preposition. Simcox[1] thinks that it is useless to elaborate any distinction in meaning between μετά, and σύν. The older grammars held that σύν expressed a more intimate fellowship than μετά. But in the N. T. μετά has nearly driven σύν out.

4. *Loss of the Locative Use.* Μετά was originally used with the locative. It is common in Homer, but even with him the genitive has begun to displace it.[2] Homer uses the locative with collective singulars and plurals.[3] Mommsen[4] indeed considers that in Hesiod ἅμα, μετά and σύν, all use the instrumental case and with about equal frequency, while μετά with the genitive was rare. But in the N. T. μετά, along with περί and ὑπό, has been confined to the genitive and accusative, and the genitive use greatly predominates (361 to 100).[5] The idea with the locative was simply between.[6] With several persons the notion of 'among' was present also.[7]

5. *With the Genitive.* In Homer it occurs only five times and with the resultant idea of 'among.' So once (*Iliad*, 13. 700, μετὰ Βοιωτῶν ἐμάχοντο), where indeed the idea is that of alliance with the Boeotians. In Rev. 2:16, etc., μετά occurs with πολεμέω in a hostile sense, a usage not occurring in the older Greek, which Simcox[8] considers a Hebraism. But the papyri may give us examples of this usage any day. And Thumb (*Hellenismus*, p. 125; cf. Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 106) has already called attention to the modern Greek use of with οἰκέω. Deissmann (*Light*, p. 191) finds μετὰ στρατιώτου with οἰκέω in an ostracon (not in hostile sense) and possibly with ἀντιλογέω, 'elsewhere.' In Jo. 6:43 μετά occurs in a hostile sense with γογγύζω and probably so with ζήτησις in Jo. 3:25, though Abbott[9] argues for the idea of alliance here between the Baptist's disciples and the Jews to incite rivalry between the Baptist and Jesus. In 1 Cor. 6:6 f. we have the hostile sense also in legal trials, ἀδελφὸς μετὰ ἀδελφοῦ κρίνεται. Cf. Jo. 16:19. This notion gives no difficulty to English students, since our "with" is so used. But Moulton[10] admits a translation Hebraism in Lu. 1:58, ἐμεγάλυνεν Κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτῆς. But what about ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν

[1] Lang. of the N. T., p. 149. Cf. Thayer, under σύν.

[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 444.

[3] K.-G.; I, p. 505.

[4] T. Mommsen, Die Prap. σύν and μετά bei den nachhomerischen Epikern, 1879, p. 1 f. Cf. also Mommsen, Beitr. zu der Lehre von der griech. Prap., 1895.

[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 105.

[6] Delbrtick, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 741 f.

[7] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 136.

[8] Lang. of the N. T., p. 150.

[9] Joh. Gr., p. 267.

[10] Prol., p. 106.

(Ac. 14:27) and **τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν** (1 Jo. 4:17)? Simcox[1] again finds a Hebraism in "the religious sense" which appears in Mt. 1:23; Lu. 1:28; Jo. 3:2, etc. But the notion of fellowship is certainly not a Hebraism. **Μετά** has plenty of examples of the simple meaning of the preposition. Thus **τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν** (Lu. 24:5), **ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων** (Mk. 1:13), **μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν** (Lu. 5:30), **μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη** (Lu. 22:37), an idiom not common to **σύν** and found in the classical poets.[2] Cf. also **σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων** (Rev. 21:3), **μετὰ διωγμῶν** (Mk. 10:30), **ἔμιξεν μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν** (Lu. 13:1), **οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς** (Mt. 27:34). It is not far from this idea to that of conversation as in **μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει** (Jo. 4:27), and general fellowship as with **εἰρηνεύω** (Ro. 12:18), **συμφωνέω** (Mt. 20:2), **κοινωνίαν ἔχω** (1 Jo. 1:3), **συναίρω λόγον** (Mt. 18:23), etc. Perhaps the most frequent use of is with the idea of accompaniment. So with **ἀκολουθέω** (Lu. 9:49), **λαμβάνω** (Mt. 25:3), **παραλαμβάνω** (Mt. 12:45), **ἔρχομαι** (Mk. 1:29), **ἀναχωρέω** (Mk. 3:7), etc. Cf. Mt. 27:66. So with **εἰμί** (Mk. 3:14), but sometimes the notion of help or aid is added as in Jo. 3:2; 8:29, etc. Cf. also **ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν** (Ro. 16:20) and often. The notion of fellowship may develop into that of followers or partisans as in Mt. 12:30. Sometimes the phrase of **οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ** with the participle (Jo. 9:40) or without (Mt. 12:4) means one's attendants or followers (companions). The idea of accompaniment also occurs with things as in **ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν** (Lu. 22:52), **μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων** (Mt. 25:4), **μετὰ σάλπιγγος** (Mt. 24:31), **μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ** (Ac. 13:17), some of which approach the instrumental idea. Cf. **μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν** (1 Tim. 4:14), where the idea is rather 'simultaneous with,' but see **μετὰ ὅρκου** (Mt. 14:7), **μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης** (Lu. 17:15). Still in all these cases accompaniment is the dominant note. See also **μηδέν(α) ἀπολελύσθαι τῶν μετὰ σίτου** ('in the corn service'), B.U. 27 (ii/A.D.). Certainly it is not a Hebraism in Lu. 1:58, for Moulton (*Prol*., p. 246) can cite A.P. 135 (ii/A.D.) **τί δὲ ἡμεῖν συνέβη μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων;** In later Greek the instrumental use comes to be common with **μετά** (cf. English "with").[3] In Lu. 10:37 **ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ** Debrunner (Blass-Deb., p. 134) sees a Hebraism. But see Herm. S. V. 1, 1, **ἐποίησε μετ' ἐμοῦ**. The metaphorical use for the idea of accompaniment occurs also like **μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης** (Mt. 24:30), **μετὰ σπουδῆς** (Mk. 6:25), **μετὰ δακρύων** (Heb. 12:17), **μετὰ**

[1] Lang. of the N. T., p. 150. [2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 133 f.

[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 387. For **μετά** compared with **παρά** see Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 268.

φόβου καὶ τρόμου (2 Cor. 7:15), **παρρησίας** (Ac. 2:29), **θορύβου** (Ac. 24:18), etc. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, pp. 64, 265) finds in the papyri examples of **μετὰ καί** like that in Ph. 4:3. Cf. Schmid, *Der Atticismus*, III, p. 338. In the modern Greek vernacular **μέ** is confined to accompaniment, means or instrument and manner. Time has dropped out (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 103. f.).

6. *With the Accusative.* At first it seems to present more difficulty. But the accusative-idea added to the root-idea ("midst") with verbs of motion would mean "into the midst" or "among." But this idiom does not appear in the N. T. In the late Greek vernacular **μετά** with the accusative occurs in all the senses of **μετά** and the genitive,[1] but that is not true of the N. T. Indeed, with one exception (and that of place), **μετὰ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα** (Heb. 9:3), in the N. T. **μετά** with the accusative is used with expressions of time. This example in Hebrews is helpful, however. The resultant notion is that of behind or beyond the veil obtained. by going through the midst of the veil. All the other examples have the resultant notion of "after" which has added to the root-meaning, as applied to time, the notion of succession. You pass through the midst of this and that event and come to the point where you look back upon the whole. This idea is "after." Cf. **μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας** (Mt. 26:2). In the historical books of the LXX **μετὰ ταῦτα** (cf. Lu. 5:27) is very common.[2] Simcox[3] treats **οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας** (Ac. 1:5) as a Latinism, but, if that is not true of **πρό**, it is hardly necessary to posit it of **μετά**. Cf. **μετὰ ἡμέρας εἴκοσι** Herm. Vis. IV, 1, 1. The litotes is common. Jannaris[4] comments on the frequency of **μετὰ τό** with the infinitive in the LXX and N. T. So **μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι** (Acts 10:41). Cf. 1 Cor. 11:25; Heb. 10:26, etc. This comes to be one of the common ways of expressing a temporal clause (cf. **ἐπεί** or **ὅτε**). Cf. **μετὰ βραχύ** (Lu. 22:58), **μετὰ μικρόν** (Mk. 14:70), adverbial phrases.

(k) **Παρά**.

1. *Significance*. Delbruck[5] does not find the etymology of **παρά** clear and thinks it probably is not to be connected with *parea* (Sanskrit), which means 'distant.' Brugmann[6] connects it with the old word *pura* like Latin *por—*, Gothic *faura*, Anglo-Saxon *fore* (cf. German *vor*). Giles[7] thinks the same root furnishes **παρός** (gen.),

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 387.
[2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 266.
[3] Lang. of the N. T., p. 151.
[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 386.
[5] Vergl. Synt., I, pp. 755, 761.
[6] Kurze Vergl. Gr., II, p. 474; Griech. Gr., p. 446.
[7] Comp. Philol., p. 342.

παρά (instr.), παραί (dat.), περί (loc.). He also sees a kinship in these to πέραν, πέρα, πρός.

2. *Compared with* πρός. In meaning[1] παρά, and πρός do not differ essentially save that παρά merely means 'beside,' 'alongside' (cf. our "parallel"), while πρός rather suggests 'facing one another,' an additional idea of contrast. This oldest meaning explains all the later developments.[2] Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 116) thinks that the N. T. shows confusion in the use of παρά (διελογίζοντο παρ' [marg. of W. H. and Nestle, ἐν in text] ἑαυτοῖς, Mt. 21:25) and διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοίς (Mk. 11:31). But is it not diversity the rather?

3. *In Composition*. The preposition is exceedingly common in composition, though with nouns it falls behind some of the others a good deal. **Π**αρά does not survive in modern Greek vernacular save in composition (like ἀνά and ἐκ) and some of its functions go to ἀπό and εἰς.[3] All the various developments of παρά appear in composition, and the simplest use is very common. Thus παρα-βολή (Mk. 13:28) is a 'placing of one thing beside another.' So παρα-θαλάσσιος (Mt. 4:13) is merely 'beside the sea.' Cf. also παρα-θήκη (2 Tim. 1:14), παρα-καθεσθείς (Lu. 10:39), παρα-λακέω (Ac. 28:20), παρά-κλητος (Jo. 14:16), παρα-λέγομαι (Ac. 27:8), παρ-άλιος (Lu. 6:17), παρα-μένω (Heb. 7:23; cf. μενῶν καὶ παρα-μενῶ Ph. 1:25), παρα-πλέω (Ac. 20:16), παρα-ρρέω (Heb. 2:1), παρα-τίθημι (Mk. 6:41), πάρ-ειμι (Lu. 13:1), etc. A specially noticeable word is πάρ-οινος (1 Tim. 3:3). Cf. also ἀντι-παρ-ῆλθεν in Lu. 10:31 f. Sometimes παρά suggests a notion of stealth as in παρ-εισ-άγω (2 Pet. 2:1), παρ-εισ-δύω (Ju. 4), παρ-είσ-ακτος (Gal. 2:4), but in παρ-εισ-έρχομαι at in Ro. 5:20 this notion is not present. Cf. Mt. 14:15, ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρῆλθεν, 'the hour is already far spent' ('gone by'). Note also the Scotch "far in" like modern Greek παραμέσα (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 247). A few examples of the "perfective" use occur as in παροξύνω (Ac. 17:16), παρα-πικραίνω (Heb. 3:16), παρά-σημος (Ac. 28:11), παρα-τηρέω (Gal. 4:10, but in Lu. 14:1 the idea of envious watching comes out). With παρα-φρονέω the notion is rather 'to be beside one's self,' 'out of mind.' Cf. also παρά-σημος in Heb. 6:6, found in the ostraca (Wilcken, i. 78 f.) as a commercial word 'to fall below par.' For παρενοχλεῖν, (Ac. 15:19) see παρενοχλεῖν ἡμᾶς, P. Tb. 36 (ii/B.o.). **Π**αρά occurs in the N. T. with three cases. The locative has 50 examples, the accusative 60, the ablative 78.[4]

[1] K.-G., I, p. 509.
[2] Delbruck, Die Grundl., p. 130.
[3] Thumb., FIandb., p. 102.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 106.

4. *With the Locative*. **Παρά** with the locative is nearly confined to persons. Only one other example appears, **ἱστήκεισαν παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ** (Jo. 19:25). This confining of παρά to persons is like the usual Greek idiom, though Homer[1] used it freely with both. Homer used it also as an adverb and in the shortened form πάρ. The only instance in the N. T. of the locative with παρά, after a verb of motion is in Lu. 9:47, **ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ' ἑαυτῷ**, though here D reads **ἑαυτόν**. The locative with παρά leaves the etymological idea unchanged so that we see the preposition in its simplest usage. Cf. **ὃν ἀπέλειπον παρὰ Κάρπῳ** (2 Tim. 4:13) as a typical example of the use with persons which is much like *apud* in Latin, 'at one's house' (Jo. 1:40), 'in his society,' etc. So **καταλύσαι παρά** (Lu. 19:7), **μένω παρά**, (Jo. 14:17), **ξενίζω παρά** (Ac. 21:16). Cf. Ac. 21:8. In Rev. 2:13; Mt. 28:15, παρά has the idea of 'among.' The phrase **παρὰ τῷ θεῷ** (Lu. 1 : 30) is common. The word is used in ethical relations,[2] also like **παρ' ἐμοί** (2 Cor. 1:17). Cf. **τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται᾽ αρ' ὑμῖν** (Ac. 26:8) and **φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς** (Ro. 12:16). **Παρά** with the locative does not occur in Hebrews.

5. *With the Ablative.* But it occurs only with persons (like the older Greek). The distinction between παρά and **ἀπό** and **ἐκ** has already been made. In Mk. 8:11 both παρά and **ἀπό** occur, **ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ** (cf. 12:2), and in Jo. 1:40 we have both παρά and **ἐκ, εἷς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων παρὰ Ἰωάνου**. In a case like Jo. 8:38 the locative is followed by the ablative,[3] **ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρί — ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρός**, though some MSS. have locative in the latter clause also. But the ablative here is in strict accordance with Greek usage as in a case like **ἀκοῦσαι παρὰ σοῦ** (Ac. 10:22). On the other hand in Jo. 6:45 f. we find the ablative in both instances, **ὁ ἀκούσας᾽ αρὰ τοῦ πατρός— ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ** (cf. **ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός** in Jo. 1:18). But this last παρά implies the coming of Christ from the Father, like **παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον**, (Jo. 16:27). **Παρά** with the ablative means 'from the side of' as with the accusative it means 'to the side of.' The phrase **οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ** therefore describes one's family or kinsmen (Mk. 3:21). In the papyri the phrase is very common for one's agents, and Moulton4 has found one or two like **οἱ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντες** parallel to of **οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ** in Mk. 3:21. Cf. also **τὰ παρ'**

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 134.
[2] Simcox, Lang. of N. T., p. 151.
[3] Abbott Joh. Gr., p. 271.
[4] Prol., p. 106. In G. H. 36 (ii/B.C.), B. U. 998 (ii/B.C.), P. Par. 36 (ii/B.C.). Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 138.

αὐτῶν (Lu. 10:7) for one's resources or property. Rouffiac (*Recherches*, etc., p. 30) cites ἐδαπάνησεν παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ from inscription from Priene (1,11, 117). Note also ἡ παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ διαθήκη (Ro. 11:27) with notion of authorship. With passive verbs the agent is sometimes expressed by παρά as in ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ (Jo. 1:6), τοῖς λελαλημένοις παρὰ **Κυρίου** (Lu. 1:45). Cf. Text. Rec. in Ac. 22:30 with κατηγορεῖται παρὰ τῶν ᾽**Ιουδαίων**, where W. H. have **ὑπό. Π**αρά, occurs with the middle in Mt. 21:42, παρὰ **Κυρίου ἐγένετο**. In the later Greek vernacular παρά with the ablative helped supplant **ὑπό** along with **ἀπό**, and both παρά and **ὑπό** (and **ἐκ)** vanished[1] "before the victorious **ἀπό**."

6. *With the Accusative.* It is not found in John's writings at all[2] as it is also wanting in the other Catholic Epistles. The accusative is common in the local sense both with verbs of motion and of rest. The increase in the use of the accusative with verbs of rest explains in part the disuse of the locative.[3] One naturally compares the encroachments of **εἰς** upon **ἐν**. We see the idiom in the papyri as in **οἱ** παρὰ *σὲ* **θεοί**., P. Par. 47 (B.C. 153). The use of παρά with the accusative with verbs of rest was common in Northwest Greek (Buck, *Greek Dialects*, p. 101). Thus in Mt. 4:18 we find περιπατῶν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν logically enough, but in 13:1 we meet ἐκάθητο παρὰ τῆν θάλασσαν, and note καθήμενοι παρὰ τῆν ὁδόν (Mt. 20:30), ἑστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην (Lu. 5:1), ἐστὶν οἰκία παρά θάλασσαν (Ac. 10:6), διδάσκειν παρὰ θάλασσαν (Mk. 4:1), ἀνατεθραμμένος παρὰ τοὺς πόδας (Ac. 22:3). Cf. Ac. 4:35. So no difficulty arises from ἔριψαν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας (Mt. 15: 30). There is no example in the N. T. of παρά in the sense of 'beyond,' like Homer, but one where the idea is 'near to,' alongside of,' as ἦλθεν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν (Mt. 15:29). But figuratively παρά does occur often in the sense of 'beside the mark' or 'beyond.' Once[4] indeed we meet the notion of 'minus,' as in τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν (2 Cor. 11:24). Cf. παρὰ τάλαντόν σοι πέπρακα, B.U. 1079 (A.D. 41), where παρά means 'except.' The modern Greek vernacular keeps παρὰ τρίχα, 'within a hair's breadth' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 98). The notion of 'beyond' is common enough in classic writers and is most frequent in Hebrews in the N. T. It occurs with comparative forms like διαφορώτερον (Heb. 1:4), πλείονος (3:3), κρείττοσι (9:23; cf. 12:24),

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 391.

[2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 270. [3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 138.

[4] W.-Th., p. 404. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 138, less naturally explains παρά here as meaning 'by virtue of,' but not Debrunner.

with implied comparison like ἠλάττωσας βραχύ τι (2:7), or with merely the positive like ἁμαρτωλοί (Lu. 13: 2; cf. 13:4). Indeed no adjective or participle at all may appear, as in ὀφειλέται ἐγένοντο παρὰ πάντας (Lu. 13:4 ; cf. 13:2). The use of the positive with παρά is like the Aramaic (cf. Wellhausen, *Einl*., p. 28). Here the notion of 'beyond ' or 'above ' is simple enough. Cf. παρά after ἄλλος in 1 Cor. 3:11 and ἡμέραν in Ro. 14:5; Heb. 11:11. The older Greek was not without this natural use of παρά for comparison and the LXX is full of it.[1] In the later Greek vernacular the ablative and both retreat before παρά and the accusative.[2] In the modern Greek vernacular we find παρά and the accusative and even with the nominative after comparison (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 75). The notion of comparison may glide over into that of opposition very easily. Thus in Ro. 1:25, ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, where 'rather than' is the idea (cf. "instead of "). Cf. Ro. 4:18, παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, where both prepositions answer over to each other, 'beyond,' 'upon.' So in 2 Cor. 8:3 κατὰ δύναμιν and παρὰ δύναμιν are in sharp contrast. Cf. Ac. 23:3. In Gal. 1:8 f. παρ' ὅ has the idea of 'beyond' and so 'contrary to.' Cf. Ro. 11:24; 12:3; 16:17. To exceed instructions is often to go contrary to them. In a case like παρὰ νόμον (Ac. 18:13), to go beyond is to go against. Cf. English trans-gression, παρά-πτωμα. Once more παρά, with the accusative strangely enough may actually mean 'because of,' like *propter*. So in 1 Cor. 12:15 f. παρὰ τοῦτο. Cf. D in Lu. 5:7. The Attic writers used παρά thus, but it disappears in the later vernacular.[3] The notion of cause grows out of the idea of nearness and the nature of the context. Farrar[4] suggests the English colloquial: "It's all along of his own neglect."

(l) **Περί**. There is some dispute about the etymology of περί. Some scholars, like Sonne,[5] connect it in etymology and meaning with ὑπέρ. But the point is not yet clear, as Brugmann[6] contends. Whatever may be true about the remote Indo-Germanic root, περί belongs to the same stem as παρά and is in the locative case like *pari* in the Sanskrit.[7] Cf. also Old Persian *pariy*, Zend *pairi*, Latin *per*, Lithuanian *per*, Gothic *fair–*, Old High German *far–, fer,* German *ver–*. The Greek uses πέρι as an adverb (Homer)

[1] C. and S., p. 85 f.; Thack., Gr., p. 23.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 389.
[3] Ib., p. 390.
[4] Gk. Synt., p. 104.
[5] K. Z., 14, pp. 1ff. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 700.
[6] Kurze vergl. Gr., II, p. 475.
[7] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 447; Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 700.

and the AEolic dialect[1] even uses πέρ instead of περί. The intensive particle περ is this same word.

1. *The Root-Meaning*. It is 'round' (‘around’), 'on all sides' (cf. ἀμφί, ‘on both sides’). Cf. πέριξ (Ac. 5:16), where the root-idea is manifest. Cf. Latin *circum, circa*. The preposition has indeed a manifold development,[2] but after all the root-idea is plainer always than with some of the other prepositions. The N. T. examples chiefly (but cf. Ac. 28:7) concern persons and things, though even in the metaphorical uses the notion of ‘around’ is present.

2. *In Composition.* The idea of 'around' in the literal local sense is abundant. Cf. περιῆγεν (Mt. 4:23), περιαστράψαι (Ac. 22: 6), περιεστῶτα (Jo. 11:42), περιέδραμον (Mk. 6:55), περιφέρειν (Mk. 6:55), περι-έρχομαι (Ac. 19:13), φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν (Mt. 21:33). In περι-πατέω (Mt. 9:5) περί has nearly lost its special force, while in περιεργαζομένους (2 Th. 3:11) the whole point lies in the preposition. Note in Mk. 3:34, περι-βλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους, where κύκλῳ explains περί already twice expressed. Cf. also περι-κυκλώσουσίν σε (Lu. 19:43). The perfective idea of περί in composition is manifest in περι-ελεῖν ἁμαρτίας (Heb. 10:11), 'to take away altogether.' Cf. περι-αψάντων πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς (Lu. 22:55), where note the addition of περί to ἐν μέσῳ. In Mk. 14:65 περι-καλύπτω means 'to cover all round,' ‘to cover up,’ like περι-κρύπτωin Lu. 1:24. This is the "perfective" sense. Cf. περί-λυπος in Mt. 26:38. *Per contra* note περίεργος (1 Tim. 5:13) for 'busybody,' busy about trifles and not about important matters. In 1 Tim. 6:10 note περιέπειραν in the sense of 'pierced through.' But in 2 Cor. 3 : 16, περιαιρεῖται, 'the veil is removed from around the head.'

3. *Originally Four Cases Used*. These were the locative, accusative, genitive, ablative. The locative was never common in prose and died out in the late Greek, not appearing in the N. T. Delbruck[3] is very positive about the ablative in some examples in Homer and the earlier Greek. Indeed he thinks that the true genitive is a later development after the ablative with περί. I think it probable that some of these ablative examples survive in the N. T., though I do not stress the point.[4]

4. *With the Ablative*. There is some doubt as to how to explain

[1] K.-G., I, p. 491.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 447.
[3] Die Grundi., p. 131 f.; Vergl. Synt., I, p. 711 f.
[4] Cf. also Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 447.

the ablative with περί. In Homer[1] it is usually explained as like ablative of comparison. Cf. ὑπέρ. Thus περί is taken in the sense of 'beyond' or 'over,' and is allied to πέρα (πέραν) and ὑπέρ, according to the original sense.[2] Brugmann[3] cites also περίειμι and περιγίγνομαι where the notion of superiority comes in. With this compare περικρατεῖς γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης (Ac. 27:16), which would thus have the ablative in σκάφης. But Monro[4] admits that the origin of this notion with περί is not quite clear. On the other hand, the use of περί in composition may throw light on the subject. In 2 Cor. 3:16, περι-αιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα, 'the veil is taken from around.' Cf. also Ac. 27:20. The same notion occurs in περι-κάθαρμα (1 Cor. 4:13) and περιψημα (ib.), 'off-scouring' and 'off-scraping.' The same idea of *from around* occurs in περι-ρήξαντες τὰ ἱμάτια (Ac. 16:22; cf. 2 Macc. 4:38). In Lu. 10:40 this idea appears in a metaphorical sense with περιεσπᾶτο, 'drawn away' or 'from around,' 'distracted.' See περισπαῖ, P. Brit. M. 42 (B.C. 168) for 'occupy.' Cf. also the notion of beyond in περιεργος (1 Tim. 5:13), περιλείπω (1 Th. 4:15), περιμένω (Ac. 1:4), περιούσιος (Tit. 2:14), περισσεύω (Jo. 6:12), περισσός (Mt. 5:37). In the last example, τὸ περισσὸν τούτων, note the ablative. There remains a group of passages of a metaphorical nature where the idea is that of taking something away. These may be explained as ablatives rather than genitives. So in Ro. 8:3, περὶ ἁμαρτίας, the idea is that we may be freed from sin, from around sin. Thayer (under περί) explains this usage as "purpose for removing something or taking it away." This, of course, is an ablative idea, but even so we get it rather indirectly with περί. See Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν in 1 Pet. 3:18. It is worth observing that in Gal. 1:4 W. H. read ὑπέρ rather than περί, while in Heb. 5:3 W. H. have περί rather than ὑπέρ. Cf. Mk. 14:24. In Eph. 6:18 f. we have δεήσει περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, where the two prepositions differ very little. But in 1 Pet. 3:18 (see above), ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, the distinction is clearer. Cf. Jo. 16:26; 17:9. See Simcox, *Lang. of the N. T.*, p. 152 f. D has ὑπέρ with ἐκχυννόμενον in Mt. 26:28 rather than περί. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 134. Cf. περί with ἱλασμός in 1 Jo. 2:2. The ablative with ὑπέρ renders more probable this ablative use of περί.

5. *With the Genitive*. This is the common case with περί in the

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 133; Sterrett, The Dial. of Hom. in Hom. Il., N 47.
[2] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 714. Cf. περαιτέρω, Ac. 19 : 39.
[3] Griech. Gr., p. 448. Cf. Furze vergl. Gr., II, p. 476.
[4] Hom. Gr., p. 133.

N. T. If the genitive and ablative examples are counted together (the real ablatives are certainly few) they number 291 as against 38 accusatives.[1] But in the later Greek the accusative gradually drives out the genitive (with the help of διά also).[2] The genitive was always rare with περί in the local or temporal sense. The N. T. shows no example of this usage outside of composition (Ac. 25:7), unless in Ac. 25:18 περὶ οὗ a be taken with σταθέντες, which is doubtful.[3] Curiously enough the Gospel of John has the genitive with περί almost as often as all the Synoptic writers and the accusative not a all in the critical text, Jo. 11:19 reading πρὸς τὴν **Μ**άρθαν.[4] This frequency in John is due largely to the abundant use of **μαρτυρέω, λέγω,** λαλέω, γράφω, etc. Cf. Jo. 1:7, 22:7, 13, 17, etc. **Π**ερί may occur with almost any verb where the notion of 'about,' 'concerning' is natural, like ἐσπλαγχνίσθη (Mt. 9:36), ἠγανάκτησαν (20:24), **μ**έλει (22:16), ἐλεγχόμενος (Lu. 3:19), ἐθαύμασαν (Lu. 2: 18), etc. The list includes verbs like **ἀκούω, γινώσκω, διαλογίζομαι ἐνθυμέομαι, ἐπιζητέω**, etc. The usage includes both persons, like προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν (1 Th. 5:25), and things, like περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε (Mt. 6:28). One neat Greek idiom is τὰ περί. Cf. τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, (Ac. 24:22), τὰ περὶ **Ἰ**ησοῦ (18:25; Mk. 5:27), τὰ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ (Ac. 24:10). Blass[5] considers ποιεῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ (Lu. 2:27) "an incorrect phrase," which is putting it too strongly. Cf. λαγχάνω περί in Jo. 19:24, like classical **μ**άχομαι περί. Sometimes rept appears rather loosely at the beginning of the sentence, περὶ τῆς λογίας (1 Cor. 16:1), περὶ **Ἀ**πολλώ (16:12). Sometimes περί is used with the relative when it would be repeated if the antecedent were expressed, as in περὶ ὧν ἐγράψατε (1 Cor. 7:1) or where περί properly belongs only with the antecedent, as in περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς **μ**οι (Jo. 17:9). In Lu. 19:37, περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων, the preposition strictly belongs only to the antecedent which is incorporated. In a case like περὶ πάντων εὔχομαι (3 Jo. 2) the subject-matter of the prayer is implied in περί as cause is involved in περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ (Mk. 1:44) and as advantage is expressed in περὶ αὐτῆς (Lu. 4:38). But this is merely due to the context.

6. *With the Accusative*. This construction in reality occurs with much the same sense as the genitive. The accusative, of course, suggests a placing around. It is rare in the N. T., but in later Greek displaced the genitive as already remarked. But it does not survive in the modern Greek vernacular. With the accusative

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 105.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 392.
[3] W.-Th., p. 373.
[4] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 272.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 135.

περί is used of place, as in σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν (Lu. 13:8), περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον (Ac. 28:7). Cf. Mk. 3:8. So with expressions of time, as in περὶ τρίτην ὥραν (Mt. 20:3). Note the use of περί with the different parts of the body, as περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν (Mt. 3:4), περὶ τὸν τράχηλον (18:6). Cf. Rev. 15:6. **Περί** is used of persons as in περι-αστράψαι περὶ ἐμέ (Ac. 22:6), εἶδαν περὶ αὐτούς (Mk. 9:14). An ancient Greek idiom occurs in **οἱ περὶ Παῦλον** (Ac. 13:13), like of **περὶ Χενοφῶντα** (Xen. *Anab*. 7, 4, 16), where the idea is 'Paul and his companions.'[1] But in a case like **οἱ περὶ αὐτόν** (Lu. 22:49) the phrase has only its natural significance, 'those about him.' The still further development of this phrase for the person or persons named alone, like the vernacular "you all" in the Southern States for a single person, appears in some MSS. for Jo. 11:19, **πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν**, where only Martha and Mary are meant,[2] the critical text being **πρὸς τὴν Μάρθαν**. Blass[3] notes that only with the Philippian Epistle (2:23, **τὰ περὶ ἐμέ**) did Paul begin the lase of the accusative with περί (cf. genitive) in the sense of 'concerning,' like Plato. Cf. in the Pastoral Epistles, **περὶ τὴν πίστιν** (1 Tim. 1:19), **περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν** (2 Tim. 2:18). But Luke (10: 40 f.) has it already. Cf. **περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα** (Ac. 19:25). But **κύκλῳ** in the LXX, as in the **κοινή**, is also taking the place of **περί** (Thackeray, Gr., p. 25). **Ἀμφί** could not stand before **ὑπέρ**, and finally **περί** itself went down. The entrance of **ὑπέρ** into the field of **περί** will call for notice later.

(m) **Πρό**. Cf. the Sanskrit *pra* and the Zend *fra*, Gothic *fra*, Lithuanian *pra,* Latin *pro*, German *fur*, *vor*, English *for* (*for*-ward), *fore* (*fore*-front). The case of **πρό** is not known, though it occurs a few times in Homer as an adverb.[4] Cf. **ἀπό** and **ὑπό**. The Latin *prod* is probably remodelled from an old **pro* like an ablative, as *prae* is dative (or locative).

1. *The Original Meaning.* It is therefore plain enough. It is simply 'fore,' 'before.' It is rather more general in idea than Cori and has a more varied development.[5] In **πρό τῆς θύρας** (Ac. 12:6) the simple idea is clear.

2. *In Composition*. It is common also in composition, as in **προ-αύλιον** (Mk. 14:68), 'fore-court.' Other uses in composition grow out of this idea of 'fore,' as **προ-βαίνω** (Mt. 4:21), 'to go on' ('for-wards'), **προ-κόπτω** (Gal. 1:14), **προ-άγω** (Mk. 11:9; cf. **ἀκολουθέω** in contrast), **πρό-δηλος** (1 Tim. 5:24), 'openly manifest,'

[1] W.-Th., p. 406.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 134.
[3] Ib.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 149.
[5] K.-G., I, p. 454. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl; Synt., I, p. 716.

'before all' (cf. Ga1.3:1, προ-εγράφη); προ-έχω (Ro. 3:9), 'to surpass'; προ-αμαρτάνω (2 Cor. 12:21), 'to sin before,' 'previously'; προ-ορίζω (Ro. 8:29), to 'pre-ordain.' Cf. πρό-κριμα (1 Tim. 5: 21), 'pre-judgment.' In these respects the N. T. merely follows in the wake of the older Greek.[1] One may illustrate πρό still further by the comparative προ-τερος and the superlative πρῶ-τος (cf. Doric πρᾶ-τος.). Cf. also πρό-σω, προ-πέρυσι.

3. *The Cases Used with* πρό. These call for little comment. It is barely possible that οὐρανόθι πρό in Homer may be a remnant of a locative use.[2] Brugmann[3] thinks that a true genitive is seen in πρὸ ὁδοῦ, but this is not certain. But the ablative is probably the case. In very late Greek πρό even appears with the accusative.[4] It is not in the modern Greek vernacular. The ablative is due to the idea of comparison and is found also with the Latin *pro*.[5] **Πρό** occurs only 48 times in the N. T. and is almost confined to Matthew's and John's Gospels, Luke's writings and Paul's Epistles (12 times).

4. *Place*. Thus it occurs only in four instances, πρὸ τῆς θύρας (Ac. 12:6), πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν (Jas. 5:9), πρὸ τοῦ πυλῶνος (Ac. 12:14), πρὸ τῆς πόλεως (14:13). Cf. ἔμπροσθεν, (Mt. 5:24), which is more common in this sense in the N. T. Some MSS. have πρό in Ac. 5:23. In Cyprus (borrowing from the literary language) to-day we still have πρὸ κεφαλῆς, 'at the head of the table' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 98).

5. *Time*. This is the more common idea with πρό in the N. T. Thus we find such expressions as τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν (Mt. 5:12), πρὸ καιροῦ (8:29), πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ (Mt. 24:38), πρό τοῦ ἁγίστου (Lu. 11:38), πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 11:55), πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων (1 Cor. 2:7), πρὸ χειμῶνος (2 Tim. 4:21). This is all plain sailing. Nor need one stumble much at the compound preposition (translation Hebraism) πρὸ προσώπου σου (Mk. 1:2 and parallels). Cf. Ac. 13: 24; Lu. 9:52. Nine times we have πρὸ τοῦ with the infinitive, as in Lu. 2:21; 22:15; Jo. 1:48. Here this phrase neatly expresses a subordinate clause of time (antecedent). Cf. *ante quam*. A real difficulty appears in πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 12:1), which does look like the Latin idiom in *ante diem tertium Kalendas.*

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 449.

[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 149. Cf. Delbruck, Die Grundl., p. 132. The inscr. show the loc. also. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 393.

[3] Griech. Gr., p. 449.

[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 393.

[5] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 722.

Jannaris[1] attributes this common idiom in the late Greek writers to the prevalence of the Roman system of dating. This has been the common explanation. But Moulton[2] throws doubt on this "plausible Latinism" by showing that this idiom appears in a Doric inscription of the first century B.C. (Michel, 694), **πρὸ ἁμερᾶν δέκα τῶν μυστηρίων**. The idiom occurs also in the inscriptions, **πρὸ ιε Καλανδῶν Αὐργούστων**, I.M.A. iii. 325 (ii/A.D.), and the papyri, **πρὼ δύο ἡμερόν** F.P. 118 (ii/A.D.). So Moulton proves his point that it is a parallel growth like the Latin. Rouffiac (*Recherches*, p. 29) re-enforces it by three citations from the Priene inscriptions. Cf. also **πρὸ πολλῶν τούτων ἡμερῶν** *Acta S.-Theogn*., p. 102. Moulton thinks that it is a natural development from the ablative case with **πρό**, 'starting from,' and refers to **ὀψὲ σαββάτων** in Mt. 28:1 as parallel. May it not be genuine Greek and yet have responded somewhat to the Latin influence as to the frequency (cf. LXX and the N. T.)? Similarly **πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων** (2 Cor. 12:2), 'fourteen years before (ago).' Abbott[3] considers it a transposing of **πρό**, but it is doubtful if the Greek came at it in that way. Simcox[4] calls attention to the double genitive with **πρό** in Jo. 12:1, really an ablative and a genitive.

6. *Superiority*. **Πρό** occurs in the sense of superiority also, as in **πρὸ πάντων** (Jas. 5:12; 1 Pet. 4:8). In Col. 1:17 **πρὸ πάντων** is probably time, as in **πρὸ ἐμοῦ** (Jo. 10:8; Rom. 16:7). Cf. **πρὸ τούτων πάντων** in Lu. 21:12.

(n) **Πρός**. The etymology of **πρός** is not perfectly clear. It seems to be itself a phonetic variation[5] of **προτί** which is found in Homer as well as the form **ποτί** (Arcad. **πός, πότ** in Boeotian, etc.). What the relation is between **ποτί** and **προτί** is not certain.[6] The Sanskrit *prati* is in the locative case. The connection, if any, between **πρός** and **πρό** is not made out, except that **προ-τί** and *pra-ti* both correspond to **πρό** and *pra*. Thayer considers **–τί** an adverbial suffix.

1. *The Meaning*.[7] It is the same as **προτί** and **ποτί**. The root-idea is 'near,' 'near by,' according to Delbruck,[8] though Brugmann[9] inclines to towards.' In Homer **πρός** has an adverbial

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 394. Cf. Viereck, Sermo Graecus, p. 12 f.

[2] Prol., pp. 100. He refers also to the numerous ex. in W. Schulze, Graec. Lat., pp. 14-19.

[3] Joh. Gr., p. 227.

[4] Lang. of the N. T., p. 153 f.

[5] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 449.

[6] Ib.

[7] Delbrilek, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 726. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 449.

[8] Die Grundl., p. 132.

[9] Griech. Gr., p. 449.

use, πρός δέ with the notion of 'besides.'[1] 'Near,' rather than 'towards,' seems to explain the resultant meanings more satisfactorily. The idea seems to be 'facing,' German *gegen*. Cf. πρόσωπον. In ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Jo. 1:1) the literal idea comes out well, 'face to face with God.'

2. *In Composition.* Probably one sees the original notion in προσ-εδρεύω, 'to sit near' (cf. Eurip., etc.). Some MSS. read this verb in 1 Cor. 9:13, though the best MSS. have παρεδρεύω. But we do have προσ-κεφάλαιον (Mk. 4:38) and προσ-μένω (Mt. 15:32; 1 Tim. 5:5). Cf. also προσ-φάγιον (Jo. 21:5), and προσ-ορμίζω (Mk. 6:53). The other resultant meanings appear in composition also as ' towards ' in προσ-άγω (Lu. 9:41), 'to' in προσ-κολλάω (Eph. 5:31), 'besides' in προσ-οφείλω) (Phil. 19), 'for' in προσ-καιρος (Mt. 13:21). This preposition is common in composition and sometimes the idea is simply "perfective," as in προσ-καρτερέω (Ac. 1:14), πρόσ-πεινος (Ac. 10:10).

3. *Originally with Five Cases*. The cases used with πρός were probably originally five according to Brugmann,[2] viz. locative, dative, ablative, genitive, accusative. The only doubt is as to the true dative and the true genitive. Delbruck[3] also thinks that a few genuine datives and genitives occur. Green[4] (cf. πρό) speaks of "the true genitive" with πρό; it is only rarely true of πρός and ὑπέρ. The genitive with πρός is wanting in the papyri and the Pergamon inscriptions (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 117). And in the N. T. no example of the genitive or dative appears. In Lu. 19:37 πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει might possibly be regarded as dative with ἐγγίζοντος; but it is better with the Revised Version to supply "even" and regard it as a locative. In composition (προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς, Lu. 12:1) the dative is common.[2] Maccabees shows the literary use of πρὸς with dative of numbers (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 188).

4. *The Ablative*. There is only one example of the ablative in the N. T. and this occurs in Ac. 27:34, τοῦτο πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει. This metaphorical usage means 'from the point of view of your advantage.' It is possible also to explain it as true genitive, 'on the side of.' This is a classical idiom. So then πρός in the N. T. is nearly confined to two cases. Moulton[5] agrees

[1] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, p. 728. **Πρός**, as well as μετά, still appears as adv. in Polyb. Cf. Kaelker, Quest. de Eloc. Polyb., p. 283.

[2] Griech. Gr., p. 448 f.

[3] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 729 f.

[4] Notes on Gk. and Lat. Synt., p. 163.

[5] Prol., p. 106.

with Blass[1] that this is a remnant of the literary style in Luke. Moulton finds the genitive (ablative) 23 times in the LXX. The true genitive appeared in examples like πρὸς τοῦ ποταμοῦ, 'by the river' or 'towards the river.' In the modern Greek vernacular πρός fades[2] before εἰς and ἀπό as the ablative use is going in the N. T. It is rarely used of place and time, and even so the usage is due to the literary language (Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 106).

5. *With the Locative*. **Πρός** indeed occurs in the N. T. with the locative only seven times, so that it is already pretty nearly a one-case preposition. These seven examples are all of place and call for little remark. Cf. πρὸς τῷ ὄρει (Mk. 5:11), πρὸς τῷ μνημείῳ (Jo. 20:11). They are all with verbs of rest save the use with ἐγγίζοντος in Lu. 19:37. See under 3. The correct text gives the locative in Mk. 5:11 and Jo. 20:11, else we should have only five, and D reads the accusative in Lu. 19:37. These seven examples illustrate well the etymological meaning of πρός as 'near' or 'facing.' Moulton counts 104 examples of πρός and the dative (locative) in the LXX. Four of these seven examples are in John's writings. Cf. especially Jo. 20:12. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 106) notes "P. Fi. 5 πρὸς τῷ πυλῶνι, as late as 245 A.D. "

6. *With the Accusative*. It was exceedingly common in Homer and always in the literal local sense.[3] The metaphorical usage with the accusative developed later. How common the accusative is with πρός in the N. T. is seen when one notes that the number is 679.[4] This was the classic idiom[5] with πρός both literally and metaphorically. It is not necessary to say that πρός with the accusative means 'towards.' The accusative case implies extension and with verbs of motion πρός ('near') naturally blends with the rest into the resultant idea of 'towards.' This is in truth a very natural use of πρός with the accusative, as in ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν (Mk. 3:7). In Mk. 11:1 note both εἰς (Ἱεροσόλυμα) and πρός (τὸ ὄρος) with ἐγγίζω). In Phil. 5 (W. H.) the margin has both with persons. Here Lightfoot (*in loco*) sees a propriety in the faith which is towards (πρός) Christ and the love exerted upon (εἰς) men. But that distinction hardly[6] applies in Ro. 3:25 f.; Eph. 4:12. Cf. Mk. 5:19. In Mk. 9:17 W. H. and Nestle accent πρὸς σέ. There seems to be something almost intimate, as well as personal, in some of the examples of πρός. The examples of πρός with persons are very numerous, as in ἐξεπροεύετο πρὸς αὐτόν (Mt. 3:5),

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 140.
[2] Jann., Gk. Gr., p. 366.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 142.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 106.
[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 394.
[6] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 155.

δεῦτε πρός με (Mt. 11:28), etc. But one must not think that the notion of motion is essential to the use of πρός and the accusative (cf. εἰς and ἐν). Thus in Mk. 4:1, πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν, note both ἐπί and πρός and the obvious distinc-. tion. Cf. also θερμαινόμενος πρὸ τὸ φῶς (Mk. 14:54). It is not strange, therefore, to find πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσίν (Mt. 13:56), πρὸς σὲ ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα (26:18). Cf. also τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν in Mk. 2:2. The accusative with πρός is not indeed exactly what the locative would be, especially with persons. In Mk. 14:49 we find καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸ ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων. Abbott[1] properly illustrates Jo. 1:1, ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν with this passage in Mk. and with 2 Cor. 5: 8, ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον. It is the face-to-face converse with the Lord that Paul has in mind. So John thus conceives the fellowship between the Logos and God. Cf. στόμα πρὸς στόμα in 2 Jo. 12, 3 Jo. 14 and πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον in 1 Cor. 13:12. But, while this use of πρός with words of rest is in perfect harmony with the root-idea of the preposition itself, it does not occur in the older Greek writers nor in the LXX.[2] Jannaris[3] is only able to find it in Malalas. Certainly the more common Greek idiom would have been παρά, while μετά and σύν might have been employed. Abbott,[4] however, rightly calls attention to the frequent use of πρός with verbs of speaking like λέγω, λαλέω, etc., and Demosthenes has it with ζάω. So then it is a natural step to find πρός employed for living relationship, intimate converse. Two very interesting examples of this personal intercourse occur in Lu. 24:14, ὡμίλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, and verse 17, ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους. Cf. also πρός with περιπατέω (Col. 4:5), κοινωνία (2 Cor. 6:14), διαθήκη (Ac. 3:25 as in ancient Greek), λόγος (Heb. 4:13), etc. Certainly nothing anomalous exists in πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας (Mk. 5:22) and προσκόψῃς πρὸ λίθον (Mt. 4:6). **Π**ρός is not used often with expressions of time, and the notion of extension is in harmony with the accusative case. Cf. πρὸς καιρόν in Lu. 8:13, πρὸς ὥραν in Jo. 5:35, πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας in Heb. 12:10. In πρὸς ἑσπέραν (Lu. 24:29) the resultant notion is 'toward,' rather than 'for.' Blass[5] points out that πρὸς τὸ παρόν (Heb. 12:11) is classical. The metaphorical uses of πρός are naturally numerous. Disposition towards one is often expressed by πρός, whether it be friendly as in μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας (1 Th. 5:14) or hostile as in ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς αὐτούς (Lu. 23:12).

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 273 f.
[2] Ib.
[3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 395.
[4] Joh. Gr., p. 275.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 139.

Cf. μετ᾽ ἀλλήλων (*ib.*). **Πρός** does not of itself mean 'against,' though that may be the resultant idea as in γογγυσμὸς—πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους (Ac. 6:1). Cf. also πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός (Col. 2:23) and πρὸς τοὺς κτλ. (2 Cor. 5:12). Sometimes πρός adds nothing to the vague notion of extension in the accusative case and the idea is simply 'with reference to.' Thus πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει (Heb. 1:7). Cf. also Lu. 20:19. **Πρός** in the κοινή shares with εἰς and περί, the task of supplanting the disappearing dative (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 112). In particular πρὸς αὐτόν, (–ούς) takes the place of αὐτῷ (--οῖς) after λέγω, εἶπον ἀποκρίνομαι, as shown by parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels, as in Lu. 3:14, where MSS. vary between αὐτοῖς and πρὸς αὐτούς. Adjectives may have πρός in this general sense of fitness, like ἀγαθός (Eph. 4:29), δυνατά (2 Cor. 10:4), ἱκανός (2 Cor. 2:16), λευκαὶ πρὸς θερισμόν (Jo. 4:35), etc. Cf. also τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Ro. 15: 17). The phrase τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς; (Mt. 27:4) has ancient Greek support.[1] The notion of aim or end naturally develops also as in ἐγράφη πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν (1 Cor. 10:11), πρὸς τί εἶπεν (Jo. 13:28), ὁ πρὸς τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην καθήμενος (Ac. 3:10). Cf. 1 Cor. 14:26; 15:34. Some examples of the infinitive occur also in this connection, like πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς (Mt. 6:1), πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι αὐτά (13:30), etc. In πρὸς τὸ δεῖν προσεύχεσθαι (Lu. 18:1) the notion is hardly so strong as 'purpose.' But see Infinitive. Then again cause may be the result in certain contexts as in Μωυσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν (Mt. 19:8). There is no difficulty about the notion of comparison. It may be merely general accord as in πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ (Lu. 12: 47), πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν (Gal. 2:14), or more technical comparison as in οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι (Ro. 8:18). With this may be compared πρὸς φθόνον, in Jas. 4:5, where the phrase has an adverbial force.

(o) **Σύν**. The older form ξύν (old Attic) appears in some MSS. in 1 Pet. 4:12 (Beza put it in his text here). This form ξύν is seen in ξυνός. In μετα-ξύ both μετά and ξύ(ν) are combined.[2] Delbruck[3] is indeed in doubt as to the origin of σύν, but see Mommsen,[4] and some (Giles, *Comp. Philol.*, p. 343) consider ξύν and σύν, different.

1. *The Meaning*. This is in little dispute. It is 'together with.'[5]

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 139.

[2] Brug., Griech. Cr., p. 454:

[3] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 730.

[4] Entwick. einiger Cosetze fur d. Gehr. d. Prap. μετά, σύν and ἅμα, p. 444.

[5] Drug., Griech. Or., p. 454.

Cf. Latin *cum* and English *con*-comitant. The associative instrumental is the case used with **σύν** as with **ἅμα** and it is just that idea that it was used to express originally.[1] It never departed from this idea, for when the notion of help is present it grows naturally out of that of association. The Attic, according to Blass,[2] confines **σύν**, to the notion of 'including,' but the Ionic kept it along with **μετά**, for 'with.'

2. *History*. It is not without interest. In Homer it is sometimes an adverb (tmesis). Indeed it never made headway outside of poetry save in Xenophon, strange to say. The Attic prose writers use **μετά** rather than **σύν**. Thus in 600 pages of Thucydides we find **μετά** 400 times and **ξύν** 37, while Xenophon has **σύν** more than **μετά**. In Demosthenes the figures run 346 of **μετά** and 15 of **σύν**, while Aristotle has 300 and 8 respectively.[3] Monro[4] thinks that **μετά** displaced **σύν** in the vernacular while **σύν** held on in the poets as the result of Homer's influence and finally became a sort of inseparable preposition like *dis*— in Latin (cf. **ἀμφι**— in N. T.). In the modern Greek vernacular **σύν** is displaced by **μέ (μετά)** and sometimes by **ἅμα**.[5] The rarity of **σύν** in the N. T. therefore is in harmony with the history of the language. Its use in the N. T. is largely confined to Luke's Gospel and Acts and is entirely absent from John's Epistles and the Apocalypse as it is also from Hebrews and 1 Peter, not to mention 2 Thessalonians, Philemon and the Pastoral Epistles. It is scarce in the rest of Paul's writings and in Mark and Matthew,[6] and John's Gospel has it only three times (12:2; 18:1; 21:3). It occurs in the N. T. about 130 times (over two-thirds in Luke and Acts), the MSS. varying in a few instances.

3. *In Composition.* Here **σύν** is extremely common. See list of these verbs in chapter on Cases (Instrumental). Cf. Thayer's Lexicon under **σύν**. The use in composition illustrates the associative idea mainly as in **συν-άγω** (Mt. 2:4), **συν-έρχομαι** (Mk. 3:20), though the notion of help is present also, as in **συν-αντι-λαμβάνομαι**. (Lu. 10:40), **συν-εργέω** (1 Cor. 16:16). Cf. **χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω** (Ph. 2:17 f.). The "perfective" use of **σύν** is seen in **συν-καλύπτω** (Lu. 12:2), **συν-κλείω** (Ro. 11:32), **συν-κύπτω** (Lu. 13:11). Cf. **συντελέω, συντηρέω**, etc. In **σύνοιδα** the knowing may be either with another, as possibly Ac. 5:2, or with one's self, as in 1 Cor. 4:4.

[1] Delbruck, Die Grundl., p. 133.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 132.
[3] Cf. Mommsen, Entw. etc., p. 4 f.
[4] Hom. Gr., p. 147.
[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 366.
[6] Cf. on the whole subject Mommsen, Entw., p. 395.

The verb δυνέχω (Lu. 22:63; Ac. 18:5) is found in the papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 160. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, 1911, p. 278). As already explained, the case used is the associative-instrumental. In the very late Greek the accusative begins to appear with σύν, (as indeed already in the LXX!) and both σύν and ἅμα show[1] examples of the genitive like μετά.

4. *N. T. Usage.* There is very little comment needed on the N.T. usage of the preposition beyond what has already been given.[2] The bulk of the passages have the notion of accompaniment, like σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν (Mt. 26:35). So it occurs with μένειν (Lu. 1:56), καθίσαι (Ac. 8:31), etc. Cf. also σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (Ac. 15:22), where the use of σύν may subordinate the church a bit to the Apostles (Thayer).[3] Cf. also Ac. 14:5; Lu. 23:11, where καί rather than σύν might have occurred. As applied to Christ, σύν, like ἐν, may express the intimate mystic union, as in κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ (Col. 3:3). The phrase οἱ σύν is used much like οἱ παρά, οἱ περί, οἱ μετά. Thus Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ (Lu. 9:32). Cf. Lu. 5:9 and Mk. 2:26. Once σύν occurs in a context where the idea is 'besides,' ἀλλά γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσιν τούτοις (Lu. 24:21). Cf. Neh. 5:18. So probably also Ph. 1:1. It appears in the papyri in this sense also. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, "Lexical Notes on the Papyri," *The Expositor*, 1911, p. 276. In Mt. 8:34 Text. Rec. reads εἰς συνάντησιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, where critical text has The case of Ἰησοῦ is associative-instrumental in either instance. MSS. give συν-- in other passages. The use of σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου (1 Cor. 5:4) has a technical sense ('together with') seen in the magical papyri and in an Attic cursing tablet (iii/B.C.). Cf. Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 304 f. See also Deissmann's *Die neut. Formel "in Christo Jesu"* for discussion of σὺν Χριστῷ, the notion of fellowship in Ph. 1:23. He now cites a *graffito* with these words to a deceased person, εὔχομαι κἀγὼ ἐν τάχυ σὺν σοὶ εἶναι (*Light*, p. 305). Cf. Col. 3:3. In 1 Th. 4:17 note ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς and in 5:10 ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ like our "together with," which shows also the retreat of σύν before ἅμα. For συν-επι and κατά see Ac. 16:22.

(p) Ὑπέρ. In Homer, by anastrophe, sometimes we have ὕπερ. Cf. Sanskrit *upari* (locative case of *upar*), Zend *upairi*, Latin *super*, Gothic *ufar*, German *uber*, Anglo-Saxon *ofer*, English *over*. The

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 396 f.; Jour. of Hell. Stud., XIX, pp. 287-288.

[2] Cf. Westcott on Jo. 1:2 for discussion of distinction between σύν and μετά.

[3] Cf. the use of σὺν καί in the pap. Deiss., B. S., p.. 265 f.

oldest Indo-Eur. locative[1] was without *i*. A longer comparative occurs in **ὑπέρτερος**, and a superlative **ὑπέρτατος** shortened into **ὕπατος**. Cf. Latin *superus, summus*, and English *up, upper, uppermost*.

1. *The Meaning*. It is therefore clear enough. It is the very English word 'over' or 'upper.' Chaucer uses ‘over’ in the sense of 'upper.' As an adverb it does not occur in Homer, though Euripides (*Medea*, 627) has **ὑπὲρ ἄγαν**. Jannaris[2] calls **ὕπερ** (Blass **ὑπὲρ**) **ἐγώ** (2 Cor. 11:23) "the monstrous construction," which is rather overdoing the matter. The use of the preposition is not remarkably abundant in the N. T.

2. *In Composition.* The N.T. has also the compound prepositions bream.) (Eph. 1:21), **ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ** (Eph. 3:20), **ὑπερέκεινα** (2 Cor. 10:16) and the adverbs **ὑπερλίαν** (2 Cor. 11:5), **ὑπερβαλλόντως** (2 Cor. 11:23). The literal meaning of **ὑπέρ** (‘over’) appears in **ὑπερ-άνω** (Heb. 9:5), **ὑπὲρ αὐτή** (ib. D), **ὑπερ-ῷον** (‘upper room,’ Ac. 1:13). The notion of ‘excess,’ ‘more than’ (comparison), appears in **ὑπερ-αίρω** (2 Cor. 12:7) **ὑπερ-εκπερισσοῦ** (1 Th. 3:10), **ὑπερ-ἐχω** (Ph. 4:7), **ὑπερ-νικάω** (Ro. 8:37), **ὑπερ-υψόω** (Ph. 2:9), **ὑπέρ-φρονέω** (Ro. 12:3). 'Beyond' is rather common also, as in **ὑπέρ-ακμος** (1 Cor. 7:36), **ὑπερ-αυξάνω** (2 Th. 1:3), **ὑπερ-βαίνω** (1 Th. 4:6), **ὑπερ-εκτείνω** in 2 Cor. 10:14, **ὑπερ-ἐκεινα** (10:16), and this grows into the "perfective" idea as in **ὑπερ-ήφανος** (Ro. 1:30), **ὑπερ-ύψωσεν** (Ph. 2:9), **ὑπερ-οχή** (1 Tim. 2:2), **ὑπερ-πλεονάζω** (1 Tim. 1:14). Cf. English "over-zealous," "over-anxious," etc. The negative notion of ‘overlook’ appears in **ὑπερ-εῖδον** (Ac. 17:30). The idea of ‘defence,’ ‘in behalf of,’ ‘bending over to protect,’ occurs in **ὑπερ-εντυγχάνω** (Ro. 8:26). In the late Greek vernacular **ὑπέρ** fades[3] before **ὑπεράνω** and **διά** and already in the N. T. the distinction between **περί** and **ὑπέρ** is not very marked in some usages, partly due to the affinity in sound and sense.[4] Passages where the MSS. vary between **ὑπέρ** and **περί** are Mk. 14:24; Jo. 1:30; Ac. 12:5; Ro. 1:8; Gal. 1:4; etc.

3. *With Genitive?* A word is needed about the cases used with **ὑπέρ**. There is no trouble as to the accusative, but it is a mooted question whether we have the true genitive or the ablative. Brugmann[5] views the ,case as genitive without hesitation and cites the Sanskrit use of *upari* in support of his position. But

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 146; Brugmann, Griech. Gr., p. 228.
[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 398.
[3] Jann., ib., p. 366.
[4] Ib., p. 398.
[5] Griech. Gr., p. 451; Kurze vergl. Gr., II, p. 464.

on the side of the ablative we note Kuhner-Gerth[1] and Monro,[2] while Delbruck[3] admits that either is possible, though leaning to the genitive. Where such doctors disagree, who shall decide? The Sanskrit can be quoted for both sides. The main argument for the ablative is the comparative idea in **ὑπέρ** which naturally goes with the ablative. On the whole, therefore, it seems to me that the ablative has the best of it with

4. *With Ablative.* Certainly as between the ablative and the accusative, the ablative is far in the lead. The figures[4] are, ablative 126, accusative 19. On the whole, therefore, **ὑπέρ**, drops back along with **ὑπό**. There is no example of the strictly local use of **ὑπέρ** in the N. T. unless **οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν** (1 Cor. 15:29) be so understood, which is quite unlikely.[5] This obscure passage still remains a puzzle to the interpreter, though no difficulty arises on the grammatical side to this or the other senses of **ὑπέρ**. The N. T. examples are thus metaphorical. These uses fall into four divisions.

The most common is the general notion of 'in behalf of,' 'for one's benefit.' This grows easily out of the root-idea of 'over' in the sense of protection or defence. Thus in general with **προσεύχομαι** (Mt. 5:44), **δέομαι** (Ac. 8:24), **ἀγωνίζομαι** (Col. 4:12), **καθίσταμαι** (Heb. 5:1), **προσφέρω** (*ib.*), etc. The point comes out with special force in instances where **κατά** is contrasted with **ὑπέρ** as in **εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου** (1 Cor. 4:6). Cf. also Mk. 9:40; Ro. 8:31. We must not, however, make the mistake of thinking that **ὑπέρ** of itself literally means 'in behalf of.' It means 'over.'

It is sometimes said that **ἀντί** means literally 'instead' and **ὑπέρ** 'in behalf of.'[6] But Winer[7] sees more clearly when he says: "In most cases one who acts in behalf of another takes his place." Whether he does or not depends on the nature of the action, not on **ἀντί** or **ὑπέρ**. In the *Gorgias* of Plato (515 C.) we have **ὑπὲρ σοῦ** for the notion of 'instead.' Neither does **πρό** (nor Latin *pro*) in itself mean 'instead.' In the *Alcestis* of Euripides, where the point turns on the substitutionary death of Alcestis for her hus-

[1] I, p. 486.
[2] Hom. Gr., p. 147.
[3] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 749.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 105.
[5] Cf. W.-Th., p. 382.
[6] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 156. Winer (W.-Th., p. 38) implies the same thing.
[7] Ib. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 135, has nothing on this use of Moulton, Prol., p. 105, merely calls **ὑπέρ** "the more colourless" as compared with **ἀντί**.

band, **ὑπέρ** occurs seven times, more than **ἀντί** and **πρό** together. Cf. Thucydides I, 141 and Xenophon *Anab*. 7:4, 9 for the substitutionary use of **ὑπέρ**. In the Epistle to Diognetus (p. 84) we note **λύτρον ὑπέρ ἡμῶν**, and a few lines further the expression is **ἀνταλλαγή** Paul's combination in 1 Tim. 2:6 is worth noting, **ἀντιλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων**, where the notion of substitution is manifest. There are a few other passages where **ὑπέρ** has the resultant notion of 'instead' and only violence to the context can get rid of it. One of these is Gal. 3:13. In verse 10 Paul has said that those under the law were under a curse (**ὑπὸ κατάραν**). In verse 13 he carries on the same image. Christ bought us "out from under" the curse (**ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου**) of the law by becoming a curse "over" us (**γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα**). In a word, we were *under* the curse; Christ took the curse on himself and thus *over* us (between the suspended curse and us) and thus rescued us *out from under* the curse. We went free while he was considered accursed (verse 13). It is not a point here as to whether one agrees with Paul's theology or not, but what is his meaning. In this passage **ὑπέρ** has the resultant meaning of 'instead.' The matter calls for this much of discussion because of the central nature of the teaching involved. In Jo. 11:50 we find another passage where **ὑπέρ** is explained as meaning substitution, **ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται**. Indeed Abbott[1] thinks that "in almost all the Johannine instances it refers to the death of one for the many." In Philemon 13, **ὑπὲρ σοῦ μοι διακονῇ**, the more obvious notion is 'instead.' One may note **ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἰδότος γράμματα**, P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66), where the meaning is obviously 'instead of him since he does not know letters.' Deissmann (*Light*, p. 152 f.) finds it thus (**ἔγραψεν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ**) in an ostracon from Thebes, as in many others, and takes **ὑπέρ** to mean 'for' or 'as representative of,' and adds that it "is not without bearing on the question of **ὑπέρ** in the N. T." Cf. **ἔγραψα ὑ[πὲρ αὐτ]ωῦ ἀγραμμάτου**, B.U. 664 (i/A.D.). In the papyri and the ostraca **ὑπέρ** often bore the sense of 'instead of.' In 2 Cor. 5:15 the notion of substitution must be understood because of Paul's use of **ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον** as the conclusion[2] from **εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν**. There remain a

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 276.

[2] Cf. Thayer, p. 3, under **ὑπέρ**. In Pausanias (Ruger, Die Prap. bei Paus., 1889, p. 12) **ὑπέρ** occurs about twice as often as **ἀντί**. A. Theimer (Beitr. zur Kenntn. des Sprachgeb. im N. T., 1901, p. 25), speaking of Jo. 11:50, says: "Der Zusatz **μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται** die Bedeutung an Stelle anstatt."

number of passages where the notion of substitution is perfectly natural from the nature of the case. But in these passages one may stop in translation with 'in behalf of' if he wishes. But there is no inherent objection in **ὑπέρ** itself to its conveying the notion of 'instead' as a resultant idea. In fact it is *per se* as natural as with **ἀντί**. In the light of the above one finds little difficulty with passages like Ro. 5:6 f.; 8:32; Gal. 2:20; Jo. 10: 11, 15; Heb. 2:9; Tit. 2:14, etc. In Mk. 10:45 we have **λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν** and in 14:24 **τὸ αἷμα μου—τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν**. But one may argue from 1 Jo. 3:16 that **ὑπέρ** in case of death does not necessarily involve substitution. Surely the very object of such death is to save life.

The two other uses of **ὑπέρ** may be briefly treated. Sometimes the resultant notion may be merely 'for the sake of,' as in **ὑπέρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ** (Jo. 11:4), **ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ** (Ro. 15:8), **ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος** (Ac. 5:41), **ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ** (Ph. 1:29), etc. This is natural in relations of intimate love.

A more general idea is that of 'about' or 'concerning.' Here **ὑπέρ** encroaches on the province of **περί**. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:23, **ὑπὲρ Τίτου**, 2 Th. 2:1, **ὑπὲρ της παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου**. Perhaps 1 Cor. 15:29 comes in here also. Moulton[1] finds commercial accounts in the papyri, scores of them, with **ὑπέρ** in the sense of 'to.' We see the free use (‘concerning’) with verbs like **καυχάομαι** (2 Cor. 7:14), **φρονέω** (Ph. 1:7), **κράζω** (Ro. 9:27), **ἐρωτάω** (2 Th. 2:1), etc. The Latin *super* is in line with this idiom also. Cf. Jo. 1: 30, **ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον**. In 1 Cor. 10:30, **τί βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εὐχαριστῶ**, the preposition suits antecedent as well as relative. In 2 Cor. 1:6 and Ph. 2:13 **ὑπέρ** suggests the object at which one is aiming. Cf. **ὑπὲρ ὧν ἠβουλόμεθα ἀπεστάλκαμεν**, P. Goodspeed 4 (ii/B.c.); **ὑπὲρ οὗ λέγωι**, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49); **ὑπὲρ ἀραβῶνος**, P. Grenf. ii. 67 (A.D. 237), 'by way of earnest-money.'

5. *The Accusative with* **ὑπέρ** calls for little remark. The literal local use of **ὑπέρ**, occurs in D in Heb. 9:5, **ὑπὲρ δ᾽ αὐτήν**, "an unparalleled use,"[2] in the sense of 'above,' the other MSS. having **ὑπεράνω**. The accusative with **ὑπέρ** has the metaphorical sense of 'above' or ‘over,’ as in **οὐκ ἐστιν μαθητῆς ὑπὲρ δοῦλον** (Mt. 10:24). Cf. also **τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα** (Ph. 2:9), **κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα** (Eph. 1:22), **οὐκέτι ὡς δοῦλον ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ δοῦλον** (Phil. 16). This notion easily gets into that of 'beyond' in harmony with the accusative case. Thus **ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται** (1 Cor. 4:6), **πειρασθῆναι ὑπὲρ ὃ δύνασθε** (1 Cor. 10:13). Cf. **ὑπὲρ δύναμιν** (2 Cor. 1:8),

[1] Prol., p. 105. [2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 313.

ὑπὲρ πολλούς (Gal. 1:14), **ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα** (Ac. 26:13). Classical Greek only shows the beginning of the use of **ὑπέρ** with comparatives,[1] but the N. T. has several instances. Thus the LXX often uses it with comparatives, partly because the Hebrew had no special form for the comparative degree.[2] But the **κοινή** shows the idiom. So we find **φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱούς** (Lu. 16:8), **τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν** (Heb. 4:12). In Jo. 12:43 W. H. read **ἤπερ** in text and **ὑπέρ** in margin after **μᾶλλον**. But **ὑπέρ** has the comparative sense of 'more than' after verbs, as **ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ** (Mt. 10:37). In the LXX the positive adjective occurs with **ὑπέρ** as **ἔνδοξος ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἀδελφούς** (1 Chron. 4:9). In Ro. 12:3, **μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν**, note the conjunction of **ὑπέρ** and **παρά**. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 237) cites **ὑπὲρ ἑαυτὸν φρονεῖν**, T.P. 8 (ii/B.C.). Blass[3] doubts whether **ὑπερλίαν, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ** can be properly regarded as compounds. He would separate **ὑπέρ** as an adverb, **ὑπέρ λίαν**. But the modern editors are against him. It has disappeared in modern Greek vernacular before **γία** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 105).

(q) Ὑπό. Little is called for by way of etymology since **ὑπό** is the positive of **ὑπέρ**. Cf. the Sanskrit *upa*, Latin *sub*, Gothic *uf*, possibly also German *auf*, English *up*, ab-*ove*. The form **ὑπό** is of unknown case, but the Elean dialect[4] has **ὑπα—**, and Homer[5] has also **ὑπαί** (dative.)

1. The Original Meaning.[6] This was probably 'upwards' or 'from under.' Unlike **κατά, ὑπό** never means 'downwards.' As a matter of fact, 'up' and 'under' are merely relative terms. The very English word up is probably **ὑπό**. Cf. **ὕψι** 'aloft,' **ὕπ-τιος** 'facing upwards,' **ὕπ-ατος** 'uppermost,' **ὕψιστος**. The meaning of under or beneath is common in the N. T., as **ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον** (Mt. 5:15).

2. *In Composition.* Here **ὑπό** appears simply with the notion of 'under' as in **ὑπο-κάτω** (Mk. 7:28), **ὑπο-ωπιάζω** (1 Cor. 9:27), **ὑπο-γραμμός** (1 Pet. 2:21), **ὑπο-πόδιον** (Mt. 5:35), **ὑπο-δέω** (Mk. 6:9). Cf. also **ὑπό-δειγμα** (Jo. 13:15), **ὑπο-ζύγιον** (Mt. 21:5). In **ὑπό-κρισις** (Mt. 23:28), **ὑπο-κριτῆς** (Mt. 6:2) the notion of an actor under a mask lies behind the resultant idea. The idea of hospitality (under one's roof) is natural with **ὑπο-δέχομαι**, (Lu. 10: 38), **ὑπο-λαμβάνω** (3 Jo. 8). In Ro. 16:4 **ὑπο-τίθημι** has the idea of 'put under,' as **ὑπο-ζώννυμι** (Ac. 27:17), 'undergird.' In **ὑπο-**

[1] Ib., p. 108.
[2] C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 84.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 135.
[4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 452.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 139.
[6] Ib. Cf. Brug., ib.

λαβὼν εἶπεν, (Lu. 10:30) the notion of interrupting or following a speech comes from the idea of 'up' in **ὑπό**, taking up the talk, etc. The "perfective" idea appears in **ὑπο-λείπω** (Ro. 11:3), 'leave behind or over.' So with **ὑπο-τρέχω** (Ac. 27:16), 'run under or past.' Cf. **ὑπο-πλέω** (Ac. 27: 4, 7), 'sail close by.' But in **ὑπο-πνέω** (Ac. 27:13) the preposition minimizes the force of the verb, blow softly.' Cf. our suspicion, the French *soupcon*. So with underestimate. In **ὑπο-βάλλω** (Ac. 6:11) the notion of suggestion has an evil turn, but in **ὑπο-μιμνήσκω** (Jo. 14:26) there is no such colour. The idea of subjection (note how these ideas appear in English usage all along) occurs in **ὑπ-ακούω** (Ph. 2:12), **ὑπ-είκω** (Heb. 13:17), etc. In **ὑπ-αντάω** (Mt. 8:28) the special force of **ὑπό** has rather disappeared. Cf. our vulgar "meet up" with one. So **ὑπ-εναντίος** (Col. 2:14).

3. *The Cases Once Used with* **ὑπό**. The locative was originally very common with **ὑπό**, as in Homer, even with verbs of motion.[1] As a matter of fact, however, in the historical writers the locative and accusative with **ὑπό** are very rare as compared with the ablative,[2] though Appian and Herodian use the locative more than the accusative.[3] But the locative retreated[4] before the accusative with **ὑπό** till in the N. T. and the modern Greek it has disappeared. In the N. T.[5] the accusative shows 50 examples and the ablative 165, but in the vernacular of the Byzantine Greek the accusative with **ὑπό** disappears before **ἀποκάτω** and **ὑποκάτω**.[6] In the modern Greek vernacular **ἀπό** has displaced **ὑπό** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 102). Brugmann[7] even thinks that **ὑπό** once occurred with the instrumental case, and he is clear that the ablative, as well as the genitive, was found with it. Delbruck[8] agrees to both ablative and genitive. Thus originally **ὑπό** occurred with five cases (loc., instr., acc., abl., gen.). In the N. T. we meet only the accusative and ablative. No example of the pure genitive with **ὑπό** occurs in the N. T. In Jo. 1:50 we find **εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς**, but not **ὑπό**. So also in some other N. T. passages where a genitive with **ὑπό** might have been used. Cf. Mk. 7:28; Lu. 8:16, etc. The accusative with **ὑπό**, as in **ὄντα ὑπὸ την συκῆν** (Jo. 1:48), supplants

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 140.
[2] Helbing, Die Prap. bei Herod. and and. Histor., p. 22.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 63.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 399. Cf. Jebb in V. and D., Handb. to Mod. Gk., p. 313.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 105.
[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 398 f.
[7] Griech. Gr., p. 452 f.
[8] Vergl. Synt., I, p. 698.

the genitive also in the N. T. The use of **ὑπό** for agency and cause is ablative like the Latin usage with *ab* (*a*).

4. *With the Accusative.* It is considered by Winer[1] to be the original use of **ὑπό**. This indeed would accord with the notion of 'upwards,' 'up from under.' But in the N. T., as in the later Greek, the accusative occurs with the notion of rest (cf. **εἰς**).[2] The accusative in the N. T. takes the place of the local use of **ὑπό** with locative and genitive.[3] Thus we find (motion) **τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον** (Mt. 5:15), but also (rest) **ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν** (Jo. 1:48). Other examples with verbs of rest are **ὑπὸ τὴν σικιὰν κατασκηνοῖν** (Mk. 4:32), **ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν** (Ac. 4:12), with **εἰμί**, we have **ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη** (Ro. 3:13), **ὑπὸ νόμον** (Ro. 6:14 f.), **ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν** (Gal. 3:25); etc. These examples are as freely used as those like **ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς** (Mt. 8:8). The examples are both local as with **ἐπισυνάγω** (Lu. 13:34) and figurative as with **ταπεινόω** (1 Pet. 5:6). Cf. Ac. 4:12 **ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν** with **ὑπὸ Δία Γῆν Ἥλιον ἐπὶ λύτροις** P. Oxy. 48, 49, 722 (A.D. 86, 100, 91). Cf. Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 332. Only one instance of the use of **ὑπό** with time appears in the N. T., **ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον** (Ac. 5:21), where it has the notion of 'about' (or 'close upon') dawn. John uses **ὑπό** with the accusative only once[4] (Jo. 1:48) and with the ablative only five times (Jo. 14:21; 3 Jo. 12 *bis*; Rev. 6:8, 13), an incidental argument, for unity of authorship.

5. *With the Ablative*. In the sense of efficient cause or agent it was the commonest classical usage and it continues so in the N. T.[5] The local and temporal uses do not occur, but only the metaphorical. These occur after passive or neuter verbs. Abbott[6] thinks that John preferred to represent the agent as performing the act and so avoided **ὑπό**. The ancient Greek indeed used **ὑπό** chiefly in this sense of agent. The use of **ἀποθνήσκω ὑπό** as the correlative of **ἀποκτείνει τις** is well known.[7] In the N. T. once (Rev. 6:8) **ὑπό** actually occurs with the active of **ἀποτείνω (ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ--καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων**. This is probably due to the desire to distinguish between the living agent and the lifeless causes preceding.[8] But the N. T. has neuter verbs with **ὑπό**, like **ἀπόλλυμαι** (1 Cor. 10:9), **λαμβάνω** (2 Cor. 11:24), **πάσχω** (Mk. 5:26), **ὑπομένω (**Heb. 12:3). In the case of passive verbs the usage follows the traditional lines. Cf. Mt. 4:1 for two examples, **ἀνήχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύ-**

[1] W.-Th., p. 407.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 308.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 135.
[4] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 278.
[5] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 157.
[6] Joh. Gr., p. 279.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 156.
[8] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 157.

ματος, πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. It is to be noted that in Lu. 9:8 **ὑπό** is not repeated with **ἄλλων**. The bulk of the N. T. instances of **ὑπό** occur of personal agency like **ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ**, (Mt. 3:6), **διεσπάσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ** (Mk. 5:4), etc. Sometimes, when **διά** is added to **ὑπό,** a distinction is made between the intermediate and the mediate agent, as in **τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου** (Mt. 1:22). Cf. 2:15. There is nothing peculiar about the use of **ὑπό** in 2 Pet. 1:17, **φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης**.[1] But **ὑπό** is not the only way of expressing the agent. Besides **διά** for the indirect agent **ἀπό** is the most common[2] substitute for **ὑπό**, though and **παρά** both are found for the notion of agency. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 116) speaks of aro as "die eigentlich pradestinierte Partikel." The instrumental case and **ἐν** and the locative must also be recalled. But **διά**, with the accusative (motive or cause) must not be confounded with this idea. Cf. Lu. 21:17 for **ὑπό** with ablative and **διά** with the accusative. The prepositions will richly repay one's study, and often the whole point of a sentence turns on the prepositions. In Lu. 5:19 eight prepositions occur, counting **ἔμπροσθεν**, and many such passages are found as Gal. 2: 1, 2. Cf. Joy, *On the Syntax of Some Prepositions in the Greek Dialects* (1904).

VIII. **The "Adverbial" Prepositions.** The list in the N. T. of those prepositions which do not occur in composition with verbs is considerable. As already remarked in the beginning of this chapter, what are called "proper" prepositions were originally adverbs, fixed case-forms which came to be used with nouns and in composition with verbs. We have followed the varied history of this most interesting group of words. Homer[3] in particular used most of them at times merely adverbially. In Homer the "regular" prepositions often retain this adverbial force, as **παρὰ δέ,** and this separation from a verb is no longer considered a surgical operation" (tmesis). Cf. Seymour, *Homeric Language and Verse*, 25, 78. Some of these prepositions gradually disappeared, but the total use of prepositions greatly increased. This increase was due to the wider use of the remaining prepositions and the increasing use of so-called " improper" prepositions, adverbs with cases that never came to be used in composition with verbs. The Sanskrit[4] had no proper class of prepositions, but a number of

[1] W.-Th., p. 369.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 126. But **ἀπό** occurs in this sense in Xen. Cf. W.-Th., p. 369.

[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 151. [4] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 414.

adverbs which were sometimes used with cases. These adverbial prepositions varied constantly in the history of the Greek. Some of them, like **ἄνευ, ἐγγύς, ἕνεκα**, come right on down from Homer Others drop by the way while each age sees a new crop coming on. But in the late vernacular a number of these prepositional adverbs are followed by the preposition[1] before the case, like **ἀποκάτω ἀπό.** In the modern Greek the improper prepositions are used either with the genitive (only with enclitic pronoun) or by the addition of **᾽ς, ἀπό, μέ** with the accusative. They are quite new formations, but made from ancient Greek material (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 107). From our point of view any adverb that occurs with a case may be regarded as a prepositional adverb,[2] like **ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγελίου** (Ph. 1:27). Some of these prepositional adverbs, as already shown, occur both as adverbs, as **ἅμα καὶ ἐλιπίζων** (Ac. 24:26), and as prepositions, as **ἅμα αὐτοῖς** (Mt. 13:29), while others appear only as prepositions with cases, as **ἄνευ τοῦ πατρός** (Mt. 10:29). But it is not necessary to make a separate list on this basis. Blass,[3] who treats these words very scantily, is right in saying that no hard and fast line can be drawn between adverb and preposition here. The LXX shows some adverbial prepositions which do not occur in the N. T.[4] Thus **ἀπάνωθεν**, (Judges 16:20) may be compared with **ἐπάνωθεν** (classical also), and **ὑποκάτωθεν** (Dent. 9:14), which in ancient Greek is only an adverb. Simcox[5] carefully explains **ἐνώπιον**, so common in the LXX, as a translation and imitation of בְּעֵינֵי, but even Conybeare and Stock[6] surrender this word as not a Hebraism before Deissmann's proof.[7] The N. T., like the **κοινή** in general, makes free use of these prepositional adverbs. I have given the list in my *Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (3 ed., 1912, p. 116 f.), forty-two in all, more than twice as many as the "regular" prepositions.[8] **᾽Αξίως** noted above is not included. Cf. **ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ** (Heb. 9:7). Conybeare and Stock (p. 87) even count **ἐχόμενα πέτρας** (Ps. 140:6), but surely that is going too far. Cf. **τὰ κρείσσονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας** (Heb. 6:9). There is more excuse for claiming **ἐσώτερον τῆς λολυμβήθρας** (Is.

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 366.

[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 150.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 122, 127 f.

[4] C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 86 f.

[5] Lang. of the N. T., p. 159.

[6] Sel., p. 87.

[7] B. S., p. 213 f.

[8] Krebs, Die Prapositionsadverbien in der spatteren hist. Grac., I. Tl., p. 4f., gives a list of 61, and 31 of his list do not appear in the N. T., while 12 are in the N. T. that he does not mention, viz. **ἔναντι, ἐνώπιον, κατέναντι, κατενώπιον, κυκλόθεν, μέσον, ὀπίσω, ὀψέ, παραπλήσιον, παραεκτός, ὑπέκεινα, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ**. This list by Krebs shows the freedom in the **κοινή** development of adv. prep.

22:11). It will pay us to take up briefly these adverbial prepositions. All of them use the genitive or the ablative case except ἅμα (instrumental) and ἐγγύς (dative).

1. **Ἅμα**. It is probably in the instrumental case itself. Brugmann[1] connects the word with the root of **εἷς, μέα, ἕν** as seen in **ἅ-παξ, ἁ-πλοῦς**, Latin *semel*, Sanskrit *sama*, English *same*. Cf. also **ὁμοῦ, ἑ-κατόν**. It occurs in Homer with the associative-instrumental case.[2] The word occurs in the N. T. only ten times and usually as adverb, either merely with the verb as in Ro. 3:12, LX X, or with **δὲ καί** (1 Tim. 5:13; Phil. 22). Cf. **καί** in Col. 4:3. Three of the examples are with participles (Col. 4:3 above and Ac. 24:26; 27:40). Twice we find **ἅμα σύν** with the instrumental, a sort of double preposition after the manner of the later Greek (1 Th. 4:17; 5:10) and once **ἅμα πρωί** with adverb (Mt. 20:1). The use of **ἅμα σύν** Thayer explains by taking **ἅμα** as an adverb with the verb. Only once does it occur as a simple preposition with the instrumental, **ἅμα αὐτοῖς** (Mt. 13:29). For the later revival of **ἅμα** and use like **μετά** see Jannaris.[3] In 2 Esdr. 17:3 **יחד** is translated by **ἅμα**. In the *Acta Nerei* **ἅμα** is used only with the genitive (Radermacher, N. T. Or., p. 1.19).

2. **Ἄνευ**. It is of uncertain etymology.[4] Homer has another form, **ἄνευεν**, the Eleatic **ἄνευ-ς**, the Epidaurian **ἄνευ-ν**, the Megarian **ἄνις**. There is, however, no doubt as to the meaning, 'without' or 'besides,' and the case used is the ablative. There are only three examples in the N. T., not counting Mk. 13:2, where W. H. and Nestle reject **ἄνευ χειρῶν**. Two of these (1 Pet. 3:1; 4:9) occur with abstract words, and one (Mt. 10:29) with **τοῦ πατρός**. The word is rare in the late Greek, especially with a case.[5]

3. **Ἄντικρυς** (*some editors* **ἀντικρύ**). It is a compound form that originally meant 'straight on,' but in later Greek occurs in the Sense of 'opposite,' 'face to face.' It was common in the ancient Greek as adverb of place or as preposition. In the N. T. we find it only once (Ac. 20:15) and the case used is the genitive, **ἄντικρυς Χίου**. It occurs in modern Greek vernacular (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 109).

4. **Ἀντίπερα** (**ἀντι-πέραν**, Polybius, etc.). It is just **ἀντί** and **πέραν**, combined. Thucydides uses **ἀντιπέρας** as adverbial preposition. Only one example occurs in the N. T. (Lu. 8:26), **ἀντίπερα τῆς**

[1] Griech. Or., pp. S5, 211, 230.
[2] Monro, Hom. Or., p. 151; Brug., Griech. Cr., p. 456.
[3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 397. [4] Brag., Griech. Gr., p. 456.
[5] Jann., Mist. Gk. Gr., p. 337. In Eleatic **ἄνευς** occurs with the acc.

Γαλιλαίας. The case is open to dispute, since **ἀντί** comes with the genitive and **πέραν** with the ablative. 'Over against' would be genitive, 'on the other side of' would be ablative. Either will make sense in Lu. 8:26. Probably genitive is the case here.

5. **Ἀπέναντι**. It is a triple compound of **ἀπό, ἐν, ἀντί**. A number of adverbial prepositions were formed on **ἀντί** as a base. In the N. T. we find also **ἔναντι, ἐναντίον, κατέναντι**. These are late, except **ἐναντίον** (from Homer on. Cf. **ἄνατ, ἔν-αντα**). Polybius uses **ἀπέναντι** with the genitive, and it is common with this case in the LXX[1] (cf. Gen. 3:24). In the N. T. it occurs only six times, and in two of these (Mt. 27:24; Mk. 12:41) W. H. put **κατέναντι** in the text and **ἀπέναντι** in the marg. Of the remaining four examples two (Ac. 3:16; Ro. 3:18) have the sense merely of 'before,' 'in the sight or presence of.' One (Mt. 27:61) has the notion of 'opposite' or 'over against,' while the fourth (Ac. 17:7) takes on a hostile idea; 'against.' These resultant ideas all come naturally out of the threefold combination. The other compounds with **ἀντί** will be noted later.

6. **Ἄτερ**. This word is of unknown origin, but compare Old Saxon *sundir*, Old High German *suntar*, Sanskrit *sanular*. It is common in Homer and the poets generally. Later prose uses it. But it occurs only once in the LXX (2 Macc. 12:15) and twice in the N. T. (Lu. 22:6, 35). The case is clearly the ablative, and the meaning is 'without.' One example, **ἄτερ ὄχλου**, is with persons and the other, **ἄτερ βαλλαντίου**, is with a thing.

7. **Ἄχρι(ς)**. It is related to **μέχρί(ς)** whatever its origin. Cf. *usque* in Latin and **ἄχρι εἰς** like *usque ad*. As a mere adverb it no longer occurs in the N. T., but it is common both as a preposition and as a conjunction. In the form **ἄχρι οὗ** (Ac. 7:18) and **ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας** (Mt. 24:38) it is both preposition and conjunction (resultant temporal phrase). Leaving out these examples, **ἄχρι**, is found 30 times in the N. T. (W. H. text) and some MSS. read **ἄχρι** in Ac. 1:22 and 20:4, while in Mt. 13:30 the MSS. vary between **ἄχρι, μέχρι** and **ἕως** (W. H.). The meaning is 'up to' and the case used is the genitive. It occurs with place (Ac. 13:6), persons (Ac. 11:5), time (Ac. 13:11) and abstract ideas (Ac. 22:4, 22). It occurs mainly in Acts, Paul's writings and Revelation. Cf. its use with the adverb **ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν** (Ro. 8:22).

8. **Ἐγγύς**. It is a mere adverb (see comp. **ἐγγύτερον**, superl. **ἔγγιστα**) possibly related to **ἐγ-γύν.** It is common in Homer both as adverb and with the genitive. The late Greek added the true

[1] C. and S., Sel. from the LXX, p. 86.

dative and all three uses (adverb, gen., dat.) occur in the N. T. There are nineteen examples of the pure adverb in the N. T. (cf. Mt. 24:32), one the comparative (Ro. 13:11) and the superlative in some MSS. in Mk. 6:36. There are eight examples of the genitive with ἐγγύς (cf. Jo. 11:54). Only four times does ἐγγύς have the dative (Ac. 9:38; 27:8), counting the indeclinable **Ἰερουσαλήμ** (Lu. 19:11; Ac. 1:12), in which case Luke (4) would have the dative uniformly and John (6) and Heb. (2) the genitive (H. Scott). Once (Heb. 6 : 8) it is postpositive.

9. **Ἐκτός**. It is a combination of ἐκ and the adverbial ending -τος with which may be compared Latin *coelitus*.[1] The case used with it is, of course, the ablative and it is just a fuller expression of ἐκ, meaning 'without.' In the N. T. we find it only eight times, four of these with the ablative, as in 1 Cor. 6:18 (cf. with the relative in Ac. 26:22). Note position of ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν in Ac. 26:22. Three times we have ἐκτὸς εἰ μή (1 Cor. 14:5; 15:2; 1 Tim. 5:19), which is a pleonasm due first to the use of ἐκτὸς εἰ. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 118) cites an inscription of Mopsuestia for "this jumbled phrase," peculiarly apropos since Paul was Cilician, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ [ἐ]ὰν **M**άγνα μόνη θε[λή]ση. Once (Mt. 23:26) ἐκτός is probably a mere adverb used as a substantive, though even here it may be regarded as a preposition.

10. **Ἔμπροσθεν**. This is merely ἐν and πρόσθεν which adverb used the ablative[2] when it had a case. In the N. T. it is still four times a mere adverb of place, as in Rev. 4:6, but it is usually a preposition with the ablative. It occurs with words of place, as in Mt. 5:24, with persons (Mt. 5:16), and sometimes with the notion of rank (Jo. 1:15). As a preposition it appears 44 times in the N. T.

11. **Ἐναντι**. (Cf. ἔναντα in Homer.) It is one of the ἀντί compounds and is found" with the genitive case when it has a case. It is very common in the LXX even after Swete[3] has properly replaced it often by ἐναντίον. The old Greek did not use it. In the N. T., W. H. accept it in Lu. 1:8 and Ac. 8:21 (though some MSS. in both places read ἐναντίοω) and reject it in Ac. 7:10. It is not found in the N. T. as a mere adverb.

12. **Ἐναντίον**. This is, of course, merely the neuter singular of ἐναντίος (cf. Mk. 6:48), and is common in the older Greek as in the LXX. For the papyri see ἐναντίον ἀνδρῶν τριῶν P. Eleph. 1

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 198, 254. [2] Ib., p. 456.

[3] C. and S., Se1. from LXX, p. 87. The LXX used a number of prep. to transl. לִפְנֵי. Cf. Swete, Intr. to the 0. T. in Gk., p. 308.

(B.C. 311). In the N. T. it does not occur as a mere adverb, but we find it five times as a preposition with the genitive (cf. Lu. 1:6), all with persons (cf. Latin *coram*).

13. **Ἕνεκα**. It occurs in three forms in the N. T., either **ἕνεκα**. (Lu. 6:22), **ἕνεκεν** (9:24) or **εἵνεκεν** (18:29), but always as a preposition ('for the sake of'), never as mere adverb. These variations existed in the earlier Greek also. In the **κοινή**, **ἕνεκεν** is the more usual (Schweizer, *Perg. Inschr*., p. 35). Only twice, however, is it postpositive in the N. T., and this after the interrogative (Ac. 19: 32) or the relative (Lu. 4:18, LXX). The case used is the genitive. The etymology is quite uncertain, but the form **εἵνεκεν** is Ionic and partially in the **κοινή** supersedes the Attic.[1] The preposition occurs 26 times in the N. T. Once (2 Cor. 7:12) we find it used with **τοῦ** and the infinitive. Cf. **ἕνεκεν** and **διά**. Lu. 21:12, 17.

14. **Ἐντός**. It is like the Latin *in-tus* (opposite of **ἐκτός**) and has the same ending —**τος**. It means 'within' and as a preposition is used with the genitive. The word occurs only twice in the N. T., once as an adverb with the article (Mt. 23:26), though even this may be regarded as a preposition with the article and the genitive (cf. **ἐκτός**, Mt. 23:26), and once as a preposition (Lu. 17:21) with the genitive. Thayer cites two passages from Xenophon where **ἐντός** may have the idea of 'among' and claims that this is the idea in Lu. 17:21, because of the context. But the meaning in Xenophon is disputed and Liddell and Scott give only 'within' for **ἐντός**. Besides, in one of the new *Logia*[2] *of Jesus* we have a similar saying in a context that makes 'within' necessary and would seem to settle the point about the passage in. Luke: **ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.**

15. **Ἐνώπιον**. This is the neuter singular of the adjective **ἐνώπιος** which (Thayer) is from the phrase **ἐν ὠπί (ὁ ἐν ὠπὶ ὤν)** Homer uses **τὰ ἐνώπια**, but no example of the adverb or preposition **ἐνώπιον** occurs before the time of the LXX. Deissmann[3] thinks it possible, but not probable, that it was first used in this sense as a translation of the Hebrew לִפְנֵי. A papyrus of the Thebaid from the second or third century B.C. has it also. As a preposition it is very common[4] in the LXX and in the N. T. also. Curiously enough it does not occur in Matthew and Mark, though very

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 457.

[2] C. Taylor, The Oxyrhyn. Sayings of Jesus, 1905, pp. 7, 11. Besides in Polyb. **ἐντός** is always the opposite of **ἐκτός**. Cf. Thiemann, Quest. Polyb., 1882, p. 23.

[3] B. S., p. 213. [4] C. and S., p. 87.

common in Luke's writings and Revelation. The Gospel of John has only one example and the Johannine Epistles two. Cf. also κατενώπιον. In the N. T., ἐνώπιον is always a preposition with the genitive and it occurs 92 times. It appears sometimes with place (Rev. 4:10), but usually with persons (Lu. 5:25; 12:9 *bis*), and especially of God (1:15). Sometimes the notion is that of judgment, as in 1 Tim. 2:3. See Wikenhauser, **Ἐνώπιος –ἐνώπιον—κατενώπιον** (Bibl. Z., 1910, pp. 263-270).

16. **Ἔξω**. It is an adverb from ἐξ (cf. ἔσω, ἐς) and is probably in the ablative case like **οὕτω(ς)**. As adverb and preposition it is common in the N. T. (16 times) as in the older Greek. It is found as preposition only with the ablative and that 19 times. It means 'outside' or 'without' and is used in the N. T. only with places, like ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας (Mt. 10:14). John's Gospel has it 13 times, first Ep. 1, Rev. 2; Paul has it 5, and only as adverb.

17. **Ἔξωθεν**. It is the same word plus the suffix ---θεν, 'from without,' and was common in the poets (cf. ἔσωθεν). The case used is the ablative. In the N. T. it is much less frequent (13 times) both as adverb and preposition than ἔξω. Indeed, if τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου (Mt. 23:25; Lu. 11:39) be not considered the prepositional usage, there would be only three left (Mk. 7:15; Rev. 11:2; 14:20). There is the same ambiguity in the two passages above that was noted about ἐκτός and ἐντός (Mt. 23:26 = Lu. 11:40). Cf. 547 vi.

18. **Ἐπ-άνω**. This is just the preposition ἐπί and the adverb ἄνω. It occurs in Attic Greek both as adverb and as preposition. As an adverb it is rare in the N. T. (4 times), once with the relative adverb **οὗ** (Mt. 2:9), once with a numeral with no effect on the case (1 Cor. 15:6; cf. Mk. 14:5 where the case may arise from πραθῆναι), once where a pronoun is really implied (Lu. 11:44). As a preposition we find it fifteen times in the N. T. Cf. ἐπάνω ὄρους (Mt. 5:14) where it has the somewhat weakened[1] sense of 'upon' rather than 'above.' The case used is the genitive. Modern Greek vernacular uses it as (ἀ) πάνω᾽ς (Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 109).

19. **Ἐπέκεινα**. It is merely ἐπί and ἐκεῖνα. Thayer suggests the ellipsis of μέρη. It occurs in the Attic Greek both as adverb and as preposition. In the N. T. it appears only once in a quotation from Amos 5:27 and as a preposition with the ablative in the sense of 'beyond' (Ac. 7:43. Cf. ὑπερέκεινα).

20. **Ἔσω**. It is the adverb of ἐς (cf. ἔξω) and is in the ablative

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129.

case. The form **εἴσω (εἰς)** does not occur in the N. T. nor in the LXX. Indeed the word **ἔσω** is found only nine times in the N. T. and only one, **ἔσω τῆς αὐτλῆς** (Mk. 15:16), is the prepositional use. The case used with it is the genitive. This, however, is a genuine example, while **ἔσωθεν** (12 times) is never a preposition in the N. T., unless in Lu. 11:39, **τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν**, (see p. 642). Cf. **ἐσώτερον τῆς κολυμβήθρας** (Is. 22:11).

21. **Ἕως**. In Homer it is both demonstrative and relative adverb (from **εἶος, εἴως**).[1] Cf. **ὥς** and **ὡς**. The use of **ἕως** as a preposition appears in Demosthenes, Aristotle, Polybius, etc. In Northern England and Scotland "while" is used as "till" (Liddell and Scott) and illustrates how **ἕως** as conjunction is used in the N. T. It is more common in the N. T. as preposition than conjunction, if the phrases **ἕως οὗ, ἕως ὅτου** be treated as conjunctions, as indeed they are, though technically composed of the preposition **ἕως** with the genitive of the relative. It is in the later Greek mainly, therefore, that it appears as a preposition (cf. LXX and papyri). The case used with it is the genitive (but very late Greek shows accusative sometimes), and it is found 86 times in the N. T. and 51 of the examples are in the Synoptic Gospels. The preposition is used with places, like **ἕως ᾅδου** (Mt. 11:23), **ἕως οὐρανοῦ** (Lu. 10:15), **ἕως Ἀντιοχείας** (Ac. 11:22); with persons, like **ἕως αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 4:42); with expressions of time, like **ἕως τῆς σήμερον** (Mt. 27:8), **ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης** (27:45); with abstract expressions, like **ἕως θανάτου** (Mt. 26:38); with notion of measure, like **ἕως ἡμίσους** (Mk. 6:23). See Rom. 3:12 **ἕως ἑνός** (LXX). Cf. **ἀπό--ἕως** in Mt. 1:17; 20:8; 27:51. Seventeen of the examples are uses of **ἕως** with an adverb, like **ἕως κάτω** (Mt. 27:51), **ἕως ἄρτι** (Jo. 2:10), while seven instances of **ἕως πότε** occur, like Mt. 17:17. Four times **ἕως** occurs with another preposition, like **ἕως πρός** (Lu. 24:50), **ἕως ἐπί** (Ac. 17:14), **ἕως ἔξω** (21:5). In Mk. 14:54 note **ἕως ἔσω εἰς**. Once (cf. Demosthenes, Aristotle, LXX) we find it with the article and the infinitive **ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν** (Ac. 8: 40). In **ἕως τέλους** (2 Cor. 1:13), the phrase is almost adverbial. In D (Ac. 19:26), **ἕως Ἐφέσου**, Blass[2] finds the notion of 'within.' In the LXX 2 [Heb.] Esdr. 6:20, **ἕως εἷς πάντες**, and 1 Chron. 5: 10 A, **ἕως πάντες**, Deissmann (*B. S* p. 139) sees a Hebraism.

22. **Κατέναντι**. It is not found in the older Greek, but appears in the LXX and the N. T. It is especially frequent in the Book of Sirach.[3] But in poetry we find **κατέναντα** and the word is merely

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 151.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 127.
[3] C. and S., p. 87.

the threefold preposition **κατά, ἐν, ἀντί**. The MSS. in the N. T. often vary[1] between **κατέναντι** and **ἀπέναντι** as in Mt. 21:2; 27:24; Ac. 3:16, etc. In Mt. 27:24 and Mk. 12:41 W. H. put **ἀπέναντ** in the margin. **Κατεναντίον**, found in Hesiod and Herodotus, does not occur in the N. T. There are only nine examples of **κατέναντι**, in the N. T. One of these (Lu. 19:30) is merely adverbial, while the rest are prepositional. The idea is 'before,' 'over against,' 'in the presence of,' and the case used with it is the genitive. It occurs with place (Mk. 13:3) and persons (Mt. 27:24). Cf. **κατέναντι θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ** (2 Cor. 2:17; 12:19) and the attraction of relative (ᾧ) in the dative to the genitive case of **θεοῦ**, the incorporated antecedent (Ro. 4:17).

23. **Κατενώπιον**. It is just **ἐνώπιον** (see above) and **κατά**. Homer uses **κατένωπα** with the genitive, but **κατενώπιον** appears in the LXX. The N. T. shows only three examples (cf. the frequency of **ἐνώπιον**), two with persons (Eph. 1:4; Col. 1:22), one with abstract word (Ju. 24). The case used is the genitive and the word means 'in the presence of.'

24. **Κυκλόθεν**. It is an old adverb in —**θεν**, that occasionally occurs in the LXX (Jer. 17:26) as a preposition. In the N. T. it appears as a preposition twice with the genitive **θρόνου** (Rev. 4: 3 f.) and once as an adverb (4:8).

25. **Κύκλῳ** is, of course, merely an adverb in the instrumental case and is common from Homer down. In the LXX it is extremely frequent and occasionally as a preposition with the genitive (Is. 6:2). In the N. T. it is merely an adverb except with **τοῦ θρόνου** (Rev. 4:6; 5:11; 7:11). Cf. **κύκλῳ μέχρι** (Ro. 15:19).

26. **Μέσον**. As a preposition it occurs in Herodotus 7, 170, but was not common. It appears in the late Greek writers and the papyri.[2] Many adverbial phrases were made from **μέσον** which were used as prepositions, some of which survive in the N. T., like **ἀνὰ μέσον, διὰ μέσου (-ον), εἰς μέσον** (and as **εἰς τὸ μέσον**), **ἐν μέσῳ** (and **ἐν τῷ μέσῳ**), **ἐκ μέσου, κατὰ μέσον.** But these will be discussed later. The adjective **μέσος** occurs with the genitive (Lu. 22:55; Jo. 1:26), so that it is not strange to find the adverb with the genitive as in Ph. 2:15, **μέσον γενεᾶς**. In Mt. 14:24 W. H. put **μέσον** in the margin and D reads **μέσον** in Lu. 8:7; 10:3. See Hatzidakis, *Einl*., p. 214, for examples. Cf. Homeric **μεσσηγύς**. The modern Greek vernacular uses **μέσα᾽ς, μέσ᾽ ἀπό** (Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 108).

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 128.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Cr., p. 374.

27. **Μεταξύ**. Like so many of the adverbial prepositions, it is a compound (**μετά, ξύν**). As a mere adverb, we meet it only twice in the N. T., once in the sense of 'meanwhile' (Jo. 4:31), once in the sense of 'afterwards' (Ac. 13:42), as commonly in the later Greek.[1] Cf. twofold use of **μετά**. As a preposition it occurs seven times in the N. T., with places (Mt. 23:35), persons (Mt. 18:15) and in abstract relations (Ro. 2:15). A good example occurs in Ac. 15:9 where both διά and **μεταξύ** appear.

28. **Μέχρι**. Like **ἄχρι** and **ἕως**, it is both preposition and conjunction as well as originally adverb. No example of the mere adverb is found in the N. T., as it was rare in the older Greek. The form is akin to **ἄχρι** and the sense is the same. If **μέχρις οὗ** be treated as a conjunction (cf. **ἄχρι οὗ, ἕως οὗ**), the preposition with the genitive appears fifteen times with another doubtful reading in Mt. 13:30. It is used with places (Ro. 15:19), persons (Lu. 16:16), time (Ac. 10:30), abstract expressions (Ph. 2:8). Like **ἄχρι**, the notion of 'measure' or ' degree' is sometimes present (Heb. 12:4).

29. **Ὄπισθεν**. It is of uncertain etymology, perhaps related to It occurs in Homer both as adverb and as preposition. In the N. T. we find it five times as adverb and twice as preposition, and some MSS. have it in Rev. 1:10. The case used with it is the ablative. So **ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** (Lu. 23:26). It means 'from behind' and so 'after' (Mt. 15:23). It is the opposite of **ἔμπροσθεν**.

30. **Ὀπίσω**. It is the opposite of **πρόσω** (cf. **πόρρω**) and is an ablative adverb from **ὅπις** (as above). It is very common in the older Greek as an adverb, but it is extremely common iris the LXX as a preposition.[2] In the N. T. **ὀπίσω** occurs alone as an adverb only twice (Mt. 24:18; Lu. 7:38), though we meet **τὰ ὀπίσω** seven times as in Mk. 13:16. But as a preposition we find it 26 times, mostly with persons, as in the common **ὀπίσω μου** (Mt. 3:11). It is used with the ablative, 'behind.' Cf. **δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου** in Mt. 4:19.

31. **Ὀψέ.** This word seems to be another variation of **ὅπις** and occurs in the ancient Greek, both as an adverb and as a preposition with the genitive (Thuc. 4, 93) with the sense of 'late on.' But Philostratus shows examples where **ὀψέ** with the ablative has the sense of 'after,' like **ὀψὲ τούτων**='after these things.'[3] Philostratus uses it also in the sense of 'late on.' The papyri use it in the sense of ' late on' with the genitive.[4] So **ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας** P. Par.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129.
[2] C. and S., p. 87.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 312.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 72 f.

37 (ii/B.C.). Hence in Mt. 28:1, ὀψὲ σαββάτων may be either late on the Sabbath or after the Sabbath. Either has good support. Moulton[1] is uncertain, while Blass[2] prefers 'after.' It is a point for exegesis, not for grammar, to decide. If Matthew has in mind just before sunset, 'late on' would be his idea; if he means after sunset, then 'after' is correct. Cf. δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου (Lu. 18:12).

32. **Παρα-πλήσιον**. It is merely the neuter of the adjective παραπλήσιος. This adjective usually had the associative-instrumental, seldom the genitive. But the one example of the adverbial preposition in the N. T. (Ph. 2:27), θανάτου, has the genitive. See πλησίον.

33. **Παρ-εκτός**. It is a late compound for the earlier παρέκ. It appears in the N. T. only three times, save in the margin of Mt. 19:9 of W. H.'s text. Once it is a mere adverb (2 Cor. 11:28), and twice it is a preposition with the ablative (Mt. 5:32; Ac. 26:29) meaning 'without.'

34. **Πέραν**. It comes from the root περ (cf. περάω, 'fare,' 'ferry,' etc.). Ionic πέρην. It is an adverb (cf. adv. πέρα), probably accusative case. Both as adverb and as preposition with ablative (sometimes with accusative), it survives from Homer. In the N. T. it occurs ten times as an adverb in the phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν (Mt. 8:18). It is found 13 times as a preposition with the ablative, chiefly in the expression πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (Mt. 4:15).

35. **Πλήν,** Doric πλάν. It is probably from πλέον, 'more,' and so is used with the ablative. In the N. T. it occurs only four times as a preposition with the ablative and in one of these we find πλέον --πλὴν τούτων (Ac. 15:28). Twice it is a mere adverb, πλὴν ὅτι (Ac. 20:23; Ph. 1:18), unless indeed the ὅτι clause is in the ablative. Cf. English "except that." In all the other rather numerous instances πλήν is an adversative conjunction at the beginning of a clause (cf. δέ) as in Mt. 11:22. These three usages come on clown from the older Greek.

36. **Πλησίον**, Doric πλατίον. The word is allied to πέλας and is neuter adj. from πλησίος. In the older Greek the adverb occurs absolutely or with the art. ὁ πλησίον, 'neighbour,' as in the N. T. (Mt. 5:43). As a preposition it appears with the associative-instrumental or with the genitive. But in the N. T., it is found only once and with the genitive in Jo. 4:5. In Lu. 10:29, 36, the genitive is also found with πλησίον, but the word here has more of the substantive idea ('neighbour') than the prepositional usage.

37. Ὑπερ-άνω. It is a simple compound that in the late Greek

[1] Moulton, Pro1., p. 72 f. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 97.

gradually displaced[1] **ὑπέρ**. It occurs in writers from Aristotle on both as adverb and as preposition and is common in the LXX.[2] In the N. T. we find it only three times and with the ablative each time. Twice it occurs literally of place (Heb. 9:5; Eph. 4:10) and once of rank (Eph. 1:21).

38. **Ὑπερ-έκεινα**. It is merely **ὑπέρ** and the pronoun **ἐκεῖνα** (cf. **ἐπ-έκεινα** in Ac. 7:43) which appears in the Byzantine Greek. It occurs only once in the N. T. (2 Cor. 10:16), **εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν** with the ablative in the sense of 'beyond,' 'into the (regions) beyond you.'

39. **Ὑπερ-εκ-περισσοῦ**. It is written separately in Liddell and Scott and some N. T. editors print it **ὑπὲρ ἐκπερίσσοῦ**. It is found in Dan. 3:22 (*Ald., Compl.*). W. H. read it three times (Eph. 3:20; 1 Th. 3:10; 5:13), though in the last passage **ὑπερεκ-περισσῶς** is put in the margin by W. H. As a preposition with the ablative, we find it only in Eph. 3:20 (**ὧν**, attracted to case of omitted antecedent).

40. **Ὑπο-κάτω**. It is another compound word which in the ancient Greek was used both as adverb and as preposition and especially in the **κοινή** writers (Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch). In the late Greek it gradually[3] displaced **ὑπό**. In the LXX both **ὑπερ-άνωθεν** and **ὑπερκάτωθεν** occur as prepositions as well as **κατόπισθεν**.[4] In the N. T. it is no longer adverb, but appears as preposition eleven times with, the ablative, five of them with **τῶν ποδῶν** (as Mk. 6:11). The examples are all literal, not metaphorical. Cf. **ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης** (Mk. 7:28).

41. **Χάριν**. This word is just the accusative of **χάρις** and it is still common as the substantive in the accusative (Lu. 1:30). The ancients used it freely with the genitive and with the possessive pronoun, **ἐμὴν χάριν**. The idea of 'for the sake of' (cf. Latin *gratia*) may be due to apposition originally. The usage continues in the late Greek.[5] Among the ancients it was generally postpositive, but in the LXX it is now one way, now the other. In the N. T. it occurs nine times, and is postpositive (as Gal. 3:19) always except 1 Jo. 3:12 with interrogative. It is only once in the Gospels (Lu. 7:47).

42. **Χωρίς**. It is of doubtful etymology (cf. **χάω, χήρα**), but ap-

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 367, 397.
[2] Cf. Deiss., B. S., p. 283 f.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 366.
[4] C. and S., p. 86 f.
[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 337. **Χάριν** as a prep. is in poetry till 50 B.C., when it appears first in prose. Cf. Meisterh., p. 222. He gives an interesting ex. of the prep. in Attic inscr.

pears in Homer freely as an adverb and in Pindar as a preposition. It holds on steadily in both senses. In the N. T. we have only one pure adverbial use (Jo. 20:7), while as a preposition with the ablative we find it 40 times. The usage is chiefly with persons (Mt. 14:21) or abstract relations (Mt. 13:34), though it may be used with place (Lu. 6:49). In Ro. 10:14 note **χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος** without the article. It is postpositive once, **οὗ χωρίς** (Heb. 12:14). Ramsay, *C. and B.*, II, 391 (No. 254), cites from the inscriptions **χωρὶς εἰ μή τι πάθῃ** (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 239).

Of these 42 words in the N. T. the following are only used as prepositions: **ἄνευ, ἀντίπερα, ἀπέναντι, ἄτερ, ἔναντι, ἕνεκα, ἐνώπιοιν, ἐπέκεινα, κατενώπιον, παραπλήσιον, ὑπερέκεινα, ὑπεράνω, ὑποκάτω**. Of the rest **μέσον** is also adjective; **χάρις** substantive; **πλησίον** substantive and adjective; **ἄχρι, ἕως, μέχρι, πλήν**, conjunctions; and the rest are also adverbs.

IX. **Compound Prepositions.** A considerable number of these adverbial prepositions are compound words. So are **ἀντι-κρύ(ς), ἀντί-περα, ἀπ-έν-αντι, ἔμ-προσθεν, ἔν-αντι, ἐν-αντίον, ἐν-ώπιον, ἐπ-άνω, ἐπ-έκεινα, μετα-ξύ, παρα-πλήσιον, παρ-εκτός, ὑπερ-άνω, ὑπερ-εκ-περισσοῦ, ὑπο-κάτω**. The modern Greek vernacular shows similar forms in **ἀποκάτω ἀπό, ἀποπίσω ἀπό, ἀπέξω ἀπό** (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 110). See chapter XII, vi.

X. **Prepositional Circumlocutions**. Blass calls these Hebraisms and it is true that the frequency of these phrases in the LXX and the N. T. is due to the influence of the Hebrew idiom. But the construction itself is good Greek, though not so common, as the papyri show.[1]

(a) **Μέσον**. This word furnishes a number, one of which, **ἀνὰ μέσον,** "has turned up abundantly in the papyri."[2] In the N. T. we find this compound preposition only four times. Moulton thinks that in 1 Cor. 6:5, **διακρῖναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ,** the text is corrupt, but probably the phrase is not to be taken too literally and etymologically (cf. **διά** here). **Διὰ μέσον** is read once (Lu. 17:11) and **διὰ μέσου** once in W. H. (Lu. 4:30). **Εἰς μέσον** (Mk. 14:60) appears once, but **εἰς τὸ μέσον** (Lu. 4:35) six times. **Ἐκ μέσου**, like all the circumlocutions with **μέσον**, is followed by the genitive (Mt. 13:49) and it occurs 7 times. **Κατὰ μέσον** is found once (Ac. 27:27). The commonest (27 times) of these circumlocutions is **ἐν μέσῳ (ἐμμέσῳ** some MSS.) as in Mt. 10:16. **Ἐν τῷ μέσῳ** (Mt. 14:6; Ac. 4:7) is not a prepositional phrase. Cf. **ἐκ τοῦ μέσου** (Col. 2:14). See also chapter XII, x, (b).

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129 f. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 99 f.

(b) **Ὄνομα**. It is sometimes adduced as an example of a prepositional circumlocution and as a pure Hebraism. Deissmann[1] has given abundant illustrations from the papyri to show that the use of **εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι** is common enough in the vernacular **κοινή** where, as in the LXX and the N. T., **ὄνομα** represents the person. It is more than doubtful if we are justified in considering these phrases as mere prepositional circumlocutions with the genitive. The examples that come nearest to it are **εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου, εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου, εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ** (Mt. 10:41 f.); but even here **ὄνομα** brings out the notion that one has the name or character of prophet, righteous man, disciple. In Mt. 28:19, **ὄνομα** has the idea of 'the authority of.'

(c) **Πρόσωπον**. This word also furnishes a number of such phrases which in the LXX seem to be based on Hebrew originals (translation Hebraisms).[2] Thus **ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου** (Ac. 3:19) is like מִפְּנֵי while **πρὸ προσώπου σου** is like לִפְנֵי, and **κατὰ πρόσωπον Πειλάτου** (Ac. 3:13) Blass[3] finds like בִּפְנֵי. Cf. **πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον** (1 Cor. 13:12).

(d) **Στόμα**. This again is a Hebraism in the LXX due to translation. In Mt. 4:4 we have **διὰ στόματος θεοῦ,** a quotation from Deut. 8:3. In Mt. 18:16, **ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων** is likewise from Deut. 19:15. So in Mt. 21:16, **ἐκ στόματος νηπίων** is from Ps. 8:3. Cf. also **ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 22:71), **ἐν τῷ στόματί σου** (Ro. 10:8 from Deut. 30:14). But this picturesque phraseology belongs to all language as a matter of fact.

(e) **Χείρ**. It shows several similar examples. Thus **διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν** (Ac. 15:23), **διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν** (Ac. 14:3), **εἰς χεῖρας** (Lu. 24:7), **εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 15:22), **ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων** (Lu. 1:71), **ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ** (Jo. 3:35), **σὺν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου** (Ac. 7:35). Here again the Greek idiom follows the Hebrew particularity, but with perfect ease. The classical Greek is not without examples[4] of this use of **χείρ** and one may note the English idiom also.[5] See 2 Sam. 15:2, **ἀνὰ χεῖρα τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς πύλης**.

See also **ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ** (Mk. 15:39) and **παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας** in the margin (W. H.) of Mt. 19: 9.

[1] B. S., pp. 146 f., 197. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 100. See also Heitmuller's proof, Im Namen Jesu, pp. 100

[2] Moulton, Prol., pp. 81, 99; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 129 f. [3] Ib.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 130.

[5] Cf. for the LXX, Swete, Intr. to 0. T. in Gk., p. 308.

CHAPTER XIV

ADJECTIVES (**ἐπίθετα**)

I. Origin of Adjectives. This matter was touched upon in the chapter on Declensions, but calls for a further word here. There is no absolute line of cleavage between substantive and adjective either in form or sense.[1] The Alexandrian grammarians had no special treatment of the adjective. "The division line between substantive and adjective, always an uncertain one in early Indo-European language, is even more wavering in Sanskrit than elsewhere."[2] Indeed it is not difficult to conceive the time when there was no distinct adjective. The substantive would be used in apposition as in English, brother man, church member. Cf. the common use of titles also like doctor, president, governor, etc. This attributive use of the substantive is not a peculiarity of any language, but belongs to Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, English, etc. It is out of this use of the substantive that the adjective as a separate part of speech developed.[3] The adjective is not therefore a mere variation of the genitive, though, like the genitive, it is descriptive. The term noun (**ὄνομα**) is used to cover both substantive and adjective, but many substantives continue to be used in a descriptive or adjectival sense and many adjectives in a substantival sense.[4] The term adjective covers words of one, two or three genders, and indeed includes numerals and some of the pronouns also. But the pronouns require treatment in a separate chapter. Participles are verbal adjectives. See later. The close relation between adjective and substantive is well illustrated by **δοῦλα** (Ro. 6:19). Cf. **δοῦλοι**.

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 117.

[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 111.

[3] "It is this change from subst. in apposition to adj. which according to Delbruck is the explanation of the numerous Gk. adjectives in o." Giles, Man., etc., p. 239.

[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 117. Cf. Schoemann, Die Lehre von den Redet. nach den Alten, 1862, p. 15, where he makes the quality of the thing essential to the idea of noun.

II. The Adjectival or Appositional Use of the Substantive.

Examples have already been given in the chapter on the Sentence. Let one suffice here: ἐν τῷ ᾽Ιορδάνῃ ποταμῷ (Mt. 3:6).[1] Cf. further Lu. 24:19; Ac. 1:16; 3:14. This idiom is common enough in the N. T. I must demur, however, at this point to Winer's idea (Winer-Thayer, p. 236) that "a notion which should naturally be expressed by an adjective as an epithet, is sometimes, by a change of construction, brought out by a substantive." What I object to is the word "should." He is right in saying that "the N. T. is by no means poor[2] in adjectives," but wrong in urging that the N. T. ought to use more. As already observed, substantives continued to be used in a descriptive sense not only in apposition, but also in the genitive. This original use of the substantive never ceased. Hence it is useless to talk of "this substitution of a substantive for an adjective" and to explain it as "a Hebraistic mode of expression" due to "the want of adjectives in Hebrew" and to "the peculiar vividness of the Oriental languages" (p. 237). He admits, however, that the matter is not arbitrary, but the principal word stands in the genitive. There is this difference between the adjective as an epithet and the genitive. The two substantives do not merge into one idea quite so completely. Winer's examples illustrate this point well: μηδὲ ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι (1 Tim. 6:17), ἵνα ὑμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν (Ro. 6:4), βλέπων τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως (Col. 2:5), λόγοις τῆς χάριτος (Lu. 4:22), οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας (16:8), κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας (18:6), πάθη ἀτιμίας (Ro. 1:26), τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως (Heb. 1:3), etc. It was just the shade of difference between the substantive in the genitive and the adjective that led to the expressions above. Phrases like τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας (Eph. 6:12) are analogous to the use of the adjective as substantive to be discussed directly. The use of υἱός or τέκνον, with the genitive is exactly like the Hebrew idiom with בֵּן and is extremely common in the LXX and fairly so in the N. T. Thus υἱοῖς ἀπειθίας (Eph. 2:2), πέκνα φωτός (Eph. 5:8), etc. But this "Hebraistic circumlocution" turns up in inscriptions and on coins,[3] so that it is clearly not un-Greek. Deissmann, however, since the idiom is so common and many of the N. T.

[1] Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 88; K.-G., I, p. 272 f.; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 415. On the later distinction between adj. and subst. see Schroeder, tber die formelle Untersch. der Redet., 1874, pp. 195 ff.

[2] But his notion of adjs. "formed by the apostles themselves" vanishes sadly in the light of the papyri.

[3] Deiss., B. S., p. 165 f. So υἱὸς τῆς γερουσίας, υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως, etc,

examples are quotations from the LXX or translations from the Aramaic, admits that the majority in the N. T. are clue to "translation Hebraisms" and the rest to analogical formation.

III. **The Adjective as Substantive.** Simcox[1] thinks that the N. T. shows a more frequent use of this idiom than the earlier Greek. But the earlier Greek shows abundant evidence of the use of the adjective without the substantive as a practical substantive, usually with the article, but not always.[2]

(a) ANY GENDER. Such adjectives may be of any gender, according to the gender of substantive. So **ὁ καλός, ἡ ἔρημος, τὸ χηρστόν**. This is no peculiarity of Greek alone, though it has its own development in the substantival use of the adjective. Indeed the participle was often used as a substantive. Thus **ὁ σπείρων** (Mt. 13:3), **ἡγούμενος** (Mt. 2:6). In Ph. 3:8 we have the participle used as a substantive with the genitive, **τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως**. Cf. Lu. 16:1, **τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ**. So **τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφορον** (1 Cor. 10:33) where the adjective, like a substantive, has the genitive.

(b) WITH MASCULINE ADJECTIVES. With masculine adjectives the substantives naturally suggest themselves out of the context or the nature of the case.[3] Thus in Mt. 11:5, **τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, κτλ.** Cf. **οἱ ἅγιοι** (1 Cor. 6:2), **ἁμαρτωλούς** (1 Tim. 1:15), **δικαίου** and **τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ** (Ro. 5:7), **ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ** (8:33), **τὸν ἀληθινόν** (1 Jo. 5:20), **ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ** (Jo. 6:69) and probably **τοῦ πονηροῦ** (Mt. 6:13). In Jas. 5:7, **πρόϊμον καί ὄψιμον**, supply **ὑετόν**. Sometimes only the context can determine the gender, as in Eph. 6:16; 1 Jo. 3:12).

(c) WITH FEMININE ADJECTIVES. These are usually examples of the ellipsis of **ὁδός, χείρ, γῆ, γυνή, ἡμέρα, γλῶσσα**. I follow Blass[4] mainly in these examples. Thus **γῆ** is responsible for the feminine gender in **τὴν ξηράν** (Mt. 23:15; Heb. 11:29), **ἡ περίχωρος** (Mt. 3:5), **τὴν ὀρεινήν** (Lu. 1:39), **τῇ ἐρήμῳ** (Mt. 3:2), **τῆς οἰκουμένης** (Ro. 10:18), etc. In **ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν** (Lu. 17:24) Blass prefers **μερίδος** to **γῆς** and urges that we do not refine too sharply over **ἐξ ἐναντίας** (Mk. 15:39; Tit. 2:8). As examples of the influence of **ὁδός** note **εὐθείας** (Lu. 3:5), **ποίας** (5:19), **ἐκείνης** (19:4). For **χείρ** observe **ἡ ἀριστερά** and **ἡ δεξιά** (Mt. 6:3), **ἐν δεξιᾷ** (Ro. 8:34), **τῇ δεξιᾷ** (Ac. 2:33). But **ἐκ δεξιῶν** (2:34) may be compared with **εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη** (Jo. 21:6). The ellipsis of **ἡμέρα** is noticed by Blass in **τῇ ἐχομένῃ** (Lu. 13:33), **τῇ ἐπιούσῃ** (Ac. 16:11),

[1] Lang. of the N. T., p. 91.
[2] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 414; K.-G., I, p. 266 f.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 140, [4] Ib., p. 140 f.

τῇ ἑτέρᾳ (20:15), τῇ ἐπαύριον (Mt. 27:62), τῇ τρίτῃ (Lu. 13:32), τῆς ἑβδόμης (Heb. 4:4), τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (Ac. 20:7), μέχρι τῆς σήμερον (Mt. 11:23), ἀφ᾽ ἧς (2 Pet. 3:4), τῇ ἑξῆς (Ac. 21:1). But Blass rightly supplies ὥρα with ἀφ᾽ ἧς in Lu. 7:45, as with ὀψίας (Mt. 8:16), πρωίας (Mt. 27:1). To conclude the list of feminine examples with τῇ πνεούσῃ (Ac. 27:40) supply αὔρᾳ, with ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ (Rev. 9:11) supply γλώσσῃ (but cf. τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, Ac. 22:2), with πολλάς and ὀλίγας (Lu. 12:47 f.) supply πληγάς, with ἀπὸ μιᾶς (Lu. 14:18) insert φωνῆς. But κατ᾽ ἰδιάν (Mk. 6:31) and ἰδίᾳ, (1 Cor. 12:11), though stereotyped, may refer to ὁδῷ. Cf. also κατὰ μόνας (Mk. 4:10) as an instance of ὁδός. So δημοσίᾳ (Ac. 16:37). Words like σωτήριος (Tit. 2:11), αἰώνιον (Jo. 6:47), ὑπερίστατον (Heb. 12:1) are, of course, feminine, not masculine. See chapter on Declensions.

(d) WITH THE NEUTER. The neuter furnishes a number of interesting examples. Thus ποτήριον ψυχροῦ (Mt. 10:42), where ὕδατος is referred to. So ὕδωρ is meant by τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρόν (Jas. 3:11). With ἐν λευκοῖς (Jo. 20:12), one must insert ἱματίοις as with ἐν μαλακοῖς (Mt. 11:8). Cf. πορφυροῦν in Rev. 18:16. With τοῦ διοποετοῦς (Ac. 19:35) Blass[1] suggests ἀγάλματος, and with τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς (Rev. 8:7) we must supply μέρος ("not classical," Blass). Cf. εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (Mt. 21:23). In Mt. 6:13, ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, most likely διάβολος is meant,[2] not mere evil. In Mt. 19:17 we have περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, explained by ὁ ἀγαθός, though the American Standard Version gives it 'that which is good.' But cf. Ro. 5:7. The number of these neuter adjectives used substantively in the N. T. is large and varied, but the older Greek shows abundant illustrations[3] of the same thing, especially in philosophical discussions. With prepositions in particular we meet with this use of the neuter. Thus εἰς τὸ μέσον (Jo. 20:19) ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ (Mt. 6:4), εἰς φανερόν (Mk. 4:22), μετὰ μικρόν (Mt. 26:73), ἐν μέσῳ (Mt. 10:16), ἐν ὀλίγῳ (Ac. 26:28), ἐν μεγάλῳ (26:29), μετὰ βραχύ (Lu. 22:58), etc. Cf. εἰς ἀγαθά (Jer. 24:6). Very common is the adverbial usage of this neuter like βραχύ (Ac. 5:34), μικρόν (Mt. 26:39), μόνον (Mt. 8:8), τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 12:16), but the adjective's relation to the adverb will receive special treatment. See XI. Cf. τῷ ὄντι. Sometimes the neuter singular was used in a collective sense for the sum total (cf. English "the all"). Thus, in Jo. 6:37, 39, πᾶν ὅ (5, 17:24 ὅ, where persons are meant. The neuter plural is

[1] Ib., p. 141.
[2] So Rev. Vers. uniformly. Cf. Green, Handb. to Gk. N. T., p. 268.
[3] W.-Th., p. 235.

common in this sense like τὰ πάντα (Col. 1:16) where the universe is thus described. Cf. τὰ ὄντα and τὰ μὴ ὄντα (1 Cor. 1:28). B in the LXX (Helbing, p. 51) frequently has πᾶν – πάντα (acc. sing. masc.). (Cf. also Ps. of Sol. 3:10; 8:23 V; Test. xii, Pat. Reub. 1:10 πᾶν ἄρτον, Gad 3:1 πᾶν νόμον.) See also the common collective neuter in the LXX (Thackeray, *Grammar*, p. 174 f.). Usually the neuter plural is concrete, however, as in τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ ἀόρατα (Col. 1:16), where πάντα is thus explained. Cf. τὰ βαθέα (Rev. 2:24), ἀρχαῖα (2 Cor. 5:17). In Ro. 1:20, as Winer[1] points out, τὰ ἀόρατα makes more concrete ἥ τε ἀΐδιος δύναμις καὶ θειότης. But one must confess that in Eph. 3:10, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, it is not clear what the idea is, whether places, things or relations. In Jo. 3:12 ἐπίγεια and ἐπουράνια seem to refer to truths. In 1 Cor. 2:13, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συνκρίνοντες, a like ambiguity exists, but the presence of λόγοις inclines one to the notion that Paul is here combining spiritual ideas with spiritual words. The neuter singular with the article is very common for the expression of an abstract idea. One does not have to say that the adjective is here used instead of the abstract substantive, but merely as an abstract substantive. Cf. English "the beautiful and the good" with "beauty and goodness." This is good ancient Greek. Cf. also in the papyri τὸ δίκαιον Tb.P. 40 (B.C. 117) and (ib.) καθήκοντα. Winer[2] was troubled over τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως (1 Pet. 1:7) and said that no such adjective existed and therefore this was a mere substantive. There was none in the lexica, but Deissmann[3] has found a number of instances of the adjective in the papyri. So χρυσοῦ δοκιμίου P.E.R. xii. 6 f. (93 A.D.), 'good gold.' One need not be troubled over τὸ γνωστόν (Ro. 1:19) any more than over the other neuter adjectives. Cf. τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 2:4), τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ and τὸ ἀσθενὲς τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 1: 25), τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς (Heb. 6:17), τὸ ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θελίψεως (2 Cor. 4:17), τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου (Ro. 8:3), τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ (9: 22). It is thus frequent with the genitive. Cf. also τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον (Ro. 1:15). See Heb. 7:7. In Lu. 12:23, ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς, we have πλεῖον because the abstract idea of thing is expressed. This also is a frequent Greek idiom. Cf. οὐδέν, (1 Cor. 7:19), ὅ (1 Cor. 15:10), ταῦτα (1 Cor. 6:11).

IV. Agreement of Adjectives with Substantives.

(a) IN NUMBER. It is not necessary to repeat what has been

[1] W.-Th., p. 235. Cf. lateness of the forms in —ικός (only two in Hom.). Hoffmann, Uber die Entw. des Begr. des Griech. bei den Alten, p. 2. In 1 Tim. 5:17 note διπλῆς (from –όος). [2] Ib. [3] B. S., p. 259 f.

said on this subject in chapter X, vii, (b), on concord between adjective and substantive in number. The normal thing is for adjective and substantive to agree in number. But one must not get the idea that "construction according to sense" of the grammarians is an anomaly. "The term is unobjectionable, provided we remember that constructions according to the meaning are generally older than those 'in which meaning is overridden by idiom or grammatical analogy."[1] Thus there is no cause for astonishment in seeing ἔκθαμβοι with ὁ λαός in Ac. 3:11, nor πλῆθος κράζοντες in Ac. 21:36.

(b) IN GENDER. For concord in gender see chapter X, viii. Here again the construction according to sense is normal like στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου αἰνούντων (Lu. 2:13), but οὐρανίου in the same phrase is the feminine (cf. αἰώνιος, etc.). The N. T. does not have the Attic idiom with ἥμισυς of agreement with the gender of the genitive substantive, though it is still in the LXX. Cf. τὰς ἡμίσεις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (Ezek. 16:51). Instead see ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου (Mk. 6:23). But αὕτη and θαυμαστή in Mt. 21:42 (Mk. 12:11) are probably clue to the Hebrew זֹאת, the Hebrew using the feminine for abstract ideas, since it had no neuter. But even here in Ps. 117:23 the context has κεφαλὴν γωνίας.[2] One other remark is to be made which is that when an adjective occurs with more than one substantive it may agree with the gender of the nearest, as in πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον (Lu. 10:1), be repeated with each, as in πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον (Jas. 1:17) and ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι (Ac. 4:7), or agree with the masculine rather than the feminine or neuter, as in γυμνοί (Jas. 2:15). With the same gender there may be repetition (Mt. 4:23; 9:35) or not (Mt. 12:31).

(c) IN CASE. For concord in case see chapter X, ix. The main instances of variation here belong to the participle as in Ac. 15: 22 f.), and in particular the Book of Revelation furnishes illustrations (Rev. 3:12, etc.), as already shown.

(d) Two on MORE ADJECTIVES. When two or more adjectives occur together the conjunction may be used as in πολλὰ καὶ βαρέα αἰτιώματα (Ac. 25:7) and even πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα (Jo. 20:30), as in Latin.[3] But see ἑτέρων πολλῶν (Ac.15 : 35) and the repetition of the adjective with the article (Rev. 2:12).

V. The Attributive Adjective. The adjective (from *adjaceo*) is a word joined on to another (ἐπίθετον). The adjective is by no

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 118.
[2] Cf. W.-Th., p. 238; Moulton, Prol., p. 59.
[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 87.

means the only attribute used with substantives. Thus the attribute may be substantive in apposition with another substantive, like ἀνθρωπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ (Mt. 13:52), or a genitive, like ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία (1 Pet. 3:20), or an adverb, like τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως (Ph. 3:14), or an adjunct, like ἡ κατ᾽ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις (Ro. 9:11), or a pronoun, like τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα (Mt. 18:20).[1] When the article is used before the adjective or participle it is, of course, attributive, as in ὁ καλός (Jo. 10:11), ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ (2 Pet. 1:12). But adjectives and participles may be attributive when no article is used. Thus with στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου (Lu. 2:13), ὕδωρ ζῶν (Jo. 4:10. Cf. τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν, in verse 11), μονογενὴς θεός (Jo. 1:18). The unusual position of the attributive adjective, like ὁ ὄχλος πολύς (Jo. 12:9), where the substantive and adjective form "a composite idea" (Jebb, *Soph. 0. T.*, pp. 1199 ff.), may be illustrated from the papyri, 0.P.99, τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτῷ μητρικῆς οἰκίας τριστέγου (Moulton, *Cl. Rev.,* 1904, p. 154). Cf. also ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου (1 Pet. 1:18), where, however, πατροπαραδότου may very well be predicate (see vi). Cf. French *La Republique Froncaise.*

VI. The Predicate Adjective. The adjective (like the participle) is common as a predicate, as is the substantive. Monro[2] considers the substantive in the predicate adjectival. Cf. pronoun, adverb, etc. As examples note πολλοί (Mk. 5:9), ὁμοία (Mt. 13:31), σωτήριος (Tit. 2:11), ἕτοιμα (Lu. 14:17), βαθύ (Jo. 4:11), out of many. But adjectives are predicate without a copula, as in **Τί** με λέγεις ἀγαθόν (Mk. 10:18), ὁ ποιήσας με ὑγιῆ (Jo. 5:11; cf. 7:23), ἀδάπανον θήσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (1 Cor. 9:18), μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ (Ac. 26:24), ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην (Heb. 7:24). Cf. Mk. 8:17; Jo. 5:35; 1 Cor. 11:5. As examples of the verbal in -τος take παθητός (Ac. 26:23) and γνωστόν (Ac. 4:10) with which last compare the attributive use in Ac. 4:16 γνωστὸν σημεῖον. Cf. Mk. 3:1. As further interesting examples of the predicate adjective, note ὅλος (Jo. 9:34), δόκιμοι. φανῶμεν (2 Cor. 13:7), ὑγιής (Mt. 12:13), πρῶτος (Jo. 20:4), ἑδραῖος (1 Cor. 7:37), ὀρθός (Ac. 14:10), μόνος (Lu. 24:18; cf. Mt. 14: 23), etc. Cf. ὅλον in Lu. 13:21. The distinction between the attributive adjective and the predicate adjective lies in just this, that the predicate presents an additional statement, is indeed the main point, while the attributive is an incidental description of the substantive about which the statement is made. Cf. Ac. 4:10 and 16 above for both uses of γνωστόν. Cf. ταύτας in Ac. 1:5.

[1] Cf. K.-G., I, pp. 26S ff.

[2] Hom. Gr., p. 117.

This distinct predication[1] with the adjective in an oblique case is seen in τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας (Jo. 4:18) and is a classical idiom.[2] Note the use of πάντα as predicate for ὁ θεός in 1 Cor. 15:28 as with **Χριστός** in Col. 3:11 for the totality of things.

VII. Adjective Rather than Adverb. See ch. XII, ix, for discussion of this subject. A few items are added here. Cf. πρῶτος **Μωυσῆς** λέγει (Ro. 10:19), 'Moses is the first who says,' with πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου (Mt. 5:24), 'Be reconciled with thy brother as the first thing that you do.' In Mt. 10:2 πρῶτος **Σίμων** means that first in the list is Simon, whereas πρῶτον, in Jo. 1:41, means that Andrew finds his brother Simon as the first thing which he does. **Πρῶτον** ἰχθύν (Mt. 17:27) means the first fish that came up. Cf. ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ (1 Tim. 1:16), 'me as chief.' The exact idea of πρώτη in Lu. 2:2 is not certain, but most probably Luke's idea is that there were two enrolments under Cyrenius. Cf. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* With **μόνος** and **μόνον** a like distinction is to be observed. Take ἀνεχώρησεν πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς **μόνος** (Jo. 6:15) and σὺ **μόνος** παροικεῖς **Ἰερουσαλήμ** (Lu. 24:18). The difference is much like that between the English "alone" and "only." So in Lu. 9:36, **εὑρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος,** 'Jesus was found alone,' and in Mt. 17:8 (cf. Mk. 9:8), **οὐδένα** εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν **Ἰησοῦν μόνον**, it is adjective, not adverb. Cf. **οὐκ** εἰμὶ **μόνος** (Jo. 16:32) with **οὐ μόνον** in Ac. 21:13. Cf. 2 Jo. 1. Contrast **μόνον** in Mt. 8:8 with **μόνος** in Mt. 14:23. There are some examples where either adverb or adjective would make good sense,[3] as in Mk. 6:8, **μηδὲν** εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον **μόνον**, where D reads **μόνην;** Ac. 11:19, **μηδενὶ** εἰ μὴ **μόνον Ἰουδαίοις**, where D has **μόνοις**; and 1 Jo. 5:6, **οὐκ** ἐν τῷ ὕδατι **μόνον**, where B reads **μόνῳ**. But this is not all. The Greek often uses an adjective where other languages prefer adverbs or prepositional phrases. Latin and English have similar expressions for other ideas.[4] Naturally this idiom is common in Homer.[5] For time note δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν (Ac. 28:13), 'we came second-day men' ('on the second day'). Cf. τεταρταῖος Jo. 11: 39. D has likewise πεμπταῖοι in Ac. 20:6. So γενόμεναι ὀρθριναὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον (Lu. 24:22), ἐπιστῇ ἐφνίδιος (Lu. 21:34), αὐθίρετος (2 Cor. 8:17), ὀκταήμερος (Ph. 3:5).

VIII. **The Personal Construction.** This matter belongs more properly to indirect discourse and the participle, but it calls for

[1] Monro, ib., p. 119.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 141.
[3] Ib.
[4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 89.
[5] Seymour, Hom. Lang. and Verse, p. 79. On the relation between adj. and adv. see Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 416 f.; Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 40 f.

just a word here. The Greeks were more fond of the personal construction than we English are. Farrar[1] indeed doubts if Greek has a true impersonal verb. But ἐγένετο in a passage like Lu. 1:8 comes close to it. Cf. Lu. 1:23. We have fewer examples in the N. T. of the personal construction, none in truth with either δῆλος (1 Cor. 15:27 is impersonal construction) or with φανερός. But we do have φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor. 3:3). Cf. Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι, in 1 Cor. 15:12. Note also ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω (Jo. 1:27), but the impersonal construction is found with δίκαιον in Ph. 1:7. See also ἱκανὸς ἵνα in Mt. 8:8. Δυνατός occurs with the infinitive (2 Tim. 1:12). This personal construction is probably due to assimilation of gender by analogy.[2] Cf. δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι (1 Cor. 3:18), perfectly regular predicate nominative. See good example in 1 Cor. 15:9.

IX. **Adjectives Used with Cases**. Examples were given under the various oblique cases of adjectives that were construed with the several cases. A mere mention of the matter is all that is required here. Thus the genitive appears with ἔνοχος θανάτου (Mt. 26:66), the ablative with ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν (Eph. 2:12), the dative (Mt. 20:1) and accusative with ὅμοιος υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου (Rev. 14:14), the ace. with πιστὸς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Heb. 2:17), the dative with ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει (Mt. 5:21) and καλόν σοί ἐστιν (Mt. 18: 8), the instrumental with ἴσους ἡμῖν (Mt. 20:12), the locative with βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ (Lu. 24:25). Cf. locative in Col. 2:13 f. The adjective is, of course, used with various prepositions, as τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας (Gal. 6:10), πιστός ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ (Lu. 16:10), βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν (Jas. 1:19).

X. Adjectives with the Infinitive and Clauses. If cases can occur with adjectives, it is natural that the verbal substantive known as the infinitive should come within that idiom anti be in a case. The case of the infinitive will vary with the adjective. Thus in ἄξιος κληθῆναι, (Lu. 15:19) the infinitive is probably in the genitive case. Cf. also ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω (Jo. 1:27). With δυνατὸς κωλῦσαι (Ac. 11:17) we have the accusative of general reference. In the case of ἱκανὸς βαστάσαι (Mt. 3:11) we may see either the accusative of general reference, as above, or the dative, according to the original idea of the form and the common case with ἱκανός. Cf. also ἱκανὸς ἵνα εἰσέλθῃς (Mt. 8:8). The instances of both infinitive and ἵνα are numerous in the N. T. As specimens of the infinitive anti preposition after the adjective, take ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι (Jas. 1:19). Indeed the genitive

[1] Gk. Synt., p. 89. [2] Middleton, Anal. in Synt., p. 15.

article τοῦ with the infinitive occurs with adjectives where it would not naturally be looked for, as in ἕτοιμοί ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν (Ac. 23:15). Cf. ἕτοιμός εἰμι πορεύεσθαι (Lu. 22:33). But see further (βραδεῖς τοῦ πιστεύειν (Lu. 24:25).

XI. The Adjective as Adverb. This subject has been treated in the chapter on the Cases as well as in the one on Adverbs. Hence a few words will suffice here. The border line between adjective in the nominative and adverb gets very dim sometimes. Thus in English we say "I am well," "He spoke well." Farrar[1] even says that it is "more correct" to use an adverb than an adjective in a phrase like ἄσμενος ὑμᾶς εἶδον. But that is going too far even if we call it *antimeria*. He quotes Milton (*Par. Lost*, vii, 161), "Meanwhile inhabit lax," and Shakespeare (*Taming of Shrew*; I, i, 89), "Thou didst it excellent." We can see the difference between ἀνάστηθι ὀρθός (Ac. 14:10) and ὀρθῶς ἔκρινας (Lu. 7:43). But, as already observed, the difference between μόνον and μόνῳ grows faint in 1 Jo. 5:6 and similar examples. Hence it becomes very easy for the adjective form in the accusative to be used indiscriminately as adverb where the adjective idea disappears. Thus only the context can tell whether μόνον is adjective (Jo. 8:29) or adverb (Gal. 1:23). So as to μικρόν (Jo. 7:33 and 16: 19), πολύ (Lu. 12:48 and Ro. 3:2), ὀλίγον (Mk. 1:19), etc. Πρῶτον, for instance, is very common as an adverb (cf. Mt. 7:5, and even τὸ πρῶτον is found, Jo. 10:40), but πρώτως occurs only once (Ac. 11:26). It is needless to multiply here examples like these. Other cases are used besides the accusative to make adverbs from adjectives, as the ablative in πρώτως above, the genitive as ὁμοῦ (Jo. 4:36), the associative-instrumental as δημοσίᾳ (Ac. 16:37). Cf. πολλῷ (Ro. 5:9). All degrees of comparison furnish adverbs, thus πολύ (Ro. 3:2; 2 Cor. 8:22), πλέον (Jo. 21: 15), μάλιστα (Ac. 20:38). The accusative singular of the comparative is the common adverb of that degree as περισσότερον (Heb. 7:15), but see περισσοτέρως (2 Cor. 1:12). In the superlative both the singular as πρῶτον (Lu. 6:42) and the plural as μάλιστα (above). These examples sufficiently illustrate the principles involved.

XII. The Positive Adjective.

(a) RELATIVE CONTRAST. In discussing the positive adjective first one must not get the idea that the positive was originally the absolute idea of the adjective as distinct from the comparative or superlative. This notion of absolute goodness or great-

[1] Gk. Synt., p. 90.

ness, etc., is itself later than the notion of comparison.[1] Indeed the adjective itself has a relative sense and suggests the opposite, as light implies darkness. And then many of the oldest comparative forms have no positive at all and never did have, like ἀμφοτερος, ἀριστερός, βέλτερος, δεύτερος, etc. More of this under the comparative. The point to get hold of just here is that the adjective *per se* (like many other words) implies contrast, and that originally this is hat the comparative form meant. Thus in Homer some comparatives in –τερος have no notion of greater or less degree, the idea of duality, but merely contrast, like θηλυτέρα as opposed to male, ὀρέστερος as opposed to valley, ἀρειστερός opposed to right, δεξίτερος opposed to left, ἡμέτερος opposed to ὑμέτερος and *vice versa*.[2] Cf. the comparative idea (and ablative case after) in τὸ περισσὸν τούτων (Mt. 5:37).

(b) USED AS COMPARATIVE OR SUPERLATIVE. With this notion of the relative contrast in the adjective and the first use of the comparative one is not surprised to find the positive still used alongside of the comparative. In Lu. 1:42, εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν, we do not have a mere Hebraism, though a very natural one in this translation from the Aramaic talk of Elizabeth. The Hebrew has no degrees of comparison at all and has to resort to circumlocutions.[3] But Homer and other early Greek writers show a similar idiom, like δῖα θεάων, δῖα γυναικῶν (Eurip., *Alc*, 471).[4] Other examples occur in the N. T., like ἅγια ἁγίων (Heb. 9:2 f., frequent in the LXX), ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ (Mt. 22:36). Cf. βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, (Rev. 19:16), κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων (1 Tim. 6:15), τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων (Eph. 3:21). The vernacular κοινή uses repetition of the adjective, as in μεγάλοι μεγάλοι, B.U. I, 229, μεγάλων καὶ μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν, Inscription of Thera (*Herm*. 1901, p. 445), θερμὰ θερμά, Herondas IV, 61. Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 57. The positive suggests contrast clearly in τῶν πολλῶν (Mt. 24:12). Cf. of οἱ πολλοί in Ro. 5:15, 19; 1 Cor. 10:33. Here the majority is the idea, a comparative notion. Cf. Paul's use of τοὺς πλείονας (1 Cor. 9:19) and Matthew's ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος (21:8). See also Mk. 12:37 ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος and Lu. 7:11 ὄχλος πολύς, and in 2 Cor. 8:15 τὸ πολύ and τὸ ὀλίγον. Hence it is not surprising in Lu. 16:10 to see ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ and ἐν πολλῷ side by side (cf. ἐν ὀλίγῳ, καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ in Ac. 26:29), as in Mt. 5:19 also ἐλάχιστος and

[1] Cf. Schwab, Hist. Synt. d. griech. Comp., Heft i, 1893, p. 7 f.
[2] Seymour, Hom. Lang. and Verse, p. 60. Cf. K.-G., II, p. 21.
[3] C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 64.
[4] Schwab, Hist. Synt. d. griech. Comp., Heft i, p. 9.

μέγας are set over against each other. Cf. also Mt. 22:38. In Ac. 26:24, τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα, we have an implied comparison.[1]

(c) WITH PREPOSITIONS. The positive may be used with prepositions also where comparison is implied. Thus ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους (Lu. 13:2). Winer[2] properly compares this idiom with the use of ὡς in Heb. 3:2, for in the next verse the author uses πλείονος δόξης as the sense of verse 2. But in the LXX this is a very common idiom[3] and it is found in the classical Greek. The correct text in Lu. 18:14 (ℵBL) has also δεδικαιωμένος παρ᾽ ἐκεῖνον. Cf. ἄξια πρός in Ro. 8:18.

(d) COMPARISON IMPLIED BY ἤ. Once more the positive may occur with It is not necessary, in view of the preceding discussion, to suggest the "omission" of μᾶλλον.[4] It is true that we have only one such example in the N. T. καλόν σοί ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν ἢ βληθῆναι (Mt. 18:8). Cf. Mk. 9:43, 45. But the LXX again furnishes many illustrations[5] like λευκοὶ ἤ (Gen. 49:12). The ancient Greek also is not without parallels. And there are N. T. examples, as in LXX, of verbs so employed like θέλω ἤ (1 Cor. 14:19) and λυσιτελεῖ ἢ (Lu. 17:2) and substantives as χαρὰ ἔσται ἤ (Lu. 15:7). Older Greek writers show this idiom with substantives and verbs.[6] In Mt. 18:8 we have the positive adjective both before and after ἤ as κυλλόν ἢ χωλὸν. But cf. 2 Tim. 3:4 for comparative before and positive after.

(e) IN ABSOLUTE SENSE. After the three grades of comparison were once established, analogy worked to form and use positive, comparative and superlative. And sometimes the positive occurs in the absolute sense. So we find Christ discussing the absolute meaning of the positive ἀγαθός in Mt. 19:17 (Mk. 10:18). Thus it comes to pass that sometimes the positive is more absolute than comparative or superlative which are relative of necessity. God is alone ἀγαθός in this sense, while others are βελτίονες and βέλτιστοι. Our God, ὁ ἀγαθὸς θεός, is higher in ideal and fact than Jupiter Maximus or Ζεὺς ἄριστος ἠδὲ μέγιστος.[7] Of καλός the opposite is οὐ καλός and this is not the positive attribute αἰσχρός. In Mt. 17:4 we find Peter saying fervently καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι. "The positive represents the highest absolute idea of a quality and cannot therefore be increased."[8]

[1] Blass, Gr. of -N. T. Gk., p. 143.
[2] W.-Th., p. 240.
[3] C. and S., p. 64.
[4] Though Blass does, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 143.
[5] C. and S., p. 64; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 143; W.-Th., p. 241.
[6] W.-Th., p. 240 f.
[7] Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft i, p. 9.
[8] Ib., p. 19-

XIII. The Comparative Adjective (συγκριτικὸν ὄνομα).

(a) CONTRAST OR DUALITY. On the forms see chapter VII, 3. As already observed, the first use of the comparative form was to express contrast or duality.[1] This is clear in ἡ ἀριστερά (Mt. 6:3), though ἡ δεξιά occurs in the same verse. But Homer uses δεξίτερος as comparative. Cf. also **ἀμφότερος, ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος, ἕτερος, ἑκάτερος, ὁπότερος, πότερος**, where the notion of two is accentuated. Contrast between two or duality, therefore, is clear in these pronouns. They will receive separate treatment later. Here they are merely used to illustrate the origin of the comparative form. **Ἄλλος** (Latin *alius*) is also comparative,[2] ***ἄλ-ιος**. So is **δεξ-ίος**[3] which explains the disappearance of **δεξίτερος.** One of the comparative endings is **–ιος**. This leads one to remark that the oldest comparative forms are not formed from positives as such, but from their own roots. Thus **δεύτερος**, which is obviously comparative and expresses duality, has no positive form. Cf. **ἀμφότερος** and the examples just mentioned.[4] This original comparative need not be formed from an adjective at all, but from a substantive like, **βασιλεύτερος, κύντερος**, etc., in Homer where the comparative expresses the possession of the quality "in contradistinction to objects which are without it" (Monro, *Homeric Gr.*, p. 82). So **πρότερος** (from the adverb **πρό)** is not 'more forward,' but 'forward' in opposition to **ὕστερος**, 'backward.' Cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 415. Cf. **ἐλεύθερος**, 'free to come.' So **ἐξώτερος** is 'outside,' not 'more outside.' These oldest forms represent the original meaning which was not the comparison of greater or less, not a matter of degree, but a question of contrast or duality.[5] So **βέλτερος, ἀμείνων** have no positive forms. There is indeed a distinct weakening of this original duality in adjectives as in pronouns.[6] Cf. the dropping of the dual endings. Thus in the N. T. **πρότερος** an adjective occurs only once, **κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν** (Eph. 4:22). It is rare in the papyri (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 79). Elsewhere **πρῶτος** holds the field when only two objects or persons are in view, like **πρῶτός μου** (Jo. 1:15), **πρῶτος** and **ἄλλος** (20:4), etc. Cf. our 'first story' when only two stories are contemplated, 'first volume,' etc. And as an adverb **πρότερον** survives only ten times (cf. 2 Cor. 1:15), while **πρῶτον** is very com-

[1] Moulton, Prol., pp. 77 [2] Brug., Grundr. vergl. Gr., II, i, p. 420.
[3] Ib. Transl. (Comp. Gr.), vol. TI, p. 132.
[4] Schwab, Hist. Synt. d. griech. Comp., Heft i, p. 5.
[5] Ib., pp. 4 ff.
[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 77 f.; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 439; 1903, p. 154.

mon. Luke does not use πρότερος (adjective or adverb) so that πρῶτος in Ac. 1:1 with λόγος does not imply τρίτος. Moulton[1] finds πρότερος only once in the Grenfell-Hunt volumes of papyri so that this dual form vanishes before the superlative πρῶτος. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 244) sees this matter rightly and calls it a Latin point of view to insist on "former" and "latter" in Greek, a thing that the ancients did not do.

(b) DEGREE. The next step was for the notion of degree to come into the comparative. The notion of "two-ness" remained, but it had the added idea of more in degree. They run along then parallel with each other. The comparative form, therefore, has two ideas, that of contrast or duality (*Gegensatz*) and of the relative comparative (*Steigerung*), though the first was the original.[2] Relative comparison is, of course, the dominant idea in most of the N. T. examples, though, as already remarked, the notion of duality always lies in the background. Thus ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται (Mt. 10:15), βεβαιότερον (2 Pet. 1:19), εἰς τὸ κρεῖσσον (1 Cor. 11:17), σοφώτερον and ἰσχυρότερον (1 Cor. 1:25).

(c) WITHOUT SUFFIXES. But the comparative did not always use the comparative suffixes, though this was usual. Sometimes μᾶλλον was employed with the positive, though this idiom is not very frequent in the N. T. Thus we find μᾶλλον with καλός (Mk. 9:42), with μακάριον (Ac. 20:35), with ἀναγκαῖα (1 Cor. 12:22), with πολλά (Gal. 4:27). Once indeed (2 Tim. 3:4) μᾶλλον occurs with one adjective before ἤ and not with the other after ἤ. The Greeks preferred to put both qualities in the comparative degree when two adjectives were compared.[3] But here we have φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι. "In Jo. 3:19 μᾶλλον — ἤ is used with two substantives" (H. Scott). In Phil. 16 we have a distinction drawn between μάλιστα and μᾶλλον with ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπητόν. No example occurs in the N. T. of two comparatives with but in Ro. 9:12 we have ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι and in Heb. 1:4, τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον.

(d) DOUBLE COMPARISON. Sometimes indeed μᾶλλον, occurs with the comparative form itself. This applies to adjectives and adverbs. Thus μᾶλλον περισσότερον (Mk. 7:36), περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον (2 Cor. 7:13). Cf. ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον (Ph. 1:9), περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλον (Heb. 7:15). Recall also the double comparative form like vernacular English "lesser," μειζοτέραν (3 Jo. 4), and the comparative on the superlative ἐλαχιστότερος (Eph. 3:8. It oc-

[1] Prol., p. 79.
[2] Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft i, p. 21 f.
[3] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 42.

curs in Test. xii, Pat. Jos. 17:8). All this is due to the fading of the force of the comparatives suffix and the desire for emphasis. Homer has χειρότερος, AEschylus μειζονώτερος and ὑπερτερώτερος, Xenophon ἐσχατώτερος, Aristophanes προτεραίτερος. Cf. Schwab, *Hist. Syntax* etc., Heft iii, p. 60. Modern Greek vernacular has πλειότερος and χειρότερος. The papyri give illustrations like πρεσβυτερωτέρα (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 236). Cf. Latin double comparative *dex-ter-ior, sinis-ter-ior*. See list in Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 147. This double comparative is due to analogy and weakened sense of the form (Middleton, *Analogy in Syntax*, p. 38). Other means of strengthening the comparative were the accusative adverb πολύ, as in Heb. 12:9, 25 (cf. 2 Cor. 8:22), and in particular the instrumental πολλῷ, as in Lu. 18:39. In 1 Cor. 12:22 we have πολλῷ μᾶλλον over against ἀσθενέστερα. But in Ph. 1:23 note πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον where all this emphasis is due to Paul's struggling emotion. The ancient Greek used all these devices very often. Cf. Schwab, *Hist. Syntax*, etc., Heft iii, pp. 59 ff. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk*., p. 143) rightly observes that in 2 Cor. 12:9 ἥδιστα μᾶλλον are not to be taken together. The older Greek used also μέγα and μακρῷ to strengthen the comparison. Cf. Mayer, *Verstarkung, Umschreibung and Entwertung der Comparationsgrade in der alteren Gracitait*, 1891, p. 16 f.

(e) WITHOUT OBJECT OF COMPARISON. Sometimes the comparative form is used absolutely. It is beside the mark to say with Clyde[1] that this idiom occurs "through politeness for the positive." It is not used for the positive. It is true that no object of comparison is expressed, but that is because the context makes the point perfectly clear. In rapid familiar conversation this would often be true. Blass[2] also thinks that sometimes the comparative is no more than a positive. Winer[3] more justly holds that the point of comparison may "ordinarily be gathered from the context." The point is always in the context. Thus ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχειον (Jo. 13:27) may mean more quickly than Judas would have done but for the exposure. Note that this is a conversation and Judas would understand. In Heb. 13:19 περισσοτέρως and τάχειον correspond easily, and in verse 23, ἐὰν τάχειον ἔρχηται, perhaps it means 'if he come before I leave.' None of the examples of Blass are convincing, for πρεσβύτερος, though used of an official, is one who is older (elder) as compared with νεώτερος, and the bishop. is not to be a neophyte (1 Tim. 3:6). The point, of course, lies

[1] Gk. Synt., p, 41.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 142.
[3] W.-Th., p. 242.

more in length of experience than of age. Deissmann (*B. S.*, p. 154 f.) finds in the papyri ὁ πρεσβύτερος ὁ κώμης, an official title. Pap. Lugd. A, 35 f. (Ptol. Per.). In Ac. 17:21 καινότερον means, of course, something newer than what they had recently heard. Socrates said to Hippocrates when he came in (Plato, *Protagoras* 309 C): μή τι νεώτερον ἀγγέλλεις; Then again, in Ac. 17:22, δεισιδαιμονεστέρους is more religious (or superstitious, as the case may be, a matter for exegesis. I prefer religious) than ordinary or than I had supposed. One does not need to deny the "elative" comparative sense of "very"[1] here and elsewhere. The elative comparative is still comparative. But Blass[2] denies even the elative comparative in a number of these examples. This is to a certain extent to surrender to translation the true interpretation of the Greek idiom. In Ac. 18:26 ἀκριβέστερον ἐξέθεντο teaches that Apollos received more accurate information than he had previously had. Cf. ἐξετασθήσεται περὶ τούτου ἀκριβέστερον, B.U. 388 (ii/A.D.). Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p. 439. So in Ac. 24:22 ἀκριβέστερον εἰδώς means that Felix more accurately than one would suppose, and in verse 26 πυκνότερον shows that he sent for Paul more frequently than he had been doing before. Ac. 25:10 κάλλιον ἐπιγινώσκεις is an interesting example. Paul hints that Festus knows his innocence better than he is willing to admit. Cf. βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις (2 Tim. 1:18), 'better- than I.' **Β**ελτίων occurs in the papyri as adjective, though not in the N. T. Thus one could go through all the rather numerous examples of elative comparative adjectives and adverbs in the N. T. and show that with proper attention to the context the point of (comparison appears plainly enough. The comparative even without the expressed object of comparison is not just the positive. So in Ac. 27:13 ἆσσον παρελέγοντο clearly means 'nearer than they could do before' (cf. παραλεγόμενοι in verse 8). Again in Jo. 4:52 κομψότερον ἔσχεν (note the construction) is 'better than before the word of Christ was spoken.' As further illustrations, not to overdo the point, note μᾶλλον in 2 Cor. 7:7 (cf. Ph. 1:12), σπουδαιότερος in 2 Cor. 8:17 (cf. 2 Tim. 1:17) and σπουδαιοτέρως in Ph. 2:28 (cf. 1 Th. 2:17), τολμηροτέρως (Ro. 15: 15), μείζονες (2 Pet. 2:11), κατώτερα in Eph. 4:9. The common expression οἱ πλείους (Ac. 19:32), and τοὺς πλείονας (1 Cor. 9:19) for 'the majority' should occasion no difficulty. In free translation one may sometimes use 'very' or 'rather,' but this is

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 236. He notes some "elative comparatives" in D, in AC. 4:16 φανερότερον, 10:28 βέλτιον.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 142.

merely the resultant idea. Cf. ἑτέροις λόγοις πλείοσιν (Ac. 2:40). The older Greek shows this idiom.[1]

(f) FOLLOWED BY ἤ. This ἤ is merely the disjunctive conjunction. But ἤ is not common in the N. T. in this connection. Indeed Blass[2] considers that it does not occur where any other construction would be perfectly clear. As is well known in the ancient Greek, ἤ is not common after πλείων and ἐλάττων with numerals. This use of the comparative as a mere parenthesis is in the papyri. Cf. Moulton. *C1. Rev*., 1901, p. 438. O.P. 274 (i/A.D.) πλείω πήχεις ἐννέα. Cf. Schwab, *Hist. Syntax,* Heft ii, pp. 84 ff. Cf. also ἐπάνω in Mk. 14:5 and 1 Cor. 15:6, where it has no effect on the construction. In Mt. 5:20 there is an ellipsis (πλεῖον τῶν Φαρ.), 'than that of the Pharisees.' So in Mt. 26:53 πλείω δώδεκα λεγιῶνας occurs with no change in the case of λεγιῶνας. In Ac. 4:22; 23:13; 24:11 likewise ἤ is absent without change of case. So in Ac. 25:6 οὐ πλείους ὀκτὼ ἢ δέκα, for ἤ here does not go with πλείους. But in Lu. 9:13 we do find οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ ἄρτοι πέντε. And in 1 Tim. 5:9 the ablative construction occurs. In justification of Blass' point[3] above, he points out that with two adjectives we have ἤ (2 Tim. 3:4); with a conjunction, as ἐγγύτερον ἢ ὅτε (Ro. 13:11); with an infinitive, εὐκοπώτερον εἰσελθεῖν ἤ (εἰσελθεῖν to be repeated, Mt. 19:24. Cf. Ac. 20:35); with a genitive (same form as the ablative would be if ἤ were absent), like ὑμῶν ἀκούειν μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ (Ac. 4:19); with a dative, like ἀνεκτότερον γῇ Σοδόμων ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ (Mt. 10 : 15). These are all pertinent and striking examples. There remain others (against Blass' view) which are not so justified, like πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ ἢ Ἰωάνης (Jo. 4:1), ἠγάπησαν μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς (Jo. 3:19), etc. But it remains true that ἤ is becoming rare in this usage in the N. T.

(g) FOLLOWED BY THE ABLATIVE. The ablative is the most common means of expressing the standard of the comparison: so we must take the case, and not as genitive. As remarked in the chapter on the cases, this ablative construction seems rather more common in the N. T. than in the papyri. It is found in Homer.[4] In the old Sanskrit the ablative was found with comparatives,[5] though occasionally the locative or the instrumental appeared.

[1] Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft ii, p. 178; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 143.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 107 f.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 316, sustains him.
[4] Monro, Hom., dr., p. 109.
[5] Ziemer, Vergi. der Indoger. Comp., 1884, pp. 29 ff.

Indeed the various constructions after the comparative (particle like ἤ, case, preposition) occur in the other Indo-Germanic languages.[1] Schwab[2] estimates that in Attic prose the ablative after the comparative stands in relation to ἤ as 5.5 to 1 and in poetry 18 to 1. Blass[3] thinks that in the κοινή the ablative is three times as common in this idiom as in Attic prose. So in the N. T. this is the usual construction after the comparative. As further examples observe μείζων τούτων (Mk. 12:31), μείζων τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (Jo. 4:12), πλέον τούτων (Jo. 21:15), σοφώτερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων (1 Cor. 1:25), etc. Cf. 1 Jo. 3:20; Heb. 7:26. Sometimes the comparison is a little complicated, as in Mt. 5:20, ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων, where 'righteousness' is dropped in the second member. Note πλεῖον as a fixed or stereotyped form.[4] Cf. also Jo. 5:36. In Mt. 21:36, ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώτων, note the use of comparative and superlative side by side.

(h) FOLLOWED BY PREPOSITIONS. Prepositions occur not infrequently after the comparative. We have already seen the positive so used with παρά, and πρός. Wellhausen[5] considers this positive use like the Aramaic. In the classical Greek we see beginnings of this usage.[6] In the modern Greek, the normal[7] way of expressing comparison is to use afro with the accusative and occasionally παρά with the nominative. The examples of the use of παρὰ chiefly in Luke and Hebrews. Thus Lu. 3:13, μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν; Heb. 1:4, διαφορώτερον παρ᾽ αὐτούς 3:3, πλείονος δόξης παρὰ Μωυσῆν; 9:23, κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. So Heb. 11:4; 12:24. Examples of ὑπέρ in this sense occur likewise in Lu. 16:8, φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺ υἱούς; Heb. 4:12, τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν. In the LXX[8] comparison was usually completed by means of παρά or ὑπέρ.

(i) THE COMPARATIVE DISPLACING THE SUPERLATIVE. This increase of the comparative in contrast to the corresponding decrease of the superlative is one of the most striking peculiarities of the adjective in the κοινή. Indeed one may broadly say with Blass,[9] that in the κοινή vernacular the comparative with the article takes

[1] Ib., p. 1. [2] Hist. Synt. etc., Heft ii, p. 92.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 329. The abl. is sometimes used with personal pronouns after the comp. in mod. Gk. (Thumb, p. 76). [4] Blass, ib., p. 108.

[5] Einl. in die drei ersten Evang., p. 28. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 236.

[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 108. [7] Thumb, Handb., p. 75 f.

[8] C. and S., Sel., pp. 84 ff. For various prepositions so used in older Gk. see Schwab., Hist. Synt., Heft i, pp. 45 ff.

[9] Hermeneutik and Kritik, p. 199.

over the peculiar functions of the superlative. In the modern Greek vernacular the comparative with the definite article is the only idiom employed for the true superlative.[1] The form in —τατος in modern Greek is rare and always elative. Moulton[2] finds the papyri supporting this disappearance of the superlative form before the comparative to a certain extent. "It seems fair to conclude that (1) the superlative, apart from its elative use, was dying, though not dead; (2) the comparative had only sporadically begun to be used in its place."[3] He reminds us that the literary use had as much weight as the vulgar idiom. As a matter of fact the superlative form is not essentially necessary. The Armenian has no superlative and is like the vernacular modern Greek. The root-difference between the comparative and the superlative is that between "twoness" and "moreness." As the notion of duality vanished or was no longer stressed, the need for a distinction between the comparative and superlative vanished also. Both are in reality comparative in relation to the positive.[4] In the N. T. therefore we see this blurring of distinction between comparative and superlative. Cf. 1 Cor. 13:13 **μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη** where three things are compared. In English we say "greatest of these." Sir W. M. Ramsay gives **πάντων μεῖζον** in a Christian inscription.[5] In Mt. 18:1 we have **τίς ἄρα μεῖζων**, etc. Cf. Mk. 9:34. So in Mt. 11:11 (cf. Lu. 9:48) note **ὁ δὲ μικρότερος** (but note also **μείζων αὐτοῦ**). In Lu. 7:42 f., **πλεῖον** and **τὸ πλεῖον** do indeed refer to the two debtors (verse 41), though it is questionable if that fine point is here insisted on. But in 1 Cor. 12:23 the comparatives have their usual force. Moulton[6] cites from O.P. 716 (ii/A.D.) **τὴν ἀμείνονα αἵρεσιν διδόντι**, 'to the highest bidder.' Winer[7] indeed finds similar examples in Demosthenes and Athenagoras. Note the adverb **ὕστερον πάντων** (Mt. 22:27), obviously as superlative. So in 1 Tim. 4:1, **ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς**. In Eph. 4:9, **τὰ κατωτερα μέρη** is likewise in the superlative sense. The Epistle of Barnabas shows similar examples. Blass[8] reminds us that the Italian does not distinguish between the comparative and the superlative. The modern Greek- to-day says **ὁ σοφώτερος ἀπὸ ὅλους** 'the wisest of all.'[9]

[1] Thumb, Handb., p. 73.

[2] Prol., p. 78; Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 439; 1904, p. 154. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33.

[3] Ib., Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 439. Cf. Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft ii, pp. 172, 177.

[4] Ib., Heft i, pp. 17 ff.

[5] Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, II, p. 525.

[6] Prol., p. 78 f.

[7] W.-Th., p. 242.

[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33.

[9] Jebb, V. and D.'s Handb., p. 309.

Moulton[1] notes the fact that, while κρείττων and χείρων in the N. T. are strictly comparative, they have no superlative, but he notes (p. 236) that the papyri show χείριστος, as Tb.P. 72 (ii/B.c).

XIV. The Superlative Adjective (ὑπερθετικὸν ὄνομα). For the forms see chapter VII, II, 3, (c). As already set forth, the superlative is moreness rather than twoness.

(a) THE SUPERLATIVE VANISHING. As already remarked, the superlative forms are vanishing in the N. T. as in the κοινή generally. Blass[2] observes that ἔσχατος and πρῶτος are the only exceptions to this disappearing tendency. Under the weakening of dualism πρότερος goes down. Usually ἔσχατος refers to more than two, the last of a series or last of all, like ἐν ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, (Jo. 11: 24), ἔσχατον[3] πάντων (1 Cor. 15:8). Sometimes first and last are contrasted, like ἡ ἐσχάτη πλάνη χείρων τῆς πρώτης (Mt. 27:64). Note comparative also. Cf. Mt. 19:30. So ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσξατος about Jesus (Rev. 1:17). In the LXX ἔσχατος occurs as comparative (cf. in Deut. 24:3), and even as an adverb meaning 'after' in Deut. 31:29. Cf. Thackeray, p. 184. Even more common than ἔσχατος is πρῶτος. It is used in the usual sense often (Mk. 12:20), but is also common where only two are concerned (1 Cor. 15:45; Jo. 20:4) as already shown. Sometimes πρῶτος expresses mere rank as in Ac. 17:4. In Mt. 22:38 note ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή. Cf. πρώτη πάντων in Mk. 12:28 (note gender also).[4] These are true superlatives. Sir W. M. Ramsay (Expositor, Nov., 1912) shows that πρώτη in Lu. 2:2 is not in sense of πρότερος. It is first of a series of enrolments as we now know. But this proves nothing as to Ac. 1:1. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 60) quotes I *Gr.* XII, 5, 590, ἔφθασας ἀλάχου πρῶτος, where two are compared.

(b) A FEW TRUE SUPERLATIVES IN THE N. T. But a few other true superlatives survive in the N. T. Thus ὁ ἐλάχιστος in 1 Cor. 15:9 is a true superlative, 'the least.' But it is dative in Lu. 12:26. Cf. Mt. 2:6; 5:19. Moulton[5] finds ἐλάχιστος as a true superlative in a papyrus of second century B.C. Tb.P. 24. But there are very few true superlatives in the papyri.[6] In Ac. 17:15 ὡς τάχιστα is a true superlative. Ὕψιστος is a true super-

[1] Prol., p. 78. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 141 f.

[3] On this word cf. Gonnet, Degres de signif. en Grec et en Lat., 1876, p. 131.

[4] On πρῶτος in older Gk. for not more than two see Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft ii, p. 175. [5] Prol., p. 79.

[6] Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 439; 1904, p. 154. See τὴν ἐσομένην πλείστην τιμήν, Tb.P. 105 (ii/B.C.).

lative both when applied to God, **τοῦ ὑψίστου** (Mk. 5:7), and the abode of God, **ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις** (Mt. 21:9). Some MSS. (D, etc., W. H. marg.) have **ἔγγιστα** in Mk. 6:36, which is a true superlative. In Ac. 20:38 **μάλιστα**, 'most of all,' is probably a true superlative. In 1 Cor. 14:27 **τὸ πλεῖστον**, 'at the most,' is a true superlative. In Mt. 11:20 **αἱ πλεῖστον δυνάμεις** we probably have the true superlative. Cf. **τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει** (Ju. 20) and **τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν** (Ac. 26:5), true superlatives in **--τατος**. In Rev. 18:12; 21:11 **τιμιώτατος** is probably elative. Cf. **μονώτατος**, 1 Ki. 8:39. The list is indeed very small.

(c) THE ELATIVE SUPERLATIVE. In the sense of 'very' or 'exceedingly' it comprises the great majority of the superlative forms that survive in the N. T.[1] In the papyri the immense majority of superlative forms are dative. Cf. Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p. 439. **Κράτιστος** is dative always in the N. T. and is indeed merely a sort of title.[2] So **κράτιστε** in Lu. 1:3. So **ἥδιστα** is only elative (2 Cor. 12:9, 15). **Μέγιστος** occurs only once (2 Pet. 1:4) and is dative, **τὰ τίμια καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῖν ἐπαγγέλματα** (*permagnus*, Blass). In Lu. 12:26 **ἐλάχιστον** is elative as also in 1 Cor. 4:3; 6:2, while in Eph. 3:8 the comparative superlative **ἐλαχιστότερος** is doubtful.[3] **Πλεῖστος**, generally dative in the papyri,[4] is so in Mk. 4:1, **ὄχλος πλεῖστος. Μάλιστα** occurs some 12 times and is usually elative, as in Ph. 4:22.

(d) No DOUBLE SUPERLATIVES. The scarcity of the superlative in the N. T. removes any ground for surprise that no double superlatives occur. In Eph. 3:8 **ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ** is indeed a superlative strengthened by the comparative. In Gal. 6:10 the elative superlative **μάλιστα** occurs by way of repetition with **τὸ ἀγαθόν**, as in Phil. 16 it does with **ἀγαπητόν**. Schwab[5] gives a considerable list of double or strengthened superlatives from classic writers, like **πλεῖστον ἥδιστος** (Eurip., *Alc.*), **μέγιστον ἔχθιστος** (Eurip., *Med.*), **μάλιστα φίλτατος** (Eurip., *Hippol.*), **μάλιστα δεινότατος** (Thuc.), etc. Cf. Latin *minimissimus* and English "most straitest sect," "most unkindest cut of all," etc.

(e) FOLLOWED BY ABLATIVE. The superlative, like the comparative, may be followed by the ablative.[6] Thus with **πρῶτον** (Jo. 15:18), **πρῶτός μου** (Jo. 1:15), and possibly in **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου**

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 33. Blass considers **τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ** (Ju. 20) elative.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 78.

[3] Ib., p. 236.

[4] Ib., p. 79.

[5] Schwab, Hist. Synt. etc., Heft iii, pp. 70 ff.

[6] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., pp. 11 ff.

τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων (Heb. 1:2), though this passage may be merely the genitive.

(f) No "HEBRAISTIC" SUPERLATIVE. It is gratuitous to consider ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ (Ac. 7:20) and similar passages superlatives.

XV. Numerals. For thel general discussion of the forms see chapter VII, III. The ordinals are indeed adjectives, as are the first four cardinals and all 'after two hundred. The syntactical peculiarities of the numerals are not many.

(a) **Εἷς** AND **Πρῶτος**. The use of εἷς rather than πρῶτος is one of the most striking points to observe. Before we can agree with Blass[1] that this is "undoubtedly a Hebrew idiom," who follows Winer,[2] we must at least hear what Moulton[3] has to say in reply. To begin with, in modern Greek "the cardinals beyond 4 have ousted the ordinals entirely."[4] Then we learn from the inscriptions that this usage of cardinals as ordinals is as old as the Byzantine Greek.[5] Moulton[6] also quotes from papyri of the second and third centuries A.D. τῇ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι, B.U. 623 (ii/iii A.D.), a construction like μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός in Haggai 2:1.[7] The Germans, like the English, can say "page forty,"[8] In the N. T. we only find this substitution of the cardinal in the case of εἷς, while in the modern Greek the matter has gone much further. In the classic Greek no real analogy exists, though εἷς stands in enumerations when δεύτερος or ἄλλος follows, and in compound numerals a closer parallel is found, like εἷς καὶ τριακοστός, though even here the case is essentially different.[9] Cf. Latin *unus et vicesimus*, "a case of the formation of the ordinal being imperfectly carried out."[9] Certainly then it was possible for this development to have gone on apart from the Hebrew, especially when one considers that πρῶτος is not derived from εἷς, though Moulton[10] admits that the Hebrew has the same peculiarity. Moulton[11] further objects that if Semitic influence had been at work we should have had τῇ πέντε in the modern Greek, since the Hebrew used the later days of the month in cardinal numbers.[12] Still, the striking fact remains that in the LXX (cf. Numb. 1:1) and in the N. T. the first day of the month is expressed by μία, not by πρώτη. This was obviously in harmony with the κοινή of a later time, but the first evidence of its actual

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.
[2] W.-Th., p. 248 f.
[3] Prol., p. 95 f.
[4] Ib. Cf. Thumb, Handb., etc., p. 82.
[5] Dieterich, -linters. etc., p. 18711.
[6] Prol., p. 96.
[7] C. and S., Sel., p. 31.
[8] W.-Th., p. 249.
[9] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.
[10] Prol., p. 96.
[11] Ib.
[12] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.

(d) THE DISTRIBUTIVES. There is no trouble over the classic use of ἀνά (Mt. 20:9) and κατά (Mk. 6:40) in this sense. We have already (chapter XIII, ἀνά and κατά) discussed ἀνὰ εἷς (Rev. 21:21) and καθ᾽ εἷς (Ro. 12:5). The point here that calls for comment is whether δύο δύο in Mk. 6:7 is a Hebraism. Cf. ἀνὰ δύο [δύο] in Lu. 10:1. Winer[1] termed it "properly Hebraistic," while Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 145) more guardedly described it as "after the Semitic and more colloquial manner." The repetition of the numeral is a Hebrew way of expressing the distributive idea. Cf. in the N. T. also συμπρόσια συμπόσια (Mk. 6:39), πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ (verse 40). Moulton[2] cites also δεσμὰς δεσμάς, as the reading of Epiphanius for Mt. 13:30. But Winer[3] had himself cited AEschylus, *Persae*, 981, μυρία μυρία, and Blass[4] compares in *Eris*, the lost drama of Sophocles, μίαν μίαν. The Atticists had censured this as "colloquial," but at any rate "it was not merely a creation of Jewish Greek." Deissmann[5] besides quotes τρία τρία from the Oxy. Papyri. W. F. Moulton[6] had already called attention to the fact that modern Greek shows the same usage. Hence we must conclude, with Moulton[7] and Thumb,[8] that the κοινή development was independent of the Hebrew. Moulton[9] comments also on the reading of B in Lu. 10:1, ἀνὰ δύο δύο, and notes how in the papyri μεγάλου μεγάλου = the elative superlative μεγίστου. See also κατὰ δύο δύο in P. Oxy. 886 (iii/A.D.).

For the proportionals the N. T. has only –πλασίων, not the classic –πλάσιος. Cf. ἑκατονταπλασίων, Mk. 10:30 and Mt. 19:29 ℵCDX; πολλαπλασίων, Lu. 18:30 and Mt. 19:29 BL. Cf. Blass-Debrunner, p. 38.

(e) THE CARDINAL ῾Επτά. With ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά (Mt. 18:22) rather than ἑπτάκις D the rendering 'until seventy times seven' is certainly possible in itself and follows literally the Greek words. The identical expression (ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά) occurs in Gen. 4:24 (where the Revised Version renders it ‘seventy and seven fold’) and in Test. xii, Pat. Ben. 7:4. The margin of the Revised Version for Mt. 18:22 gives "seventy times and seven" which

[1] W.-M., p. 312.
[2] Prol., p. 97.
[3] W.-Th., p. 249; W.-M., p. 312.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 330.
[5] Theol. Literaturzeit., 1898, p. 631.
[5] W.-M., p. 312 note. Cf. Jebb in V. and D.'s Handb., p. 310. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 57) cites σφόδρα σφόδρα from the LXX and εὐθὺς εὐθύς from the Byz. Gk.
[7] Prol., p. 97.
[8] Hellen., p. 128.
[9] Prol., p. 97. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 330, cites from Gosp. of Pet. 35, ἀνὰ δύο δύο.

Winer[1] interprets as "seventy-seven times." Moulton[2] considers rightly that the passage in Genesis settles the usage in Matthew to which an allusion may be made. He cites a possible parallel from the Iliad, xxii, 349, δεκάκις [τε] καὶ *F*είκοσι.

(f) SUBSTANTIVE NOT EXPRESSED. Sometimes with numerals the substantive for money is not expressed. Thus ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε (Ac. 19:19), but in Mt. 26:16 note ἀργύρια. The use of τρίτον τοῦτο (2 Cor. 13:1) is merely an instance of the adjective used absolutely without a substantive. Cf. the neuter τὸ δεύτερον (2 Cor. 13:2).

(g) ADVERBS WITH NUMERALS. They have no effect on the construction. Thus πραθῆναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων (Mk. 14:5), ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς (1 Cor. 15:6), ὡς δισχίλιοι (Mk. 5:13), ὡσεὶ πεντκισχίλιοι (Mt. 14:21), ἑκατονταετής που (Ro. 4:19). In the case of ὡς and ὡσεί we really have conjunctions.[3] In ἕως ἑπτάκις (Mt. 18:21) we have, of course, the preposition. Cf. Winer-Moulton, p. 313, for classical parallels with ἔλαττον, πλέον εἰς, ἐν, περί, ὑπέρ, μέχρι.

(h) **Εἷς** AS INDEFINITE ARTICLE. The Greek, as a rule, had no indefinite article. The older Greek did occasionally use τις with no more apparent force than an indefinite article, but usually nothing was used for that idea in Greek. Still in Aristophanes (Av. 1292) Moulton[4] rightly sees εἷς κάπηλος, as an example of the later κοινή idiom. Aristophanes indeed preserves much of the colloquial speech. In the modern Greek ἕνας may be used.[5] **Εἷς** became naturally more popular than ἕνας since it has all three genders.[6] Moulton[7] finds numerous papyri illustrations. The modern languages have followed the Greek model here, for the English *an* (Scottish *ane*) is really *one*, like the German *ein* and the French *un*. It is therefore hardly necessary to fall back on the Hebrew precedents in the use of אֶחָד, though it here coincided with the κοινή idiom. Hence N. T. usage on this point is in full accord with the development of the Greek. Cf. εἷς γραμματεύς (Mt. 8:19), μία παιδίσκη (26:69), μία χήρα πτωχή (Mk. 12:42), εἷς ὀφειλέτης (Mt. 18:24), etc. In Jo. 6:9 some MSS. have ἕν with παιδάριον, but the sense is not materially altered either way. Cf. ἤκουσα ἑνὸς ἀετοῦ (Rev. 8:13), ἰδὼν συκῆν μίαν (Mt. 21:19), etc.

[1] W.-Th., p. 251.
[2] Prol., p. 98. Cf. W.-M., p. 314.
[3] Cf. Green, Handb., etc., p. 276.
[4] Prol., p. 97.
[5] Thumb, Handb., p. 81.
[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 170.
[7] Prol., p. 97. Cf. Wellhausen, End., p. 27.
[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 144.

Moulton[1] properly criticizs Meyer on Mt. 8:19 for his "exegetical subtleties" in denying this idiom for εἷς in the N. T.

(i) **Εἷς= Τις**. Sometimes indeed εἷς stands alone with practically the same sense as τις, as in Mt. 19:16; Mk. 10:17, though in the parallel passage (Lu.18:18) τις ἄρχων occurs. The use of εἷς with genitive (or ablative), like ἑνὶ τῶν πολιτῶν (Lu. 15:15), ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν (Lu. 8:22), or the ablative, like εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν (Jo. 13:21), is, of course, merely the same idiom expanded. Cf. εἷς τις Lu. 22:50; Jo. 11:49. In Mk. 14:10, ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, the article at first looks incongruous, 'the one of the twelve,' but the early papyri give illustrations of this usage also.[2] It is as a pronoun that εἷς is to be construed here and in the rather frequent alternative expressions εἷς — εἷς (Mt. 24:40), μία—μία (verse 41), τὸν ἕνα --τὸν ἕτερον (Mt. 6:24), ἑνὸς –τοῦ ἑτέρου (ib.), εἷς—τοῦ ἑνός. (1 Cor. 4:6). Cf. εἷς καὶ εἷς (Mt. 27:38) and the reciprocal use in 1 Th. 5:11. Cf. εἷς ἕκαστος, Mt. 26:22.

(j) THE DISTRIBUTIVE USE OF **Εἷς**. So ἓν καθ᾽ ἕν in Rev. 4:8 and the "barbaric" (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 247) εἷς κατὰ εἷς (Mk. 14:19), τὸ καθ᾽ εἷς (Ro. 12:5), ἀνά εἷς ἕκαστος (Rev. 21:21). This "barbaric" idiom came to be very common in the later Greek. Cf. modern Greek κάθε, καθένας=ἕκαστος. The free adverbial use of prepositions like ἕως, ἀνά, παρά, κατά is copiously illustrated in Winer-Schmiedel, p. 247, from the LXX and the late Greek writers. For the use of οὐδείς, οὐθείς, μηδείς, μηθείς see next chapter on Pronouns. Cf. also there οὐ—πᾶς and πᾶς –οὐ.

[1] Prol., p. 95. [2] Ib.

CHAPTER XV

PRONOUNS (**ἀΝΤΩΝΥΜΙΑΙ**)

For the antiquity and history of pronouns see iv in chapter VII (Declensions). We are here concerned, not with the form, but with the use of pronouns.[1] As a matter of fact all pronouns fall into two classes, Deictic (δεικτικαί) and Anaphoric (ἀναφορικαί). They either "point out" or they "refer to" a substantive. So we get the modern terms, demonstrative and relative (cf. Monro, *Homeric Gr.*, p.i 168 f.). But some pronouns may be demonstrative or relative according to the context. The demonstrative or deictic was the original usage. For practical purposes we have to follow a more minute division.

I. Personal Pronouns (πρωτότυποι ἢ προσωπικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι). The personal pronouns (first and second persons) are deictic (I, thou). The reason for the use of pronouns, as already explained, was to avoid the repetition of the substantive. In Jo. 11:22 note the repetition of θεός. Cf. also Lu. 6:45.

(a) THE NOMINATIVE. As already explained, the verb uses the personal pronoun as personal suffixes, so that as a rule no need was felt for the separate expression of the pronoun in the nominative. All verbs had the personal endings like **εἰ-μί, ἐσ-σί, ἐσ-τί**. The use of the personal pronoun in addition to the personal ending of the verb Was due to desire for emphasis. Then the separate expression of the pronoun led to the gradual sloughing off of the personal ending. In modern English this process is nearly complete. In Greek this process was arrested, though in modern Greek all verbs εἶναι are --ω verbs. In most cases, therefore, in Greek the existence of the personal pronoun in the nominative implies some emphasis or contrast. But this is not quite true of all examples. "The emphasis of the first and second persons is not to be insisted on too much in poetry or in familiar prose.

[1] Cf. Schoemann, Die Lehre von den Redet. nach den Alten, p. 95: "Die Nomina benenrien die Dinge nach ihren Qualitaten, die Pronomina bezeichnen sie nach ihren Verhaltnissen."

Notice the frequency of **ἐγῷδα, ἐγῷμαι**."[1] In conversation it was particularly common to have the personal pronoun in the nominative. In the later Greek generally the personal pronouns show a weakening of force,[2] but never to the actual obliteration of emphasis, not even in the Modern Greek.[3] Moulton[4] agrees with Ebeling[5] that there was "no necessary emphasis in the Platonic **ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἔφην ἐγώ, ὡς σὺ φής**." Clearly then the frequency of the pronoun in the N. T. is not to be attributed to the Semitic influence. Even Conybeare and Stock[6] see that it is not necessary to appeal to the well-known Hebrew fondness for pronouns for this usage. But Blass[7] thinks that some of the MS. variations may be due to Semitic influence. We are free therefore to approach the N. T. examples on their merits.[8]

1. The First Person, **ἐγώ** *and* **ἡμεῖς**. It is easy to find in the N.T. numerous examples where **ἐγώ** shows contrast. So **ἐγὼ χρείαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι** (Mt. 3:14), **ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω** (5:22), **ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα** (Jo. 17:4). Cf. **ἐγώ** and **σύ** in Jo. 17:23. The amount of emphasis will vary very greatly according to circumstances and may sometimes vanish entirely so far as we can determine. Different shades of meaning appear also as in **ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον** (Jo. 1:30), 'I, myself.' Cf. **κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν** (Jo. 1:33) and **κἀγὼ ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα** (verse 34) and note absence with second verb. Cf. Jo. 6:48; 16:33; 1 Cor. 2:1, 3. Note absence of **ἐγώ** in Mt. 5:18, 20, **λέγω ὑμῖν**. Cf. also **τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ**; (2 Cor. 11:29) with **τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι**; (*ib.*) as proof that the point must not be pressed too far in either direction.[9] Further examples of **ἐγώ** may be seen in Ro. 7:17; Jo. 5:31, 34; 10:30; Eph. 5:32; Ph. 4:11. For the plural **ἡμεῖς** see **ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν** (Jo. 4:22) in opposition to **ὑμεῖς**, but then follows merely **ὃ οἴδαμεν**. So in Ac. 4:20 note **οὐ δυνάμεθα ἡμεῖς ἃ εἴδαμεν** and **τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν**; (1 Cor. 15:30). Cf. Mt. 6:12. The "editorial" 'we' has already received discussion (cf. The Sentence) and may be merely illustrated here. Blass[10] considers it a "wide-spread tendency among Greek writers, when they speak of themselves to say **ἡμεῖς** instead

[1] Gildersleeve, Synt. of Cl. Gk., part i, p. 35.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 348.
[3] Thumb, Handb., etc., p. 59 f.
[4] Prol., p. 85.
[5] Gildersleeve Studies, p. 240.
[6] Sel. from the LXX, p. 65.
[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 316.
[8] In general the N. T. follows the classic idiom. W.-Sch., p. 194.
[9] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 194.
[10] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 86 f., who leaves the matter to the exegete.

of ἐγώ." This is not always true in Paul's Epistles (Ro. 1:5), for sometimes he associates others with him in the address at the beginning. There are undoubted examples in the N. T. like οἷοί ἐσμεν (2 Cor. 10:11), πειθόμεθα (Heb. 13:18), γράφομεν (1 Jo. 1:4). But sometimes the plural merely associates the readers or hearers with the writer or speaker. So ἐφορέσαμεν (1 Cor. 15:49), ὁμοιώσωμεν, (Mk. 4:30). Sometimes the first person singular is used in a representative manner as one of a class (cf. the representative article like ὁ ἀγαθός). Blass[1] does not find this idiom so common in Greek as in other languages, but it occurs in Demosthenes and certainly in Paul. So τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; (Ro. 3:7). Cf. in next verse βλασφημούμεθα. See 1 Cor. 10:30; Gal. 2:18. In Ro. 7:7-25 special difficulties occur.

2. *The Second Person,* σύ *and* ὑμεῖς. Thus in Jo. 17:5 note the contrast in με σύ. Cf. Jo. 1:42 σὺ εἶ Σίμων—σὺ κληθήσῃ, 2:10 σὺ τετήρηκας, 4:9 πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος, 4:10 σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας, Ro. 2:3 ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ, Lu. 1:76 καὶ σὺ δέ etc. Cf. also Mt. 27:11. Sometimes σύ has a very emphatic position, as in σὺ τίς εἶ (Ro. 9:20; 14:4). In 1 Cor. 15:36, ἄφρων, σὺ ὃ σπείρεις, it is possible,[2] though not necessary, to take σύ with ἄφρων (cf. Ac. 1:24). In καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ (Lu. 22:58) one is reminded of the Latin *Et tu, Brute*. See Lu. 10:15; Ac. 23:3; ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς (Ro. 14:10). As examples of the plural take ἔσεσθε ὑμεῖς (Mt. 5:48), δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν (Mk. 6:37). See ἐκεῖνος and ὑμεῖς contrasted in Jo. 5:38; ὑμεῖς in verse 39 and also in 44 f. Cf. Ac. 4:7; Lu. 10:24, and in particular ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε (Mt. 27:24). For ὑμεῖς and ἡμεῖς contrasted see Jo. 4:22. In Jo. 4:35, οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε, we have the same inclusive use of the second person that we noticed in the first. In Ro. 2:3, 17, the second person singular occurs in the same representative sense that the first has also. Cf. also Ro. 9:20; 11:17, etc. In Jo. 3:10, σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, we have a case of distributed emphasis. Cf. also Mt. 16:16; Jo. 9:34; 2 Cor. 1:23, as examples of this sustained emphasis, where the emphasis of the pronoun passes on to the remainder of the sentence and contributes point and force to the whole.[3] On the whole the Greek language has freedom in the construction of the pronouns.[4] Moulton raises[5] the question if in σὺ εἶπας (Mt. 26:64), σὺ λέγεις (27:11), ὑμεῖς λέγετε (Lu. 22:70), we do not have the equivalent of 'That is right,'

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 316 f. [2] W.-Sch., p. 195.
[3] Renaud, The Distributed Emphasis of the Pers. Pron., 1884.
[4] Bernhardy, Wissensch. Synt. der griech. Spr., 1829, p. 45.
[5] Prol., p. 86.

but πλήν (Thayer) is against it in Mt. 26:64. **Σύ** occurs in John more frequently than in all the Synoptics put together (Abbott, *Johannine Gr*., p. 297).

3. *The Third Person.* It has had a more radical development or lack of development. As a matter of fact the Greek had and has no definite third personal pronoun for the nominative like **ἐγώ** and **σύ**. No nominative was as used for **οὗ, οἷ**, etc., and this pronoun was originally reflexive. Besides it is not used in the N. T., though literary **κοινή** writers like Aristides, Arrian, Lucian, Polybius use it.[1] Where another pronoun was desired for the third person besides that in the personal ending, various devices were used. The Attic writers usually employed a demonstrative (**ὁ δέ, ὁ μέν, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, ὃς δέ, ὅδε**, etc.). The N. T. shows examples of all these constructions which will be illustrated in the discussion of the demonstrative pronouns. But the N. T. uses also **αὐτός** as the subject, an idiom foreign to Attic writers, but found already in Homer[2] and common in the modern Greek, where indeed it has come to be itself a demonstrazive.[3] Simcox[4] rightly remarks that the main point to observe is not whether it has emphasis, but its appearance at all as the mere subject. All the personal pronouns in the nominative have more or less emphasis. The use of **αὐτός** in contrast with other persons is natural like **αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ** (Mk. 2:25). We are not here considering the intensive use of **αὐτός** as 'self' nor the use of **ὁ αὐτός** 'the same.' There is no dispute as to use of **αὐτός** as emphatic 'he' in the N. T. like the Pythogorean[5] (Doric) **αὐτὸς ἔφα**. So Ac. 20:35 **αὐτὸς εἶπεν**, as much as to say 'The Master said.' Cf. the way in which some wives refer systematically to their husbands as "He." Other undoubted examples are **αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν** (Mt. 1:21). Here the emphasis is so clear that the Revised Version renders: "For he it is that shall save." In Mt. 12:50 **αὐτός μου ἀδελφός** is resumptive, gathering up **ὅστις**, and is distinctly emphatic. Cf. likewise **αὐτὸς βαπτίσει**, referring to **ὁ ἐρχόμενος** in Mt. 3:11; **ὁ τηρῶν—καὶ αὐτός**, 1 Jo. 3:24; **ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν**, Mk. 14:44. Strong emphasis also appears in examples like; **καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν πρὸ πάντων** (Col. 1:17). In Mt. 8:24 **αὐτὸς δέ** and Mk. 4:38 **καὶ αὐτός** Jesus is the chief person in the story and the pronoun has emphasis. Cf. likewise Lu. 1:16, 17; 24:21; Mt. 16:20. In Lu. 19:2 W. H. and Nestle

[1] W.-Sch., p. 191. [2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 164.
[3] Thumb, Handb., p. 90.
[4] Lang. of the N. T., p. 60. Cf. C. and S., Sel. from LXX, p. 29.
[5] Prol., p. 86.

follow B in reading καὶ αὐτός twice. Some emphasis is present both times. In Ac. 7:21 (Rec.) the pronoun αὐτόν appears three times. As regards καὶ αὐτή, the editors differ between this accent and καὶ αὕτη in Lu. 7:12; 8:42; 1 Cor. 7:12; Ro. 7:10. In Lu. 2:37; Ro. 16:2, Nestle agrees with W. H. in καὶ αὐτή. But in Lu. 2:37 αὐτὴ χήρα may be a 'widow by herself.'[1] There is no real reason for objecting to the feminine use of this idiom. The plural αὐτοί, appears in Mk. 7:36; Lu. 2:50; 9:36. The only remaining question is whether αὐτός occurs in the nominative free from any emphasis just like the personal ending in a word. It is in Luke's Gospel and the Apocalypse[2] that such instances occur. It is not a question whether αὐτός is so used in ancient Greek. Winer[3] denies that any decisive passages have been adduced in the N. T. of such unemphatic use. Certainly the matter is one of tone and subjective impression to a large extent. And yet some examples do occur where emphasis is not easily discernible and even where emphasis would throw the sentence out of relation with the context. What emphasis exists must be very slight. Cf. Lu. 1:22; 2:50; 6:8; 8:1, 22; 15:14; 24:14, 25, 31; Rev. 14:10; 19:15. Thus we see all grades of emphasis. Abbott[4] holds that in John αὐτός never means 'he,' either emphatic or unemphatic, but always 'himself.' But in Jo. 2:12 (αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μητὴρ αὐτοῦ) there is little difference between the emphatic 'he' and 'himself.' Cf. also 18:1. But the intensive idea is clear in Jo. 4:2, 12. In 4:53 it might be either way. In the LXX we find αὐτός sometimes unemphatic. Cf. Gen. 3: 15 f.; 1 Sam. 17:42; 18:16.

(b) THE OBLIQUE CASES OF THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

1. *Originally Reflexive*. In pre-Homeric times the pronominal stem was reflexive.[5] The reflexive form, as distinct from the personal pronoun, was a later development. The personal pronouns may be reflexive in Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, Pindar and the other Lyric poets.[6] Indeed, the early Attic inscriptions[7] show the same thing, not to mention the Dramatic poets and Herodotus.[8] It was only gradually that the distinctively reflexive form came into common use in the Attic prose, first for the third person, and

[1] W.-Sch., p. 195; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 164.
[2] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 61.
[3] W.-M., p. 187. [4] Joh. Gr., p. 279.
[5] Dyroff, Gesch. des Pron. Reflex., 1. Abt., p. 16.
[6] Ib., pp. 68, 75, 80 f.
[7] Ib., 2. Abt., p. 1 f. 8 Ib., 1. Abt., pp. 90 f., 126 f.

then for the first and second persons.[1] The use of the personal pronoun in the reflexive sense survived longest in the vernacular. It is not "abnormal" therefore to find in the N. T. (vernacular **κοινή**) the personal pronouns where a reflexive form might have been used. The N. T. does not here exactly represent Attic literary prose. Cf. **ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 9:23), **μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω** (Mk. 14:28; cf. Lu. 10:35), **βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ**, (Mt. 5:29). See Ro. 15:16, 19. It is not necessary to split hairs here as to whether the reflexive idea is present. It is in perfect harmony with the Greek history. Indeed English does not differ here from the Greek.

2. **Αὐτοῦ**. The use of **αυτοῦ** rather than **οὗ** and ***σφῶν*** is noticeable. As a matter of fact, however, **αὐτοῦ** had long been the main pronoun for the oblique cases of the third person. In archaic and poetic forms the early use of **οὗ** and ***σφῶν*** survived.[2] In the N. T. **αὐτοῦ**, is the only form found, as in **αὐτῷ, αὐτοῖς, αὐτόν** (Mt. 17:22 f.), **κτλ**.

3. *Genitive for Possession*. The genitive of the personal pronoun is very common as a possessive rather than the possessive pronoun or the mere article. In Jo. 2:12 **αὐτοῦ** occurs twice, but once (**οἱ ἀδελφοί**) we do not have it. These examples are so common as to call for mere mention, as **ὁ πατήρ μου** (Jo. 5:17), **τὸν κράβαττόν σου** (5:8), **τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ** (5:9). The presence of the personal pronoun in the genitive is not always emphatic. Thus no undue emphasis is to be put upon **αὐτοῦ** even in its unusual position in Jo. 9:6, nor upon **σου** in 9:10, nor upon **μου** in 9:15. See chapter on The Sentence. See also **ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 6:20), **ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν** (Lu. 21: 19). See also position of you in Mt. 8:8 and Jo. 11:32. As a matter of fact the genitive of personal pronouns, as is common in the **κοινή** (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 40 f.), has nearly driven the possessive pronoun out. The use of the article with this genitive will be discussed in that chapter (The Article). Cf. **τὸν πατέρα μου** (Mt. 26: 53) and **φίλοι μου** (Jo. 15:14). Both **ὑμῶν** in Paul (1 Cor. 9:12) and **αὐτοῦ**, (Tit. 3:5) may be in the attributive position. The position of **αὐτοῦ** is emphatic in Eph. 2:10 as is that of **ὑμῶν**, in 1 Cor. 9:11 and **ἡμῶν** in Jo. 11:48. The attributive position of **ἡμῶν** (2 Cor. 4:16) and **αὐτοῦ** with other attributes (Mt. 27:60) is not unusual.

4. *Enclitic Forms*. The first and second persons singular have enclitic and unenclitic forms which serve to mark distinctions of emphasis in a general way. We may be sure that when the long

[1] Ib., 2. Abt., pp. 69, 89.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 152.

form ἐμοῦ occurs some slight emphasis is meant, as in ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ (Rom. 1:12). But we cannot feel sure that all emphasis is absent when the short form is used. Thus οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (Mt. 16:18), πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου (11:27). With prepositions (the "true" ones) the long form is used as in ancient Greek except with πρός, which uniformly has με even where emphasis is obvious.[1] Thus δεῦτε πρός με (Mt. 11:28), καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρός με (3:14). Some editors here and in the LXX print πρὸς μέ. But in Jo. 6:37 πρὸς ἐμέ is the true text. Cf. πρὸς ἐμέ also in P.Tb. 421 (iii/A.D.). With σοῦ the only difference is one of accent and we have to depend on the judgment of the editor. It is difficult, if not impossible, to lay down any fundamental distinction on this point. On σου and σοῦ see chapter VII, iv, 4, (a). See also ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι (Mt. 11:25) and κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω (16:18). Cf. ἐγώ σε (Jo. 17:4) and με σύ (17:5). Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 168) says that ἐμοῦ and σοῦ, the emphatic forms, occur only with other genitives like αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ (Ro. 16:13). Simcox (*Language of the N. T.*, p. 55) argues that the enclitic form occurs always except when there is emphasis. But the trouble is that the enclitic form seems to occur even where there is emphasis. The genitive of the third person can be used with emphasis. Cf. αὐτῶν in Lu. 24:31. See further chapter VII, v, 4.

(c) THE FREQUENCY OF THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS. It is at bottom a differentiation from the substantive, though the roots are independent of verb and substantive and antedate historical evidence.[2] This pronoun came into play where the sense required it. Thus καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν (Ac. 13:3). Cf. Mk. 6:5. There is no doubt of the fact that the N. T. uses the pronoun in the oblique cases more frequently than is true of the older Greek.[3] What is the explanation of this fact? The Hebrew pronominal suffixes at once occur to one as the explanation of the situation and Blass accepts it.[4] The LXX shows a similar "lavish use of pronouns."[5] But a glance at the modern Greek reveals the same fondness for pronouns, and the papyri abundantly prove that the usage belongs to the vernacular κοινή.[6] Cf. ἀνύγω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου Par.P. 51 (ii/B.C.), Λάμπωνι μυοθηρευτῇ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ O.P. 299 (i/A.D.). Thumb[7] suggests that this abundance of pro-

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 165.
[2] Wundt, Volkerpsych., 1. Bd., 2. Ti., 1904, p. 47.
[3] Cf. W.-Th., p. 143; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 164.
[4] Cf. also Simcox, Lang., etc., p. 53.
[5] C. and S., Sel., etc., p. 65.
[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 84 f.
[7] Hellen., p. 108 f.

nouns is natural in the vernacular. Blass[1] finds "a quite peculiar and tiresome frequency" of the pronoun in the N. T. This is only true in comparison with literary Attic. The N. T. is here a natural expression of the vernacular. Thus in Lu. 6:20 note **αὐτοῦ** twice, **ὑμῶν** twice in Lu. 21:19, **σου** in Mt. 6:17 as the reflexive twice (**ἄλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου νίψαι**). It is not necessary to go as far as Moulton does and deny that there is any Semitic influence in the N. T. on this point. It was here in harmony with the current Greek. Cf. Lu. 24:50 for three examples of **αὐτοῦ** (**-ούς**). Cf. **σε—σε** in Jo. 1:48. For **αὐτό**= 'it' see Ro. 7: 20. In Lu. 1:62 **αὐτό** and **αυτοῦ** both refer to **παιδίον**.

(d) REDUNDANT. The pronoun, was sometimes redundant. This was also a Hebrew idiom, but the vernacular **κοινή** shows similar examples. The two streams flow together as above. With participles note **τῷ θέλοντι—ἄφες αὐτῷ** (Mt. 5:40), **καταβάντος αὐτοῦ –ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ** (8:1), **ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ** (8:23). There are besides the anacolutha like **ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν—δώσω αὐτῷ** (Rev. 2:26). Cf. also **τὸ ποτήριον—οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό** (Jo. 18:11) which does not differ radically from the other examples.[2] Cf. also the redundant personal pronoun with the relative like the Hebrew idiom with the indeclinable **אֲשֶׁר** **οὗ--αὐτοῦ** (Mt. 3:12), **ἧς –αὐτῆς** (Mk 7:25), **οὓς—αὐτούς** (Ac. 15:17), **οἷς—αὐτοῖς** (Rev. 7:2). But this idiom appeared also in the older Greek and is not merely Semitic.[3] It occurs in Xenophon and Sophocles. Indeed in Rev. 17:9; **ἑπτὰ ὄρη ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν**, we have **ὅπου** in sense of relative pronoun much like modern Greek **ποῦ**. For the redundant antecedent see further under Relative.

(e) ACCORDING TO SENSE. See also chapter X, VII, VIII, The personal pronouns are sometimes used freely according to the sense. In Ac. 26:24, **τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει**, the position of **σε** is probably a matter of euphony and a case in point. Sometimes there is no immediate reference in the context for the pronoun. The narrative is compressed and one must supply the meaning. So with **αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 1:17), **αὐτοῖς** (Mt. 8:4), **αὐτῶν** (12: 9), **αὐτῶν**, (Mt. 11:1), **αὐτόν** (Jo. 20:15), **αὐτῶν** (1 Pet. 3:14). But this is no peculiarity of N. T. Greek or of the **κοινή**. It is common at all times. In Jo. 8:44, **ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ,** the **αὐτοῦ** refers to **ψεῦδος** suggested by **ψεύστης.** In 2 Cor. 5:19 **αὐτοῖς** refers to **κόσμον**, as in Ro. 2:26 **αὐτοῦ** has in mind **ἀκρόβυστος**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 165.
[2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 281.
[3] W.-Th., p. 148. Cf. C. and S., p. 65 f.

suggested by ἀκροβυστία. So in Ac. 8:5 αὐτοῖς refers to πόλιν. In Mk. 5:4 αὐτῇ follows the natural gender of παιδίον rather than the grammatical. But in Jo. 6:39 αὐτό agrees grammatically with the abstract collective πᾶν ὅ. In Lu. 6:6 we find a usage much like the original Homeric absence of the pure relative.[1] We have καὶ αὐτοῦ used with ἄνθρωπος much as οὗ was. In Mt. 28:19 αὐτούς refers to ἔθνη. In Mk. 6:46 αὐτοῖς points to ὄχλον.

(f) REPETITION OF THE SUBSTANTIVE. Sometimes indeed the substantive is merely repeated instead of using the pronoun. Thus in Jo. 11:22 we have τὸν θεόν—ὁ θεός. This is usually due to the fact that the mere pronoun would be ambiguous as in the use of Ἰησοῦς in Jo. 4:1. Sometimes it may be for the sake of emphasis as in ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Lu. 12:8) rather than ἐγώ. Sometimes antithesis is better sustained by the repetition of the substantive. Thus with κόσμῳ--κόσμου (Jo. 9:5), ἁμαρτία-ἁμαρτίας (Ro. 5:12). But this is no peculiarity of Greek.

II. The Possessive Pronouns (κτητικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι).

(a) JUST THE ARTICLE. It is not merely the possessive relation that is here under discussion, but the possessive pronoun. Often the article alone is sufficient for that relation. Thus in ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα (Mt. 8:3) the article alone makes the relation clear. Cf. also τὰς χεῖρας (Mk. 14:46), τὴν μάχαιραν (14:47), τὸν ἀδελφόν (2 Cor. 12:18). The common use of the genitive of the personal pronoun is not under consideration nor the real reflexive pronoun like ἑαυτοῦ.

(b) ONLY FOR FIRST AND SECOND PERSONS. There is in the N. T. no possessive form for the third person. The other expedients mentioned above (usually the genitive αὐτοῦ, αὐτῶν) are used. The personal pronouns are substantival, while the possessive forms are adjectival. In modern Greek no adjectival possessive exists. Just the genitive occurs (Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 89). The possessive ἐμός and σός are disappearing in the papyri (Radermacher, *N. T. Gk.*, p. 61). Originally the accent[2] of ἐμός was *ἔμος. The forms ἡμέ-τερος and ὑμέ-τερος are both comparative and imply emphasis and contrast, the original meaning of the comparative.[3]

(c) EMPHASIS, WHEN USED. When these possessive forms occur in the N. T. there is emphasis. But it is not true, as Blass[4]

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35.

[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 250.

[3] Seymour, The Hom. Dial., p. 60.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 168. Brugmann (Vergl. Gr., ii. 283) derives the poss. from the gen., while Delbruck (V, i. 213) obtains the gen. from the poss. Who can tell?

affirms, that there is no emphasis when the genitive forms are used. See I, (b), 4. The possessives do not occur often in the N. T. For details see chapter VII, iv, 4, (d).

(d) WITH THE ARTICLE. The possessives in the N. T. usually have the article save when predicate.[1] Thus ἡ ἐμή (Jo. 5:30), τῆς ἐμῆς (Ro. 10:1), τὸ ἐμόν, (Mt. 18:20), τῷ σῷ (Mt. 7:3), etc. When the article is absent the possessive is usually predicate as in τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σά ἐστιν, καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά (Jo. 17:10; Lu. 15:31). In μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου (Ph. 3:9) the possessive is attributive, a righteousness of my own, though the article comes later. In Jo. 4:34 we have ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα where the attributive use also occurs. But see Mt. 20:23. One may note ὑμῶν in predicate (1 Cor. 3:21).

(e) POSSESSIVE AND GENITIVE TOGETHER. Paul's free use of the possessive and genitive together as attributives is well illustrated by τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν (1 Cor. 16:18). In 1 Cor. 16:17 the MSS. vary between τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα and τὸ ὑμέτερον (BCD) ὑστ. So in 1 Jo. 2:2 we have both περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν and also περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων. Indeed the genitive may be in apposition with the genitive idea in the possessive pronoun. Thus τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ **Παύλου**, (1 Cor. 16:21). Cf. 2 Th. 3:17; Col. 4:18; Jo. 14:24.

(f) OBJECTIVE USE. The possessive pronoun may be objective just like the genitive. This is in full accord with the ancient idiom. So τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (Lu. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24), τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν (15:31), τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει (Ro. 11:31), τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν (15:4). Cf. τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως (2 Cor. 1:6).

(g) INSTEAD OF REFLEXIVE. The possessive, like the personal pronoun, occurs where a reflexive might have been used. Thus τῷ σῷ with κατανοεῖς in Mt. 7:3, ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τέκνα (3 Jo. 4), ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί (Phil. 19). The pronoun ἴδιος is possessive, but is best treated as a reflexive.

III. The Intensive and Identical Pronoun (σύντονος ἀντωνυμία). The use of αὐτός was originally "purely anaphoric."[2] As the third personal pronoun it was, of course, anaphoric. The intensive use is more emphatic.

(a) THE NOMINATIVE USE OF **Αὐτός**. As already remarked, it is not always clear whether we have the emphatic 'he' or the intensive 'self' with αὐτός the nominative. Cf. αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ

[1] Simcox, Lang., etc., p. 54.

[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 170. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 351, calls this the "determinative" pronoun. On the whole subject of aims see K.-G., I, pp. 651 ff.

αὐτοῦ (Jo. 2:12). The intensive αὐτός appears in all persons, genders and numbers. Thus αὐτὸς ἐγώ (Ro. 7:25; cf. ἐγὼ αὐτός Ac. 10:26), αὐτοὶ ἀκηκόαμεν (Jo. 4:42), δύνασαι—αὐτός (Lu. 6:42), αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς (1 Th. 4:9; cf. Ac. 18:15), αὐτὸς ὁ ᾽Ιωάνης (Mt. 3:4), αὐτοὶ προφῆται (Ac. 15:32), αὐτὸ τὸ βιβλίον (Heb. 9:19), αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια (9:23), αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα (Jo. 5:36). The article is not always used. Cf. αὐτὸς Δαυείδ (Lu. 20:42), αὐτὴ Σάρρα (Heb. 11: 11), αὐτοὶ προφῆται, (Ac. 15:32). Cf. ἐγώ δὲ αὐτός P.Oxy. 294 (A.D. 22). In 2 Cor. 10:1 note αὐτὸς ἐγὼ Παῦλος. There is nothing particularly essential in the order whether αὐτὸς ἐγὼ or ἐγὼ αὐτός (see above). Ἔγωγε is not in the N. T.

(b) VARYING DEGREES OF EMPHASIS. For a list of the various shades of meaning possible with αὐτός see Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek*, p. 59 f. In Ro. 15:14 αὐτός occurs with the first person and αὐτοί with the second in sharp contrast. In Shakespeare we have "myself" as subject: "Myself have letters" (*Julius Caesar,* iv. 3).[1] Cf. Latin *ipse*. In Jo. 2:24, αὐτὸς δὲ ᾽Ιησοῦς, we have Jesus himself in distinction from those who believed on him. In 1 Cor. 11:14 ἡ φύσις αὐτή is 'nature of itself.' Note αὐτοὶ οἴδατε (1 Th. 3:3), 'ye for yourselves.' In Ac. 18:15, ὄψεσθε αὐτοί, we find 'ye by yourselves.' Each instance will vary slightly owing to the context. Cf. αὐτοί, (Ac. 16:37); αὐτὸς μόνος (Mk. 6:47). On αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν see Ac. 13:4. See ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν (Lu. 12:57), not αὐτοί.

(c) Αὐτός WITH Οὗτος. In Ac. 24:15, 20, the classical idiom αὐτοί οὗτοι occurs. Cf. εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο (Ro. 9:17), πεποιθὼς αὐτὸ τοῦτο (Ph. 1:6), αὐτὸ τοῦτο (2 Pet. 1:5, accusative of gen. reference). Cf. 2 Cor. 7:11. The other order is found in ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτό (2 Cor. 2:3).

(d) Αὐτός ALMOST DEMONSTRATIVE. In Luke αὐτὸς ὁ is sometimes almost a pure demonstrative as it comes to be in later Greek. The sense of 'very' or 'self' is strengthened to ‘that very.’ Thus αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, (Lu. 2:38), ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ (13:1), ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (23: 12). The modern Greek freely employs this demonstrative sense. Cf. Thumb, p. 90. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 91) finds this demonstrative use of αὐτὸς ὁ in the papyri. So αὐτὸν τὸν ᾽Αντάν, O.P. 745 (i/A.D.). Moulton thinks that αὐτός is demonstrative also in Mt. 3:4. See VI, (h), for further discussion.

(e) IN THE OBLIQUE CASES. It is not so common as the nominative. So αὐτοῖς τοῖς κλητοῖς (1 Cor. 1:24). Cf. καὶ αὐτούς in Ac. 15:27 (cf. 15:32). But examples occur even in the first and

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35.

second persons. Thus ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ (Ro. 16:2), σοῦ αὐτῆς (Lu. 2:35), αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς (2 Th. 1:4), ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (Ac. 20:30, probable text). Here the use is intensive, not reflexive. The same thing is possible with ὑμῶν αυτῶν in 1 Cor. 7:35 (cf. 11:13). But I think this reflexive. This intensive use of αὐτός with ἐμοῦ and σοῦ is found in Attic. In αὐτῶν ἡμῶν and ὑμῶν only the context can decide which is intensive and which reflexive. Cf. Thompson, *A Syntax of Attic Greek*, p. 64. Cf. ἐξ αυτῶν τῶν νεκροτάφων, 'from the grave-diggers themselves,' P. Grenf. ii, 73 (iii/A.D.).

(f) **Αὐτός** SIDE BY SIDE WITH THE REFLEXIVE. So αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ (Eph. 5:27), αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (Ro. 8:23). Cf. 2 Cor. 1:9; 10:12. The distinctively reflexive pronouns are, of course, compounded of the personal pronouns and αὐτός. They will be treated directly. The N. T. does not have αὐτότατος (cf. Latin *ipsissimus*). Some N. T. compounds of αὐτός are αὐτάρκης (Ph. 4:11), αὐτοκατάκριτος (Tit. 3:11), αὐτόματος (Mk. 4:28), αὐτόπτης (Lu. 1:2).

(g) **᾽Ο Αὐτός**. The use of ὁ αὐτός for identity ('the same,' the very') is close kin to the original 'self' idea. Cf. *ipse* and *idem*. The idiom is frequent in the N. T. Thus ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος (Ro. 10:12), ἡ αὐτὴ σάρξ (1 Cor. 15:39), τὰ αὐτὰς θυσίας (Heb. 10:11), and with substantive understood τὸ αὐτό (Mt. 5:47), τῶν αὐτῶν (Heb. 2: 14), τὰ αὐτά (Lu. 6:23). In 1 Cor. 11:5 we have the associative instrumental case with it, τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ. But in 1 Pet. 5:9 we actually have the genitive ('the same sort of'), τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων.

IV. The Reflexive Pronoun (ἀνταναϰλαστιϰὴ ἀντωνυμία).

a) DISTINCTIVE USE. As already explained in this chapter under Personal Pronouns, the originals of the personal pronouns in oblique cases were also reflexive.[1] Only gradually the distinction between personal and reflexive arose. But even so the personal pronouns continued to be used as reflexive. Hence I cannot agree with Blass[2] that **ἐμαυτοῦ, σεαυτοῦ, ἑαυτοῦ** "have in the N. T. been to some extent displaced by the simple personal pronoun." It is rather a survival of the original (particularly colloquial) usage. Thus we have in Mt. 6:19 f. θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυρούς, 5:29 f. and 18:8 f. βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ, 6:2 μὴ σαλπίσῃς ἔμπροσθέν σου, 11:29 ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς, 17:27 δὸς ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, 18:15 ἔλεγξον . . . μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ. Matthew has rather more of these survivals. But see ἀφίδω τὰ περὶ ἐμέ (Ph. 2:23), τὸ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ πρόθυμος (Ro. 1:15). For this idiom in Attic see Thompson, *Syn-*

[1] Cf. Dyroff, d. Pron. Reflex., 1. Abt., p. 16.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 166 f.

tax of Attic Greek, p. 64. This is not indeed the classic Attic idiom, but the vernacular Attic (as in the **κοινή**) is not so free from it. In particular the third person presents peculiar problems, since the ancient MSS. had no accents or breathings. The abbreviated reflexive **αὐτοῦ** and **αὐτοῦ** would look just alike. It is a matter with the editors. See chapter VI, iv, (f), for details. Thus W. H. give **ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 9:23), but **οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς** (Jo. 2:24). In Lu. 9:24 we have **τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ**, but in 14:26 **τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ**. In the last passage **ἑαυτοῦ** occurs with **πατέρα** and **ψυχὴν**, but not with the other words. Cf. **αὐτῷ**, Ac. 4:32. In the light of the history of the personal pronouns the point is not very material, since **αὐτοῦ**, can be reflexive also. The Attic Greek used to have **δοκῶ μοι**. But Luke in Ac. 26:9 has **ἔδοξα ἐμαυτῷ** as Paul in 1 Cor. 4:4 says **ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα**. Old English likewise used the personal pronouns as reflexive. Thus "I will lay me down and sleep," "He sat him down at a pillar's base," etc.[1] Cf. Ac. 19:21, **με** twice. See also chapter VII, Iv, 4, (c).

(b) THE ABSENCE OF THE REFLEXIVE FROM THE NOMINATIVE. It is impossible to have a reflexive in the nominative. The intensive pronoun does occur as **αὐτὸς ἐγώ** (2 Cor. 10:1). The English likewise, as already shown, early lost the old idiom of "myself," "himself " as mere nominatives.[2] Cf. **ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ**, Jo. 11:51, where **αὐτός** could have been employed.

(c) THE INDIRECT REFLEXIVE. It is less common in the N. T. It does indeed occur, as in the ancient Greek. So **θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν** (1 Cor. 7:7), **συνείδησιν δὲ λέγω οὐχὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ ἑτέρου** (10:29). But on, the other hand, note **ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαι με ἀποδώσω σοι** (Lu. 10:35), **παρακαλῶ—συναγωνίσασθαί μοι** (Ro. 15:30). Cf. 2 Cor. 2:13. This on the whole is far commoner and it is not surprising since the personal pronoun occurs in the direct reflexive sense. Cf. **ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου** (Ac. 1:4). In Thucydides the reflexive form is generally used for the indirect reflexive idea.[3]

(d) IN THE SINGULAR. Here the three persons kept their separate forms very well. Hence we find regularly **ἐμαυτόν** (Jo. 14: 21), **σεαυτῷ** (Ac. 16:28), **ἑαυτῷ** (Lu. 18:4). Indeed **ἑαυτοῦ** never stands for **ἐμαυτοῦ**.[4] For **σεαυτοῦ** or **σεαυτόν** some MSS. read **ἑαυτοῦ** in Mk. 12:31; Jo. 18:34; Gal. 5:14; Ro. 13:9. In 1 Cor. 10:29 **ἑαυτοῦ**='one's own' (Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p. 441; *Prol.*, p. 87). There was some tendency towards this usage in the an-

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 33.
[2] Ib.
[3] Dyroff, Gesch. etc., Bd. I, 1892, p. 19.
[4] W.-Sch., p. 205.

cient Greek,[1] though the explanation is not perfectly clear.[2] But the usage is clearly found in the Atticists, Dio Chrys., Lucian and Philost. II.[3] In Rev. 18:24 **ἐν αὐτῇ** is a sudden change from **ἐν σοί** of the preceding verses, but is hardly to be printed **αὐτῇ**, for it is not strictly reflexive. The same[4] use of **αὐτήν** rather than **σέ** appears in Mt. 23:37 and parallel Lu. 13:34. Cf. also Lu. 1:45. But Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, Dec., 1901, p. 441, April, 1904, p. 154) finds in the papyri several examples of this "un-. educated use of **ἑαυτοῦ**" for first and second persons singular, **συγχωρῶ μετὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τελευτήν**, B.U. 86 (ii/A.D.). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 61) cites **ἐπέγραψα ἑαυτῷ** (Petersen-Luschan, Reisen etc., p. 26, n. 32). Thucydides has a few possible examples and certainly the Latin is is in point (Draeger, *Historische Synt. d. Lat. Spr.*, p. 84). In early Greek Delbruck finds the reflexive referring indifferently to either person. The recurrence is not surprising. In the modern Greek the singular **ἑαυτοῦ** occurs constantly for first and second persons and even **τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ μου, τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ σου** for emphasis. Cf. "myself," "thyself," "herself" and vulgar " hisself." See Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 63. In translation from Semitic originals we sometimes find **ψυχήν** rather than **ἑαυτόν** as in Lu. 9:24 (cf. Mk. 8:36). Cf. Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 87; Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 114. The form **αὐτόν** (Jo. 2:24), **αὐτῷ** (Lu. 12:21) is preserved in some 20 passages by W. H. and Nestle.

(e) IN THE PLURAL. Here the matter is not in any doubt. It is rather too much to say with Simcox that **ἑαυτῶν** is the only form for the reflexive plural. This is indeed true for the first and third persons as **ἀνεθεματίσαμεν ἑαυτούς** (Ac. 23:14). In 2 Th. 1:4 **αυτούς ἡμᾶς** is intensive, as already shown (chapter VII). In the third person also only **ἑαυτῶν** occurs as in Mt. 18:31. In the second person plural a few examples of the reflexive **ὑμῶν αὐτῶν** apparently survive, as in Ac. 20:30; 1 Cor. 5:13 and probably so in 1 Cor. 7:35; **ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς** in 1 Cor. 11:13. But the common idiom for the second person plural is undoubtedly **ἑαυτῶν**, as **προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς** (Lu. 17:3). Cf. Mt. 25:9; Ro. 6:13; 1 Jo. 5:21, etc. There are some seventy examples of **ἑαυτῶν** for first and second persons plural in the N. T. (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 87), as is the custom in the papyri, chiefly in illiterate documents. Cf. **ἵνα γεινώμεθα πρὸς τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτούς**, Tb.P. 6 (ii/B.C.); **ἵνα κομισώμεθα τὰ ἑαυτῶν**, Tb.P. 47.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 167.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 421. Cf. Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 194.
[3] W.-Sch., p..205. [4] Ib.

The LXX (Conybeare and Stock, *Sel*., p. 30) has this use of ἑαυτῶν for first and second persons plural. We even find reflexive and personal together like ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς (Ex. 20:23).

(f) ARTICLE WITH. The reflexive is used with or without the article and in any position with the article. But curiously enough σεαυτοῦ is never so found and ἐμαυτοῦ only once in sharp contrast, μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφορον ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πλλῶν (1 Cor. 10:33). Instead of this reflexive genitive (possessive) we have the genitive of the personal pronoun. Cf. τιμῶ τὸν πατέρα μου (Jo. 8:49), ἄφες τὸ δῶρόν σου (Mt. 5:24). The examples of ἑαυτοῦ are, of course, abundant as in τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν (Lu. 11:21), the common idiom in the older Greek. But note also the order τὸ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ (Gal. 6:4), ἑαυτοῦ τοὺς πόδας (Ac. 21:11), δούλους ἑαυτοῦ (Lu. 19:13), κῆπον ἐαυτοῦ (Lu. 13:19). These are all attributive, but the sense is not quite the same in the two last. The use of αὐτοῦ in such examples has already been noted as in Mt. 16:24. Sometimes the MSS. vary between ἑαυτοῦ and αὐτοῦ as in Lu. 4:24. The plural ἑαυτῶν is likewise found thus, τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς (Mt. 8:22), τῷ κυρίῳ ἑαυτῶν (Mt. 18:31), ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια (Mt. 21:8). See further chapter XVI. **The Article.**

(g) REFLEXIVE IN THE RECIPROCAL SENSE. This use of ἑαυτῶν does not really differ in idea from ἀλλήλων. This is in harmony with the ancient Greek idiom. The papyri show this same blending of ἑαυτῶν with ἀλλήλων.[1] Cf. P.P. 8 (ii/B.C.) three times, O.P. 260 (i/A.D.), C.P.R. 11 (ii/A.D.) twice. Thus we may note ὅτι κρίματα ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν (1 Cor. 6:7), λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς (Eph. 5:19), νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς (Col. 3:16), etc. Sometimes it occurs side by side with ἀλλήλων as if by way of variety, as in ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς (Col. 3:13). Cf. also ἀλλήλων and αὐτούς in Lu. 23:12. In Ph. 2:3 ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν, each word retains its own idea.

(h) REFLEXIVE WITH MIDDLE VOICE. Sometimes indeed the reflexive occurs with the middle voice where it is really superfluous, as in διεμερίσαντο ἑαυτοῖς (Jo. 19:24, LXX), where[2] Mt. 27:35 (free paraphrase of LXX) has only διεμερίσαντο. So also σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος (Tit. 2:7). But usually such examples occur where the force of the middle is practically lost, as in ἥγημαι ἐμαυτόν (Ac. 26:2), ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν (Lu. 9:23). On the use of the reflexive in Anglo-Saxon see Penny, *A History of the Reflexive Pronoun in the English Language,* p. 8. Cf. παραλήμψομαι πρὸς ἐμαυτόν (Jo. 14:3). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 87) admits that sometimes

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 87. [2] W.-Th., p. 257.

ἑαυτοῦ occurs without great emphasis. This use of the reflexive with the middle may be compared with the reflexive and the personal pronoun in the LXX. So λήμψομαι ἐμαυτῷ ὑμᾶς λαὸν ἐμοί (Ex. 6:7), οὐ ποιήσετε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς (20:23). So English "me myself," "you yourselves." Cf. Thackeray, p. 191. See further chapter XVII, Voice.

(i) THE USE OF ῞**Ιδιος**. This adjective is frequent in the N. T. It is usually treated as a possessive, opposed[1] to κοινός or δημόσιος. In the N. T. we find it, especially (17 times) in κατ᾽ ἰδίαν (cf. Lu. 9:10), in the sense of 'private.' So this sense occurs also in Ac. 4:32 and Heb. 7:27. Cf. ἰδιῶται in Ac. 4:13 (1 Cor. 14:16). Sometimes also the word implies what is peculiar to one, his particularity or idiosyncrasy, as 1 Cor. 3:8; 7:7 (cf. the classic *idiom*). Cf. our "idiot." But in general ὁ ἴδιος or ἴδιος without the article (cf. ἑαυτοῦ) means simply 'one's own,' a strong possessive, a real reflexive. To all intents and purposes it is interchangeable in sense with ἑαυτοῦ. The examples of this reflexive idea are many. Thus in Mt. 9:1; Lu. 6:41; 10:34; Jo. 1:41; 4:44, etc. The use of οἱ ἴδιοι for 'one's own people' (cf. also of οἰκεῖοι, 1 Tim. 5:8, classic idiom) is not strange. Cf. Jo. 1:11; 13:1, etc. Moulton[2] finds the singular in the papyri as a term of endearment. The use of τὰ ἴδια for ‘one's home’ (Jo. 1:11; 19:27; Ac. 21:6) is seen also in the papyri. Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, 1901, p. 440) cites τὰ ἴδια, B.U. 86 (ii/A.D.), 183 (i/A.D.), 168 (ii/iii A.D.) bis, etc. The papyri also illustrate Jo. 1:11, οἱ ἴδιιοι, for ‘one's relations.’ So πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους, B.U. 341 (ii/A.D.). Examples without the article are δεσπόταις ἰδίοις (Tit. 2:9), καιροῖς ἰδίοις (1 Tim. 6:15). Cf. ὁ ἴδιος λόγος, B.U. 16 (ii/A.D.). Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., 1901, p. 440. In Jo. 1:41 Moulton[3] rightly agrees with Westcott in seeing in τὸν ἴδιον an implication that some one else went after his brother also. The only other point that here calls for remark is the question whether ὁ ἴδιος is used in an "exhausted" or unemphatic sense. Blass[4] finds it so in εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀργρόν (Mt. 22:5). Meisterhans (p. 235) finds a few examples in the Attic inscriptions and Deissmann finds the weakened use of ἴδιος in the literary κοινή. Deissmann[5] argues further that this exhausted sense may be assumed in the N. T. because some examples in the LXX (Job 24:12; Prov. 27:15), etc., seem to occur. Moulton[6]

[1] Blass, .Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 169.
[2] Prol., p. 90.
[3] Ib.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 169.
[5] B. S., p. 123 f.
[6] Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 440 f.; Prol., p. 90.

finds that the papyri do not support this contention. Emphasis is beyond dispute in most of the N. T. instances like Mt. 9:1; Lu. 6:41; Jo. 1:41; Ac. 1:25; Gal. 6:5, etc. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 89) refers with point to Ro. 14:5, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοΐ, as showing ἴδιος the equivalent of ἑαυτοῦ. The N. T. passages may be assumed to show emphasis in spite of the later Byzantine ἴδιος μου (cf. ἑαυτοῦ you in modern Greek). Moulton[1] agrees with the Revisers in using 'own' in Mt. 22:5 as a "counter-attraction." The only difficult passage is Ac. 24:24 where B may be wrong. But is it not possible that ἰδίᾳ may have a covert hint at the character of Drusilla? For the present she was with Felix. In Tit. 1:12 note ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης. Moulton (*Cl. Rev*., 1904, p. 154) cites ἡμῶν ἴδιον, Ch. P. 4 (ii/A.D.), ἴδιον αὐτοῦ N. P. 25 (ii/A. D.), and εἰς ἰδίαν μου χρείαν, B.U. 363 (Byz., Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., 1901, p. 440). In modern Greek ὁ ἴδιος= ὁ αὐτός (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 97) or 'self,' ἐγὼ ὁ ἴδιος, 'I myself.' Cf. τῆι αὐτῆι in the papyrus of Eudoxus (ii/B.C.), but Moulton (*Prol*., p. 91) observes that it does not occur in the N. T. in this sense.

V. The Reciprocal Pronoun (ἡ ἀμοιβαία ἀντωνυμία). The use of the reflexive in the reciprocal sense has just been discussed (cf. personal pronouns as reflexive). From one point of view it might seem hardly necessary to give a separate discussion of reciprocal pronouns. But, after all, the idea is not exactly that of the mere reflexive. Ἀλλήλων is, of course, reduplicated from ἄλλος, one of the alternative pronouns. Cf. the Latin alias and alter alters. The Latin idiom is common in the classic Greek and is found in Ac. 2:12, ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον λέγοντες; 19:32, ἄλλοι ἄλλο τι ἔκραζον; 21:34, ἄλλοι ἄλλο τι ἐπεφώνουν. Cf. in the papyri ἄλλο ἐγώ, ἄλλο πάντες, B.U. 1079 (A.D. 41). But the true reciprocal ἀλλήλων has no nominative and is necessarily plural or dual (in older Greek). It occurs 100 times in the N. T. (W. H.) and is fairly well distributed. We have examples of the genitive (Ro. 12:5 ἀλλήλων μέλη), the ablative (Col. 3:13 ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων), the accusative (1 Cor. 16: 20 ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους, 1 Jo. 4:7 ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους), the locative (Ro. 15:5 ἐν ἀλλήλοις), the dative (Gal. 5:13 δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις). The prepositions are used 48 times with ἀλλήλων. This pronoun brings out the *mutual* relations involved. In 1 Th. 5:11, παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἷς τὸν ἕνα, note the distributive explaining the reciprocal. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 246) compares the modern Greek ὁ ἕνας τὸν ἄλλον. In Ph. 2:3 note both ἀλλήλους and ἑαυτῶν. In 1 Th. 5:15 we have εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας.

[1] Prol., p. 90. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 613.

In 2 Th. 1 : 3 note **ἑνὸς ἑκάστου** and **εἰς ἀλλήλους**. The N. T. does not, like the LXX (Ex. 10:23), use **ἀδελφός** as a reciprocal pronoun. The middle voice is also used in a reciprocal sense as in. **συνεβουλεύσαντο** (Mt. 26:4). Cf. chapter XVII, Voice.

VI. Demonstrative Pronouns (δεικτικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι).

(a) NATURE. Curiously enough the demonstrative pronoun, like all pronouns, has given the grammarians a deal of trouble to define. For a discussion of the various theories during the ages see Riemann and Goelzer.[1] Originally all pronouns were "deictic," "pointing." The "anaphoric" use came gradually.[2] Indeed the same pronoun often continued to be now deictic, now anaphoric, as **ὅς**, for instance, originally demonstrative, but later usually relative. Indeed the anaphoric use blends with the relative. Monro[3] marks out three uses of pronouns, not three kinds of pronouns. The "deictic" "marks an object by its position in respect to the speaker." Thus **ἐγώ, σύ, ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος** all fall under this head. The "anaphoric" pronoun "is one that denotes an object already mentioned or otherwise known." Thus the resumptive use of **ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, ὅς, ὅστις**. The "relative" in the modern sense would be only **ὅς, ὅστις, οἷος, ὅσος**, etc. As a matter of fact, for practical purposes the two Greek terms "deictic" and "anaphoric" may be placed beside the Latin "demonstrative" and "relative." See further chapter VII, iv, 4, (e) .

(b) DIFFERENT SHADES OF MEANING. The demonstrative pronouns do not indeed always have the same shade of meaning. They may point out, as far or near **(ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος)**, as in apposition (**ἐκεῖνος**), as well known (**ἐκεῖνος**), as already mentioned (resumptive **οὗτος, ὅδε)**.[4] These uses belong to the various demonstratives and will come out in the context. I do not care to press the parallel with the personal pronouns (first, second, third person demonstratives) as applied to **ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος**. The pronouns had best be treated separately, not according to the special uses.

(c) **᾽Ο, ἡ, τό**. This was the simplest demonstrative.[5] The grammarians[6] call this word **ἄρθρον προτακτικόν** as distinct from **ὅς** which is **ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν**. As a matter of fact **ὁ, ἡ, τό** is the same word as the Sanskrit *sa* (*sas*), *sa, tad*.[7] The Lithuanian nominative sing-

[1] Synt., p. 763 f.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 168 f.
[3] Ib.
[4] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 779.
[5] K.-BL, I, p. 603.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 145. See Gildersleeve, Synt., pp. ii, 216-226.
[7] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 189.

ular was *ta-s, ta*, and the Greek nominative plural **οἱ, αἱ** came "instead of **τοί, ταί**," (Brugmann, *Comp. Gr.*, vol. III, p. 327). This form, like der in German and this in English, was used either as demonstrative, article or relative. See Kuhner-Gerth, I, p. 575. One is not to trace actual historical connection between **ὁ** and der (cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 559). Its old use was a sort of personal demonstrative (cf. **σὺ δέ** in Lu. 1:76).[1] Cf. also **σὺ δὲ τί** and it **ἢ καὶ σὺ τί** (Ro. 14:10) and **σὺ τίς** (14:4). Cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 428. This substantival use is the main one in Homer.[2] Indeed, as a demonstrative it means rather contrast than far or near like **ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος**, but after all **ὅδε** is nothing but **ὁ** with the ending **–δε**. The demonstrative use of **ὁ** is seen in **τοὺς ὅσοι** in Agathias[3] and **τῶν ὅσα** in Maximus of Tyre.[4] This demonstrative as antecedent to the relative (**τοὺς οἵ**) appears in Justin Martyr[5] and Tatian's *Oration to the Greeks*.[6] Plato shows a good many examples[7] (like **τὸν ὅς, τὸν ὅσος**). We meet in Xenophon and Demosthenes[8] **καὶ τόν** as demonstrative, especially **τὸν καὶ τόν, τὸ καὶ τό, τὰ καὶ τά**. The modern Greek uses **τοῦ, τῆς, τῶν,** etc., as short forms of **αὐτοῦ**, etc., and Jebb[9] pertinently asks if this is not "a return to the earliest use of **ὁ, ἡ, τό** as a pronoun." The demonstrative **ὁ** is frequent in the comic writers. Cf. Fuller, *De Articuli in Antiquis Graecis Comoedus Usu*, p. 9. Volker (Syntax, p. 5) gives papyri illustrations of demonstrative **ὁ (ὁ δέ, τοῦ δέ πρὸς τοῦ, πρὸ τοῦ, τὰ μέν, τὰ δέ** etc.)." The oblique cases have only two examples in the N. T., one a quotation from Aratus, **τοῦ καί** (Ac. 17:28), the other **τοὺς μέν, τοὺς δέ** (Eph. 4:11), where contrast exists. It is possible indeed that **τόν** in Ph. 1:11 is demonstrative. Cf. also **τὸν ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς** in 1 Jo. 2:13 and **τήν** in 1 Cor. 10:29. In Mt. 14:2 (Mk. 6:14) **αἱ** is nearly equivalent to 'these.' In Mk. 12:5 the correct text is **οὓς μέν**, etc. But in the nominative the examples of this demonstrative in the N. T. are quite numerous. There are three uses of the nominative in the N. T. (1) One is the demonstrative pure and simple without any expressed contrast. So **οἱ δὲ ἐράπισαν** (Mt. 26:67), **οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν** (Mt. 28:17). In Mt. 26:57 **οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες** we may have

[1] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 67. [2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 176.
[3] Reffel, Uber den Sprachgebr. des Agathias, 1894, p. 5.
[4] Darr, Sprachl. 1899, p. 27.
[5] Cf. Gildersleeve's ed. of First Apol., ch. 5 and note to p. 116.
[6] Otto's ed., pp. 24, 90.
[7] Cf. Gildersleeve, Justin Martyr, p. 116, for others.
[8] Hadley and Allen, Gk. Gr., p. 216.
[9] V. and D.'s Handb., etc., p. 297. [10] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 81.

this usage or merely the article. In Acts we often have **οἱ μὲν οὖν** in this sense, usually with the participle (Ac. 1:6; 8:4, 25). But even in these examples there is apparently an implied contrast. In Mt. 16:14 and Lu. 9:19 the use of **οἱ δέ** (3, below) refers to those already mentioned in an oblique case. (2) The use of **ὁ μέν, ὁ δέ**, etc. This is no longer very frequent in the N. T.[1] So **ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως** (1 Cor. 7:7); **οἱ μέν, ὁ δέ** (Heb. 7:20, 23); **οἱ μέν, οἱ δέ** (Ac. 14:4); **οἱ μέν, ἄλλοι δέ, ἕτεροι δέ** (Mt. 16:14 f:). In Mt. 13:23 we most likely have **ὃ μέν, ὃ δὲ**, not **ὁ μέν, ὁ δέ**. Cf. **ὃ μέν** (Lu. 8:5). In Ac. 17:18 note **τινες, οἱ δέ** and in Ro. 14:2 **ὃς μέν, ὁ δέ**. (3) The most common use of the demonstrative is where **ὁ δέ, ἡ δέ, οἱ δέ** refer to persons already mentioned in an oblique case. Thus in Mt. 2:5 **οἱ δέ** refers to **παρ᾽ αὐτῶν**. So in of **οἱ δέ** (Lu. 23:21) the reference is to **αὐτοῖς**, while **ὁ δέ** in the next verse points to **αὐτόν**. In Mk. 14:61 **ὁ δέ** refers to **ʼΙησοῦν**, as in Ac. 12:15, **ἡ δέ** to **αὐτήν**. In Lu. 22:70 **ὁ δέ** has no antecedent expressed, but it is implied in the **εἶπαν πάντες** before.

(d) **Ὅς**. The grammarians call it **ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν** or relative.[2] It did come to be chiefly relative, as already the Sanskrit *yas, ya, yad* has lost its original demonstrative force.[3] But in the Lithuanian *j-i-s* Brugmann (*Comp. Gr.*, III, p. 332) finds proof that the pro-ethnic *i-o* was demonstrative as well as relative. Cf. also **ἴ-να** in Homer— both 'there' and 'where' and then ‘that.’ In Homer **ὅς**, like **ὥς (ὡς)**, is now demonstrative, now relative, and was originally demonstrative.[4] This original demonstrative sense eontinues in Attic prose, as in the Platonic **ἦ δ᾽ ὅς; καὶ ὅς; ὃν μέν, ὃν δέ** etc.[5] However, it is not certain that the demonstrative use of **ὅς (καὶ ὅς, ἦ δ᾽ ὅς)** is the same word as the relative. Brugmann[6] indeed finds it from an original root, **so-s* like Sanskrit *sa-s*. The examples of this demonstrative in the nominative are few in the N. T. Thus note in Jo. 5:11 (correct text) **ὃς δὲ ἀπεκρίθη**, and also **ὃς δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβεν**, in Mk. 15:23. Indeed **ὃς δή** in Mt. 13:23 is close to the same idea. But this verse furnishes a good example of this demonstrative in contrast, **ὃ μὲν ἑκατὸν ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα**. This example happens to be in the accusative case (cf. Ro. 9:21), but the nominative appears also as in **ἃ μὲν ἔπεσεν** (Mt. 13:4), **ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δέ ἐπί τὴν ἐμπορίαν** (Mt. 22:5), **ὃς μὲν πιστεύει** (Ro. 14:2), **ὅς μὲν γὰρ κρίνει—ὅς δὲ κρίνει**, (14:5). So 1 Cor. 11: 21.

[1] Blass, .Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 145.
[2] K.-131., I, p. 608.
[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 195.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 185.
[5] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 68.
[6] Cf. Griech. Gr. p. 241; Comp. Gr., III, p. 335.

Instances of other cases occur also. I see no adequate reason for refusing to consider **ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέτειναν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν** (Mt. 21:35) examples of the demonstrative **ὅς**.[1] Cf. Lu. 23:33. In the accusative plural note **οὓς μέν, οὓς δέ,** Mk. 12:5; Ac. 27:44; Ju. 22 f. For the dative singular, **ᾧ μέν, ᾧ δέ,** note Mt. 25:15. In 1 Cor. 12:8 we have **ᾧ μέν , ἄλλῳ δέ, κτλ**. For the dative plural see **οἷς μέν, οἷς δέ,** 2 Cor. 2:16. In 1 Cor. 12:28 we have **οὓς μέν** as demonstrative without any corresponding as **οὓς δέ.** Cf. **οἱ μὲν οὖν** in Ac. 8:4, 25; 11:19; 15:3, 30, and **ὁ μὲν οὖν** in Ac. 23:18 as above in (c). The relative at the beginning of sentences or paragraphs, like **ἐν οἷς** in Lu. 12:1 (cf. **ἀνθ' ὧν** verse 3), may indeed at bottom be a reminiscence of the old demonstrative. Cf. Latin and English usage. The demonstrative is often used to connect sentences, as in Mt. 11:25; 12:1; Mk. 8:1, etc. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 276. In Mt. 26:50, **ἐφ' ὃ πάρει**, we may also have an instance of the demonstrative. But we do not have in the N. T. **καὶ ὅς, καὶ τόν, τὸν καὶ τόν, πρὸ τοῦ.** Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 62) finds demonstrative **ὅσδε** in an inscription in Heberdey-Wilhelm, *Reisen*. N. 170.

(e) **Ὅδε**. Brugmann[2] finds the enclitic **–δε** the same that we have in **δε-ῦρο, δή, ἰ-δέ**, (?), Latin *quan-de*. It corresponds to the Latin *hic*, German *der hier,* English *this here*. It refers to what is "immediately near" in space or time,[3] and is of relatively more importance than **οὗτος**. As a matter of fact **ὅδε** occurs only ten times in the N. T. In the LXX " **ὅδε** is much commoner than in the N. T." (Thackeray, *Gr. of the 0. T. in Gk.*, vol. I, p. 191), especially in the more literary parts. For its rarity in papyri and inscriptions see Mayser, Gr., etc., p. 308. It is already failing in the first century B.C. (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 62). For **τάδε** see chapter VII, iv, 4, (e). In Lu. 16:25 **ὧδε** is the correct text. In Ac. 15:23 **τάδε** is not well supported and in 2 Cor. 12:19 **τὰ δέ** is right. In one of the remaining examples, **τῇδε ἦν ἀδελφή** (Lu. 10: 39), Blass[4] bluntly calls it "not even used correctly," a rather curt judgment. But he cites the LXX (Gen. 25:24; 38:27). In Winer-Schmiedel[5] this example is not considered as **ὅδε** used for **οὗτος** but rather; like the classic **ὅδε ἐγώ, οἵδε ἡμεῖς** (cf. Ex. 8:25; Gen. 50:18). In Jas. 4:13, **πορευσόμεθα εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν**, it is hardly necessary to take **τήνδε** as like the classical **τὴν δεῖνα** or **τὴν καὶ τήν** (cf. Plato), though that is a possible construction. Cf.

[1] So Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 68, n. 3.
[2] Griech. Or., p. 242.
[3] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 65.
[4] Or. of N. T. Gk., p. 170.
[5] P. 216.

ποιήσομεν τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο in verse 15. Plutarch[1] seems to use **τήνδε** in this sense. More likely in James **τήνδε** merely means 'this' city which the enterprising Jew exploits for a year before he passes on to the next.

(f) **Οὗτος**. Of doubtful etymology, possibly an original root *u*.[2] With this combine **ὁ, ἡ, τό=οὐ, αὐ, του**. Then add **το-ς, τα(η), το**. In reality, therefore, **οὗτος** is a doubled demonstrative (combination of so and to, Giles, p. 296). It is like the Latin *is-te* (double also). **Οὗτος** is more often anaphoric than deictic.[3] In Homer[4] it (deictic) expresses an object present to the speaker, but not near him. The word is limited in use in Homer and usually refers to what is previously mentioned (anaphoric).[5] It is very common in the N. T. and on the whole the usage accords with that of the older Greek. Naturally there is much diversity in the context.

1. *The Purely Deictic*. This use is not wanting. Thus in Mt. 3:17, **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου**, the demonstrative identifies the one present as the Son of God. For further examples of the purely deictic use see Mt. 12:23; 17:5; 21:10 f. (a particularly good illustration); 21:38; 27:37, 47, 54; Mk. 6:3; 15:39; Lu. 4:22; 8:25, etc. But a still plainer example is in Jo. 21:21, when Simon pointed to John as **οὗτος δὲ τί**.

*2. The Contemptuous Use of **οὗτος**.* It is merely one variation of the purely deictic idiom due to the relation of the persons in question. It is rather common in the N. T. So in Mt. 26:61 **οὗτος ἔφη** we find a "fling" of reproach as the witnesses testify against Jesus. Cf. Mt. 26:71 (parallel Lu. 22:56 **καὶ οὗτος**), the maid about Peter; Mk. 2:7, the Pharisees about Jesus; Lu. 15:2; Jo. 6:42; 9:24; 12:34; Ac. 7:40, Jews about Moses; 19:26; 28: 4, about Paul; Lu. 15:30, the elder son at the younger; 18:11, the Pharisee at the publican, etc. A striking example occurs in Ac. 5:28.

3. *The Anaphoric Use*. The pronoun here refers to one previously mentioned, as in Mt. 27:58 where **οὗτος** alludes to **ʼΙωσήφ** in verse 57, where note the anacoluthon. So in Heb. 7:1 **οὗτος** points to the mention of Melchizedek in the preceding verse. There are many variations in the anaphoric idiom. The simplest is the one already mentioned, where the subject of discussion is merely continued by **οὗτος**, as in Mt. 3:3 (cf. the Baptist in verse 1). In particular observe **καὶ οὗτος**, as in Lu. 8:41; 16:1. In Lu. 22:59

[1] Quest. conviv. 1. 6. 1, **τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν**.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 242, 428.
[3] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 65.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 170.
[5] Ib.

καὶ οὗτος is rather deictic. A striking example of the continuative οὗτος occurs in Ac. 7:35, 36, 37, 38, 40. Here the pronoun is repeated as often as is desired. So Jo. 6:42. Cf. the use of the pronoun because of prolepsis (Ac. 9:20). The more frequent use is the resumptive or epexegetical use which is rather more abundant in the N. T.[1] Here οὗτος is really in apposition. In Ro. 7:10, ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον, we seem to have the resumptive use with a substantive. But a clear example (different in number and gender)[2] occurs in Mt. 13:38, τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, οὗτοί εἰσιν. One may note a similar use of ἐκεῖνος (Jo. 12:48; 16:13) and of αὐτός (Jo. 12:49). Another plain instance is in Ac. 2:23, where τοῦτον refers to Ἰησοῦν (verse 22). Cf. also τοῦτον (2d) in Ac. 7:35. In Ac. 4:10 ἐν τούτῳ is resumptive referring to the preceding substantive followed by two relative clauses, while οὗτος is deictic. In verse 11 again οὗτος is continuative. In Ro. 9:6, οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι (cf. Gal. 3:7), the resumptive use is plain. The participle before οὗτος is a very common idiom, as ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος (Mt. 10:22; 24:13); ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ –οὗτος (26:23). Cf. 1 Cor. 6:4; Lu. 9:48; Jo. 7:18, etc. The participle, of course, often follows οὗτος, not resumptive, as in Jo. 11:37. The relative is followed by resumptive οὗτος as in ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ--οὗτος (Lu. 9:24), ὃ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω (Ro. 7:15 f., 20). So Mt. 5:19; Mk. 6:16; Ac. 3:6; Gal. 5:17; 6:7; 2 Tim. 2:2. The plural is seen in Jo. 8:26, ἅ--ταῦτα; also in Ph. 4:9. For ἅτινα --ταῦτα see Ph. 3:7, and ὅσοι-οὗτοι Ro. 8:14; Gal. 6:12; Ph. 4:8. Cf. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 218. See ὅταν—τότε, καθώς—ταῦτα (Jo. 8:28). In Ph. 1:22 τοῦτο resumes τὸ ζῆν. In 2 Th. 3:14 τοῦτον is resumptive with εἴ τις as in Jas. 1:23. Cf. also 1 Cor. 8:3; Ro. 8:9; Jas. 3:2.[3] For ἐάν τις see Jo. 9:31. Sometimes only the context can clear up the exact reference of the anaphoric οὗτος. So in Ac. 8:26 αὕτη points to ἡ ὁδός.

4. *In Apposition.* See also chapter X, ix. **Οὗτος** itself may be expanded or explained by apposition. The simplest form of this construction is where a substantive[4] is in apposition as in 2 Cor. 13:9, τοῦτο καὶ εὐχόμεθα, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν, where agreement in gender does not occur. Cf. the nominative ἡ πίστις in 1 Jo. 5:4. Cf. 1 Th. 4:3. **Οὗτος** is, of course, the antecedent of the relative ὅς, as in Mt. 11:10; Jo. 7:25; τοῦτο ὅ in Jo. 16:17. In

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 65 f.
[2] Ib.
[3] Ib., p. 66.
[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171.

Ph. 2:5 note **τοῦτο—ὃ καί**. Sometimes a clause is in apposition with **οὗτος** which may be either nominative or in an oblique case. Thus with **ὅτι** we have the nominative (with feminine predicate noun), as in **αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι** (Jo. 3 : 19). Cf. 1 Jo. 1:5; 5:9, 11, 14. In Mk. 4:41, **τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι**, the **ὅτι** is almost equal to **ὥστε**. The accusative with **ὅτι** we have in **τοῦτο ὅτι** (Ro. 2:3; 6:6; Lu. 10:11; Ac. 24:14; 1 Cor. 1:12; 15:50; 2 Cor. 5: 14; 10:7, 11; 2 Th. 3:10; Ph. 1:6 (**αὐτὸ τοῦτο**), 25; 1 Tim. 1: 9; 2 Tim. 3:1; 2 Pet. 1:20; 3:3, 8. Cf. also **διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι** in Jo. 12:39.[1] In Gal. 3:17, after **τοῦτο λέγω**, we have the direct discourse without recitative **ὅτι**, but the quotation is really in the accusative in apposition with **τοῦτο**. Cf. also Lu. 12:18, **τοῦτο ποιήσω· καθελῶ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας**, and Jo. 4:17. The genitive with **ὅτι** appears in **περὶ τούτου ὅτι** (Jo. 16:19). The locative appears in **ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι**, 1 Jo. 4:9, 10, 13. Cf. **ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι** (Jo. 16:30; 1 Jo. 3:19, 24) in a slightly different sense where **ὅτι**, is really the accusative. But in general these substantive clauses have the same case as **τοῦτο**.

Closely allied to this use of **ὅτι** is that of **ἵνα**. Thus the nominative, **πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ**, occurs in Lu. 1:43. In Jo. 17:3, **αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἵνα**, the pronoun is feminine because of the predicate substantive. Cf. Jo. 15:12; 1 Jo. 3:11, 23; 5:3; 2 Jo. 6. The accusative as the direct object of the verb is seen in **τοῦτο προσεύχομαι ἵνα** in Ph. 1:9. Cf. also **ταῦτα—ἵνα**, Jo. 15:11, 17; 1 Jo. 5:13. The feminine substantive occurs in the accusative also, as in **ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔχομαεν ἀπ᾽ αυτοῦ, ἵνα**, 1 Jo. 4:21. The accusative is found also with prepositions. So **εἰς τοῦτο, ἵνα**, Ac. 9:21; Ro. 14:9; 2 Cor. 2:9; 1 Pet. 3:9; 4:6; 1 Jo. 3:8. In Eph. 6:22 we have **εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἵνα**. Cf. Col. 4:8. Likewise note **διὰ τοῦτο, ἵνα** in 2 Cor. 13:10; 1 Tim. 1:16; Phil. 15. In 2 Cor. 2:3, **ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτὸ ἵνα**, we probably have the direct accusative, though **τοῦτο αὐτό** could be adverbial accusative, 'for this very reason.' The locative appears in **ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ἵνα**, Jo. 15:8. Cf. 1 Jo. 4:17. The ablative case appears in Jo. 15:13, **μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα.** In 3 Jo. 4 the ablative plural is found, **μειζοτέραν τούτων—ἵνα**. The apposition in these various constructions varies in degree of directness. An example of **ὅπως** with **εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο** occurs in Ro. 9:17 quoted from the LXX (Ex. 9:16). Cf. also **στελλόμενοι τοῦτο μὴ** in 2 Cor. 8:20.

In 1 Pet. 2:19 note also the use of **εἰ** with **τοῦτο** (though **χάρις**

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 217, where it is observed that elsewhere often **διὰ τοῦτο** points to what goes before.

is predicate), **τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἰ**. Here the **εἰ** clause is in the same case as **τοῦτο**, nominative. So in 1 Jo. 2:3 we have **ἐάν** in apposition with **ἐν τούτῳ** (locative).

In 1 Jo. 5:2 the correct text has **ὅταν** in similar apposition with **ἐν τούτῳ**. The infinitive also occurs in apposition with **τοῦτο.** In Heb. 9:8 the perfect infinitive in indirect discourse with the accusative is in apposition to **τοῦτο** which is itself accusative, **τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν κτλ**. In Eph. 4:17 likewise **μηκέτι περιπατεῖν**, in apposition to **τοῦτο** (after **λέγω**, is in indirect discourse, though here it is indirect command, not indirect assertion. But in 1 Cor. 7:37 **τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον** is merely explanatory of **τοῦτο κεκρικεν**. The same thing is true in 2 Cor. 2:1, where the article is added to the infinitive which is also in the accusative, **ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ--ἐλθεῖν.** In Ac. 26:16 the infinitive **προχειρίσασθαι** is in the accusative like **εἰς τοῦτο**. Cf. **οὕτως**, 1 Pet. 2:15. The nominative infinitive in Jas. 1:27 is in apposition with **αὕτη (θρησκεία καθαρὰ --αὕτη, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι)**. So also note **οὕτως ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ –φιμοῦν** in 1 Pet. 2:15.[1] Cf. Ro. 1:12 where **τοῦτο—συνπαρακληθῆναι**, are merely subject and predicate. In 2 Cor. 7:11 the nominative infinitive, **τὸ λυπηθῆναι**, occurs with **αὐτὸ τοῦτο**. Indeed in Mk. 12:24 the causal participle is really explanatory of **τοῦτο (διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες**. It is possible to see a similar example[2] in Lu. 8:21, **ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ --ἀκούοντες**. Here in truth **οὗτοι** seems unnecessary.

5. *Use of the Article*. The article commonly occurs with the noun when the noun is used with **οὗτος**. The noun is by no means always necessary with **οὗτος**. See 6. Indeed the resumptive dem. alone is often sufficient, as in Jo. 1:2, 7, etc. So **αὐτοὶ οὗτοι** (Ac. 24:15, 20). In a sense a double demonstrative thus occurs, since the article was originally demonstrative. This is in exact accord with classic usage and calls for no special comment, except that it is an idiom foreign to Latin and English. The modern Greek preserves this idiom with the demonstrative. So **τούτη ἡ γυναίκα, αὐτὸς ὁ ἄνδρας** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 92). It is immaterial whether **οὗτος** comes first, as **οὗτος ὁ τελώνης** (Lu. 18:11), or last, as **ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος** (Lu. 23:47). Cf. Jo. 9:24. When an adjective is used with the substantive, then the article may be repeated with the adjective, as **ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἡ πτωχή** (Mk. 12:43), or **οὗτος** may, like the adjective, be brought within the rule of the article. So **τίς ἡ**

[1] For exx. in earlier Gk. and literary **κοινή**, see W.-Sch., p. 217.

[2] W.-Sch., p. 218.

καινὴ αὕτη [ἡ] ὑπὸ σοῦ λαλουμένη διδαχή (Ac. 17:19).[1] Even if the second article be admitted here, the point made still applies. The position of **οὗτος** with the article, **οὗτος ὁ** rather than **ὁ οὗτος**, does not mean simply the predicate idea, though the position is predicate. But not so **τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν** in Lu. 4:6. Here the real predicate notion appears. In Kuhner-Gerth (I, p. 628) the explanation is given that it is either apposition (**οὗτος ὁ ἀνήρ**= 'this, the man') or predicative sense (**ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος**= 'the man here'). Probably so, but in actual usage the connection is much closer than that. See Lu. 15:24, **οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου**. Cf. the French idiom *La Republique Francaise.* Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 324) takes the predicate explanation. See also chapter XVI, The Article.

6. *Article Absent*. The article does not always occur with substantives when **οὗτος** is used. When **οὗτος** occurs with proper names in the N. T., the article is present. So Ac. 1:11 **οὗτος ὁ ʼΙησοῦς**, 19:26 **ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος**, 7:40 **ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος**, 2:32 **τοῦτον τὸν ʼΙησοῦν**, Heb. 7:1 **οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ**, except in Ac. 6:14 **ʼΙησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος**, where the article is used with the adjective, not with **ʼΙησοῦς**. So uniform indeed in the Greek is the presence of the article with the noun and **οὗτος**, that the absence of the article causes something of a jolt. In Ro. 9:8 the conjunction of the words **ταῦτα τέκνα** must not deceive us. The copula **ἐστιν** must be supplied between. The American Revision indeed calls in the English relative to render the idiom **οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ**. Cf. the simple predicate use in 1 Cor. 6:11, **καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε.** In Lu. 1:36, **οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστίν**, the substantive is predicate. The same thing is clearly true of Lu. 2:2, **αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο**. Cf. also **τοῦτο ὑμῖν σημεῖον** in Lu. 2:12. Some MSS. have **τό**, but in either case the copula is supplied. The remaining examples are not so simple, but ultimately resolve themselves into the predicate usage unless one has to except Ac. 24:21 (see below). In Lu. 7:44, **ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα**, the article does not occur in L 47^{ev}. Winer[2] considers the reading without the article "unexceptionable," since the woman was present. In Lu. 24:21 the predicate accusative really is found, **τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο**, a common Greek idiom difficult to put into English. It is not 'this third day,' but 'this a third day.' Cf. also 2 Pet. 3:1, **ταύτην δευτέραν γράφω ἐπιστολήν**. In this instance the English translation resorts to the relative 'that' to bring out the predicate relation, 'this is the second epistle that I write.' In Jo. 2:11,

[1] See Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 331, for this "pseudo-attributive position."
[2] W.-Th., p. 110.

ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων even the American Revision has a wrong translation, 'this beginning of miracles.' It is rather 'this Jesus did as a beginning of miracles.' But א and Chrys. here have τήν. In Jo. 4:18, τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας, the English relative is again necessary, 'this is a true thing that thou didst say' or 'thou didst speak this as a true thing.' The translation 'truly' rather obscures the idea. In Ac. 1:5, οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας, several difficulties appear. The litotes, οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς, does not have the usual order.[1] Cf. Ac. 27:14 for μετ' οὐ πολύ. There is besides a use of μετά somewhat akin to that of πρό in πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (Jo. 12:1).[2] The order would more naturally be a οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας μετὰ ταύτας or οὐ πολλῶν ἡμερῶν μετὰ ταύτας. However, the predicate use of ταύτας without the article permits the condensation. The free translation 'not many days hence' is essentially correct. It is literally 'after not many days these' as a starting-point (from these). In Jo. 21:14, τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον ἐφανερώθη Ἰησοῦς, the matter is very simple, 'this already a third time,' or to use the English relative, 'this is now the third time that.' So also in 2 Cor. 12:14 and 13:1, τρίτον τοῦτο. The most difficult instance to understand is in Ac. 24:21, περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραξα. Here 'concerning this one voice which I cried' makes perfectly obvious sense. The trouble is that it is the only N. T. example of such an attributive usage without the article. Blass[3] takes it to be equivalent to ἡ φωνὴ ἣ ἐγένετο ἦν μία αὕτη. This is, of course, the normal Greek idiom and is possibly correct. But one wonders if a lapse from the uniform idiom may not occur here. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 92) cites τούτου πράγματος, ταῦτα ἀδικήματα, τοῦτο κτῆμα from inscriptions in Magnesia (Petersen-Luschan, *Reisen in Lykien,* p. 35, n. 54) and ἔστησαν τόδε μνῆμα from a Bithynian inscription (Perrot, *Exploration arch. de la Galatie,* p. 24, N. 34). Hence one had best not be too dogmatic as to Luke's idiom in Ac. 24:21. After all, the predicate use may be the original use, as with ἐκεῖνος. Cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 426 f.; Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek*, p. 67. See also chapter XVI.

7. **Οὗτος in Contrast with ἐκεῖνος.** The distinction between ὅδε for what follows and οὗτος for what precedes[4] (not strictly observed in the ancient Greek) amounts to little in the N. T., since ὅδε is so rare. But οὗτος does, as a rule, refer to what is near or last mentioned and ἐκεῖνος to what is remote. See αὕτη and οὗτος in

[1] W.-Sch., p. 221.
[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 126, 133.
[3] Ib., p. 172.
[4] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 66.

2 Jo. 6 f. and **τοῦτο** in 2 Cor. 13: 9. This idiomatic use of **οὗτος** is plain in Ac. 7:19. In 1 Jo. 5:20 **οὗτος** really refers to **αὐτοῦ** (**ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ**) and so no difficulty exists. In Ac. 4:11 **οὗτος** is resumptive and takes up the main thread of the story again (cf. **οὗτος** in verse 9). In Ac. 8:26 **αὕτη** may refer to **Γάζαν**, but more probably (see 3, end) refers to **ὁδός**, a more remote substantive, indeed. In Lu. 16:1 again only the sense[1] makes it clear (**ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν πλούσιος ὅς εἶχεν οἰκονόμον, καὶ οὗτος**) that **οὗτος** refers to **οἰκονόμον**. In Lu. 18:14, **κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐκεῖνον** the two pronouns occur in sharp contrast, one pointing out the publican, the other the Pharisee. In such contrasts **οὗτος** refers to the last mentioned. This is clearly one example (besides 2 Jo. 6 f.) in the N. T., which curiously enough Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 171) does not recognise. Cf. also Jo. 13:24; **ἐκεῖνος τούτῳ** in Jo. 5:38, and **ταῦτα ἐκείνοις** in 1 Cor. 10:11. In Jo. 1:7 f. both **οὗτος** and **ἐκεῖνος** are used of John and in proper idiom.[2] Instead of **ἐκεῖνος** we might have had **οὗτος** properly enough because of **αὐτοῦ**, but **ἐκεῖνος** calls us back pointedly to **ʾΙωάνης**. Cf. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 236. Note **οὗτος ὁ λόγος—ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος** in Jo. 21:23. In 1 Cor. 6:13, **ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα καταργήσει**, we find **οὗτος** used for both the near and the remote. The number and gender make it clear. In 1 Cor. 9:3 **αὕτη** points to what follows. In a case like **ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω** (Ph. 1:18), the main thought is meant by the demonstrative. So with **ἐν τούτῳ δίδωμι· τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν συμφέρει** (2 Cor. 8:10). Cf. **τοῦτο** Ac. 24:14, etc.

8. *As Antecedent of the Relative Pronoun*. The absence of the demonstrative pronoun before the relative pronoun will be discussed later. This absence is in the case of a possible pronoun before the relative and after it also. The resumptive use of the demonstrative pronoun after the relative sentence has been already treated. But[3] it is "the normal correlative" **οὗτος—ὅς**. So **οὗτος περὶ οὗ** (Mt. 11:10) **οὗτος ὅν**, (Jo. 7:25), **οὗτος ὅς** (Ac. 7:40), **τοῦτο—ὅ** (Ph. 2:5). See interrogative demonstrative and relative in **τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὅς** (Lu. 5:21; 7:49); **τί τοῦτο ὅ** (Jo. 16:17 f.). Cf. Lu. 24:17. On the whole, however, the demonstrative before the relative is not common in the N. T. In Gal. 2:10 both **αὐτό** and **τοῦτο** are incorporated into the relative clause, **ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι**.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171.

[2] Blass, ib., p. 172, explains **ἐκεῖνος** as showing that the discourse passes from John to Jesus. But **ἐκεῖνος** refers to John. [3] Thomp., Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 66.

9. *Gender and Number of* **οὗτος**. See chapter X. In general, like other adjectives, **οὗτος** agrees with its substantive in gender and number, whether predicate or attributive. Cf. Jo. 2:11. In 1 Cor. 6:13, **καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα**, note the number and gender. But sometimes the construction according to sense prevails. So the masculine, not feminine, in Ac. 8:10, **οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ Δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ**. So **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς ἐστίν μοι οὗτος** (Ac. 9:15), **οὗτοι** and **ἔθνη** (Ro. 2:14). Cf. also Ju. 12, **οὗτοι—νεφέλαι, δένδρα, κύματα, ἀστέρες**; 2 Pet. 2:17, **οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ** and **οὗτοι — ἐλαῖαι** (Rev. 11: 4). In these examples assimilation to the gender of the predicate does not occur. Cf. **ταῦτα τί**, Jo. 6:9. In Mt. 21:42 (Mk. 12:11), **παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη** the feminine occurs where the neuter would be natural in Greek. This is a piece of "translation" Greek (Ps. 118:23). In Hebrew the feminine is the case for abstract words, the Hebrew having no neuter gender. In Eph. 2:8, **τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν**, there is no reference to **πίστεως** in **τοῦτο**, but rather to the idea of salvation in the clause before. But in 1 Pet. 2:19 f. we have two examples of the neuter (**τοῦτο**) on purpose to present a more separate and abstract notion than **αὕτη** would have done, an ancient Greek idiom, **τοῦτο γάρ χάρις εἰ—τοῦτο χάρις παρὰ θεῷ**. In 1 Cor. 10:6 the same principle applies, **ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν**. A striking example is found in 1 Cor. 6:11, **καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε.** Here **ταῦτα** is much like **τοιοῦτοι**, but more definite and emphatic. For this use of **οὗτος** see also Jo. 12:34. In Ph. 3:7, **ἅτινα ἦν μοι κέρδη, ταῦτα ἥγνμαι—ζημίαν**, assimilation to the gender of the predicate is also absent.

Sometimes the plural **ταῦτα** occurs where a single object is really in mind. The adverbial phrase **μετὰ ταῦτα** (Lu. 12:4) can refer either to one or more incidents. It is not necessary to consider **ταῦτα** as singular in idea in Jo. 19:36 and 1 Cor. 9:15. But the usage does appear in 3 Jo. 4, **μειζοτέραν τούτων οὐκ ἔχω χάριν** (or **χαράν**), and the adverbial accusative **καὶ ταῦτα** in Heb. 11:12. Some MSS. have **καὶ ταῦτα** instead of **καὶ τοῦτο** in 1 Cor. 6:8.

But assimilation to the predicate both in gender and number occurs. So in Lu. 8:14 f. **τὸ . . . πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες.** The same thing[1] appears in Gal. 4:24, **ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο διαθῆκαι**. Note the assimilation of **αὕτη** in Lu. 2:2; 8:11; 22:53; Jo. 1:19; Ro. 11:27; 1 Cor. 9:3; 1 Jo. 2: 25; 5:3, 4, 9, 11, etc., and **οὗτος** in Mt. 7:12.

10. *The Adverbial Uses of* **τοῦτο** *and* **ταῦτα**. See chapter XII.

[1] W.-Sch., p. 219.

Here we have **καὶ τοῦτο** (adverbial accusative or nominative absolute) like Latin *idque* (English 'and that too') in 1 Cor. 6 : 6 (CD^b **ταῦτα**), 8 (L **ταῦτα**); Ro. 13:11; Eph. 2:8 (this last could be otherwise explained). **Καὶ ταῦτα**, the usual classical idiom,[1] appears in Heb. 11:12 with a concessive participle. In **τοῦτο μέν, τοῦτο δέ** (Heb. 10:33) Blass[2] sees a literary usage. In 2 Cor. 2:3 Paul has **τοῦτο αὐτό** in the adverbial sense, while Peter (2 Pet. 1:5) turns the phrase around **καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ.** Cf. the adverbial use of **κεφάλαιον** in Heb. 8:1. The case of **οὗτος** in Jo. 21:21 is noteworthy.

11. The Phrase **τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν**. See also chapter X, viii, (c). It is used without any regard to the number, gender or case of the word in apposition with it, exactly like the Latin *id est*. There are eighteen examples of it given in Moulton and Geden's *Concordance*, all but three of them from the Acts, Romans, Philemon and Hebrews. It is a mark of the more formal literary style. In Mt. 27:46 the case explained is the vocative, in Mk. 7:2 the instrumental, in Ro. 7:18 the locative, in Heb. 2:14 the accusative, in Heb. 9:11 the genitive, in Heb. 7:5 the plural, in 1 Pet. 3:20 the plural. In Ro. 1:12 the uncontracted form occurs with In 1 Macc. 4:52 **οὗτος ὁ μὴν Χασελεῦ** is in apposition with the genitive.[3] Here **οὗτος** performs the function of **τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν**. Cf. the case-irregularities in the Apocalypse.

12. *In Combination with Other Pronouns*. Mention may be made of **ἐν τούτῳ οὗτος** (Ac. 4:10) and other instances of the double use of **οὗτος**. Cf. Mk. 6:2. Cf. **οὗτος οὕτω** in Mk. 2:7, **ταῦτα οὕτως** (Ac. 24:9), **οὕτως τοῦτο**; (1 Cor. 5:3), and in 2 Pet. 3:11 **τούτων οὕτως πάντων**. Examples of **αὐτὸ τοῦτο** are common in Paul (Ro. 9:17; 13:6; 2 Cor. 7:11; Ph. 1:6. Cf. 2 Pet. 1:5). For **τοῦτο αὐτό** see 2 Cor. 2:3, **αὐτὸ τοῦτο** Ro. 13:6. For **αὐτοὶ οἵτοι** see Ac. 24:15, 20. For **τοῦτο ὅλον** cf. Mt. 1:22; 26:56. There is no doubt some difference between **ταῦτα πάντα** (Mt. 4:9; Lu. 12:30; 16:14) and **πάντα ταῦτα** (Mt. 6:32). "In the first expression, **πάντα** is a closer specification of **ταῦτα**; in the second, **πάντα** is pointed out demonstratively by means of **ταῦτα**."[4]

13. *Ellipsis of* **οὗτος**. The demonstrative is by no means always used before the relative. Often the relative clause is simply the object of the principal verb, as in **ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε** (Mt. 10:27). Sometimes the implied demonstrative must be expressed in the English translation. The simplest form of this

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171.
[2] Ib.
[2] W.-Sch., p. 219.
[4] W.-Th., p. 548.

idiom is where the case of the demonstrative would have been the same as that of the relative. Thus **συγγενὴς ὢν οὗ ἀπέκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὠτίον** (Jo. 18:26). Cf. **ὅν** in Ac. 1:24. In Ac. 8:24 **ὧν** is for **τούτων ἃ** by attraction. But the ellipsis occurs also when a different case would have been found.[1] So in Mt. 19:11 **οἷς δέδοται** would have been **οὗτοι οἷς** δέδ. In Jo. 13:29 **ὧν** would have been preceded by **ταῦτα**. Cf. also Ac. 8:19; 13:37, etc. In Ro. 10:14, **πῶς πιστεύσωσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν**, the antecedent of **οὗ** would be either **τούτῳ** (or **ἐπὶ τούτῳ**) or more probably **εἰς τοῦτον** (preposition also dropped). When a preposition is used, it may belong to the relative clause, as in **πῶς ἐπικαλέσωνται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν** (Ro. 10:14; cf. Jo. 19:37), or to the implied demonstrative, as in **ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν** (Jo. 6:29). In Ro. 14:21 **ἐν ᾧ** illustrates the preposition with the relative, while in the next verse it illustrates the preposition with the antecedent. In Jo. 11:6 **ἐν ᾧ τόπῳ** is an example where **ἐν** would have been used with both antecedent and relative. So as to **ἀφ᾽ ὧν** in 2 Cor. 2:3, etc.[2] The same principle of suppressed antecedent applies to relative adverbs, as in **ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν** (Jo. 11:32), strictly **ἐκεῖσε ὅπου**.

14. *Shift in Reference.* It is possible that in Ac. 5:20, **λαλεῖτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ λαῷ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης**, a slight change in sense has occurred, **ταύτης** more naturally going with **ῥήματα**. Cf. **ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου** (Ro. 7:24). But the point is not very material.

(g) **᾽Εκεῖνος**. Cf. Latin *ille*. The old form (Epic, Pindar, Tragic poets) was **κεῖνος** or **κῆνος** (Doric and Lesbian).[3] Brugmann[4] indeed connects it with the old Indo-Germanic root *ko*. The locative adverb **ἐ-κεῖ** (cf. **κεῖ-θι, κεῖ-θεν**, Doric, Lesbian) is the immediate source of the pronoun **κεῖ-νος, ἐ-κεῖ-νος**. Cf. English *hi-ther*. The original usage was therefore predicate.[5] Thus in Thuc. i, 52. 2, **νῆες ἐκεῖναι ἐπιπλέουσι** ('ships yonder are sailing ahead'), we must not confuse it with **αἱ νῆες ἐκεῖναι** ('those ships'). Cf. the "adverbial" use of **οὗτος**. By a strange coincidence, while at work on this paragraph (Nov., 1908), I received a letter from Rev. R. H. Graves, D.D., of Canton, China, concerning Chinese pronouns, suggested by the chapter on Pronouns in my *Short Grammar of the Greek N. T*. He says: "The ordinary pronoun for the third person is *k'ei*. In Canton we also use *k'ni*. Compare
He mentions other accidental similarities, but I dare not venture into Chinese etymology.

[1] W.-Th., p. 158. [3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 242 f. [5] Ib., p. 426 f.
[2] Cf. ib., p. 159. [4] Ib.

1. *The Purely Deictic*. We have a few examples in the N. T. So in Jo. 13:26, **ἐκιῆνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῳ** for Judas was present at the table. In Mt. 26:23 we have **οὗτος**. A gesture may also have accompanied the remark of the Pharisees in Jo. 9:28, **σὺ μαθητῆς εἶ ἐκείνου.** Cf. also Jo. 19:21. If **ἐκεῖνος** in Jo. 19:35 be taken as an appeal to God as a witness to the truth of what the writer is saying (possible, though by no means certain), the usage would be deictic. Blass[1] considers that "everything is doubtful" as to this verse, a doubt shared by Abbott.[2] For myself I think that **ἐκεῖνος** is here anaphoric and refers to **αὐτοῦ** (cf. the similar reference of **οὗτος** to **αὐτοῦ** in 1 Jo. 5:20; but see Remote Object). Another possible deictic example is in Jo. 7:11. Jesus was not present, but in the minds of the people a subject of discussion. Cf. also 9:12.

2. *The Contemptuous Use* (cf. **οὗτος**). It appears unmistakably (see 1) in Jo. 9:28, **σὺ μαθητὴς εἶ ἐκείνου**. It may also exist[3] in Jo. 19:21. Cf. the solemn repetition of **ἐκεῖνος** with **ὁ ἄνθρωπος** in Mt. 26:24, as well as the change from **οὗτος** in verse 23.

3. *The Anaphoric*. This is the more frequent use of this pronoun. Thus in Jo. 1:8 **ἐκεῖνος** takes up **οὗτος** of verse 7 (**᾽Ιωάνης** of verse 6). In Jo. 18:5 **ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος** resumes the story of **ἄλλος μαθητής** immediately preceding. Cf. **ἄλλος** and **ἐκεῖνος** in Jo. 5:43. In Jo. 13:25 **ἐκεῖνος** refers indeed to the preceding **τούτῳ** (cf. **ἐκεῖνος οὕτως**). In Jo. 5:19 the reference is to **πατέρα** just before. Cf. Jo. 4:25. **᾽Εκεῖνος δέ** (3 (Jo. 2:21) is continuative like **οὗτος**. The articular participle may be followed by the resumptive **ἐκεῖνος**. So **ὁ πέμψας με—ἐκεῖνος** Jo. 1:33). Cf. Jo. 5:11; 2 Cor. 10:18. So in Jo. 1:18 the pronoun refers to **θεός** followed by **ὁ ὤν**. Cf. Mk. 7:20 **ἐκεῖνο.** See Jo. 14:21. For distinction between **ἐκεῖνος** and **αὐτοῦ** see 2 Tim. 2:26; 3:9.

4. *The Remote Object (Contrast)*. This is not always true, as is shown by Jo. 18:15. Cf. Tit. 3:7. It is common thus to refer to persons who are absent. So in Jo. 3:28.(cf. Jo. 7:11) John speaks of Christ in contrast to himself, **ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμροσθεν εἰκείνου**. So in verse 30, **ἐκείνοις—ἡμῶν.** In 1 Cor. 9:25 note **ἐκεῖνοι μὲν—ἡμεῖς δέ.** So in 10:11 **ἐκείνοις—ἡμῶν**, 15:11 **εἴτε ἐγὼ εἴτε ἐκεῖνοι**. In Ac. 3:13 the contrast is sharp between **ὑμεῖς—ἐκείνου**, and in 2 Cor. 8:14 between **ὑμῶν---ἐκείνων** (cf. **ἐκείνων—ὑμῶν** in same verse). Cf. **ὑμῖν — ἐκείνοις** in Mt. 13:11. In Jo. 5:39 **ἐκεῖναι**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 172. [2] Joh. Gr., pp. 285, 567.

[3] Abbott, ib., p. 568. He cites Mt. 27: 19, 63 as exx. of the good and the bad sense of **ἐκεῖνος**. Cf. Lat. *ille*.

is in opposition to **ὑμεῖς,** as **ἐκεῖνος** to **ὑμεῖς** in the preceding verse. Cf. 2 Cor. 8:9. For a contrast between those present in the same narrative see **οὗτος** in Lu. 18:14. Cf. **ἐκεῖνος** and **αὐτός** in 1 Jo. 2:6 and **τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο** in Jas. 4:15. It is common in expressions of place, like **διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης** (Mt. 8:28), **εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην** (9:26; cf. **ἐν** 9:31), etc. It is frequent also with general phrases of time, like **ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις** (Mt. 3:1). Cf. Mk. 8:1; Lu. 2:1. It usually occurs at a transition in the narrative and refers to something previously mentioned. Blass[1] notes that Lu. (1:39) uses also **ταύταις** in this phrase and that in 6:12 D has **ἐκείναις** rather than **ταύταις**. In particular observe the phrase **ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα** for the Last Day (Mt. 7:22; Mk. 14:25; Lu. 21:34; 17:31; Jo. 16:23, etc. Cf. Jo. 6:40, etc.).

5. *Emphasis*. Sometimes **ἐκεῖνος** is quite emphatic. Abbott[2] notes that in John's Gospel, outside of dialogue, **ἐκεῖνος** usually has considerable emphasis. Instance Jo. 1:8, 18, 33; 2:21; 3:30; 4:25; 5:19, 38; 6:29; 8:42; 14:26; 15:26, etc. In the First Epistle of John he observes that it occurs only seven times and all but one refer to Christ. He is the important one in John's mind. Cf. **αὐτός** in Ac. 20:35. But **ἐκεῖνος** is not always so emphatic even in John. Cf. Jo. 9:11, 25; 10:6; 14:21; 18:17; Mk. 16:10 ff ; 2 Tim. 3:9.

6. *With Apposition.* It is not common with words in apposition. But note Jo. 16:13, **ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας** (cf. Jo. 14:26). Note also **ἐκεῖνο γινώσκετε, ὅτι** (Mt. 24:43) after the fashion of **οὗτος** with **ὅτι**. Cf. also the resumptive uses with participles (Jo. 1:18, etc.).

7. *Article with Nouns except when Predicate*. When the noun is used with **ἐκεῖνος** in the N. T., the article always appears, except when predicate. In Jo. 10:1, **ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστίν** the substantive is predicate, as in 10:35, **ἐκείνους εἶπεν θεούς**. With adjectives we may note the repetition of the article in Jo. 20:19 and the ambiguous position of **ἐκείνη** in Heb. 8:7 due to the absence of **διαθήκη**. With **ὅλος** we find this order, **εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην** (Mt. 9:26, etc.) and **πᾶς** the same, **πᾶσαν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἐκείνην** (Mt. 18:32, etc.).

8. *As Antecedent to Relative.* So **ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ** (Jo. 13:26), **ἐκεῖνον ὑπὲρ οὗ** (Ro. 14:15) **ἐκείνοις δι᾽ οὓς** (Heb. 6:7). Note also **ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν** (Jo. 14:21) where the articular participle is the practical equivalent of a relative clause.

9. *Gender and Number*. Little remains to be said about variations in gender and number. Two passages in John call for re-

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 171. [2] Joh. Gr., p. 283.

mark, inasmuch as they bear on the personality of the Holy Spirit. In 14:26, **ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει**, the relative **ὅ** follows the grammatical gender of **πνεῦμα**. ʾ**Εκεῖνος**, however, skips over **πνεῦμα** and reverts to the gender of **παράκλητος**. In 16:13 a more striking example occurs, **ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας**. Here one has to go back six lines to **ἐκεῖνος** again and seven to **παράκλητος**. It is more evident therefore in this passage that John is insisting on the personality of the Holy Spirit, when the grammatical gender so easily called for **ἐκεῖνο**. Cf. **ὅ** in Jo. 14:17, 26 and **αὐτό** in 14:17. The feminine **ἐκείνης** in Lu. 19:4 evidently refers to **ὁδοῦ** unexpressed.

10. *Independent Use.* The frequency of **ἐκεῖνος** in John's Gospel may be noticed, but the Synoptics and Acts are not far behind. More curious, however, is the fact that in the Synoptics **ἐκεῖνος** is nearly always used with a substantive (adjectival) while the independent pronominal use of the singular is almost confined to the Gospel of John (and First Epistle).[1] All the uses in the First Epistle and nearly all in the Gospel are independent. As exceptions note Jo. 4:39, 53; 11:51, 53; 16:23, 26, etc. On the other hand only two instances appear in the Apocalypse (9:6; 11:13) and both with substantives.

(h) **Αὐτός**. It has undoubtedly developed in the **κοινή** a demonstrative force as already shown on p. 686, and as is plain in the modern Greek. Moulton[2] quotes plain examples from the papyri (see above). In the N. T. it is practically confined to Luke (and Mt. 3:4 perhaps), where it is fairly common, especially in the Gospel. So **ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ οἰκίᾳ** (Lu. 10:7), 'in that house.' Moulton[3] notes that in Mt. 11:25 (parallel to Lu. 10:21) we have **ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ** and in Mk. 13:11 **ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ** (parallel to Lu. 12:12 **ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ**). The tendency was not foreign to the ancient Greek and it is common enough in the modern vernacular[4] to find **αὐτὸς ὁ** = 'this.'

(i) THE CORRELATIVE DEMONSTRATIVES. Only four occur in the N. T. One of them appears only once and without the article, **φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε** (2 Pet. 1:17). It has died in the vernacular (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 63) like **ὅδε, τηλικόσδε** and **τοσόσδε. Τηλικοῦτος** appears once as predicate, **τηλικαῦτα ὄντα** (Jas.

[1] Abbott, ib. For the Joh. use of **ἐκεῖνος** see Steitz and A. Buttmann, Stud. in Krit. (1859, p. 497; 1860, p. 505; 1861, p. 267). Cf. Blass, Gr. of N.T. Gk., p. 172.

[2] Prol., p. 91. [3] Ib. [4] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 320, 351.

3:4), elsewhere attributive. The article is not used. This correlative of age always refers to size in the N. T. (2 Cor. 1:10; Heb. 2:3). Once indeed it is in connection with **οὕτως μέγας** (Rev. 16:18) and so redundant. The other two are **τοιοῦτος** and **τοσοῦτος. Τοιοῦτος** is the demonstrative of quality (Latin *talis*) and it is used with a good deal of freedom. It is, of course, merely **τοῖος** and **οὗτος** combined. The compound form alone occurs in the N. T. and became more frequent generally.[1] **Τοιοῦτος** without a substantive is used either without the article (Lu. 9:9) or more usually with the article in the attributive position (Mt. 19:14; Ac. 19:25; Ro. 1:32; 1 Cor. 7:28; 2 Cor. 10:11, etc.). In Jo. 4:23, **τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας**, the articular participle is in the predicate accusative. When used with substantives **τοιοῦτος** may be anarthrous, as in Mt. 9:8; 18:5; Mk. 4:33; Heb. 7:26; 8:1; Jas. 4:16, etc., but the article occurs also (Mk. 6:2; 9:37; 2 Cor. 12:3). In Mk. 6:2 we have the order **αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται** (cf. **οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος**). It comes before the substantive (Jo. 9:16) or after (Ac. 16:24). It is used as the antecedent of **οἷος** (Mk. 13:19; 1 Cor. 15:48; 2 Cor. 10:11) following **οἷος**. But note also **τοιούτους ὁποῖος** in Ac. 26:29, **τοιοῦτος ὅς** in Heb. 7:26 f.; 8:1, and in 1 Cor. 5:1 **τοιαύτη ἥτις.** We even have **τοιοῦτος ὡς** in Phil. 9. Cf. **ποῖος—τοιοῦτος** in a Logion of Jesus, P.Oxy. IV, p. 3, 1. **τοσοῦτος (τόσος, οὗτος)** is the pronoun of degree (Latin *tantus*), both size, **τοσαύτην πίστιν** (Mt. 8:10), and quantity, **ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι** (Mt. 15:33). It occurs with the article only once, **ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος** (Rev. 18:16). Sometimes it appears without a substantive, as in Ac. 5:8; Gal. 3:4; Heb. 1:4, etc. It is the correlative with **ὅσος** in Heb. 1:4 **τοσούτῳ — ὅσῳ**, 7:20-22 **καθ' ὅσον—κατὰ τοσοῦτο**, and in 10:25 **τοσούτῳ-ὅσῳ**. It is worth while at this point to note the correlative adverbs, **οὕτως ὥστε** (Ac. 14:1), **οὕτως ὡς** (1 Cor. 4:1), **οὕτως—ὅπως** (Mt. 5:16). Cf. **ὥστε—οὕτως δέ** (Ro. 15:20).

VII. Relative Pronouns (᾽αναφορικαὶ ἀντωνυμίαι).

(a) LIST IN THE N. T. The only relatives in the N. T. (not counting adverbs) are **ὅς, ὅστις, οἷος, ὁποῖος, ὅσος, ἡλίκος**, and **ὁ** in the Apocalypse. The others have fallen by the way. Some MSS. read **ὅνπερ** in Mk. 15:6, while **ὁσδήπερ** in Jo. 5:4 is not in the critical text. The LXX has **ὅπερ (ἅπερ)** five times,[2] but **ἡλίκος** not at all. These relative pronouns do not occur with uniform frequency as will be seen. **῞Ος** is the only one very common.

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 162.
[2] Thack., Gr. of 0. T. in Gk., vol. I, p. 192.

(b) THE NAME "RELATIVE." It is not very distinctive.[1] The idea of relation (anaphoric use) belongs to the demonstrative and to the personal pronouns also. The anaphoric demonstrative use is indeed the origin of the relative.[2] The transition from demonstrative to relative is apparent in Homer in the case of both ὁ and ὅς. Sometimes it is difficult in Homer to tell the demonstrative and the relative apart.[3] Cf. English *that*, German *der*. Homer often used τε and τις with ὁ and ὅς to distinguish the relative from the demonstrative.[4] Gradually the relative use, as distinct from the anaphoric demonstrative, won its way.

(c) A BOND BETWEEN CLAUSES. The relative becomes then the chief bond of connection between clauses. Indeed many of the conjunctions are merely relative adverbs, such as ὡς, ὅτε, ὅπως, etc. The relative plays a very important part in the structure of the subordinate sentence in Greek. That matter will receive due treatment in chapter XIX, Mode. The agreement of the relative with antecedent in person, number, gender, and sometimes case, is just the natural effort to relate more exactly the two clauses with each other. These points will receive discussion under ὅς which best exemplifies them. The assimilation is at bottom the same that we see in other adjectives (cf. demonstrative pronouns). The assimilation of the relative in person, gender, number, and even case of the antecedent may be compared to assimilation in the adjective and even verbs (compound verbs especially) and prepositions. Cf. Josef Liljeblad, *De Assimilatione Syntactica aped Thuc. Questiones,* 1900, p. 1).

(d) **῞Ος**.

1. *In Homer*. See discussion of the demonstrative ὅς for origin.[5] But already in Homer the relative sense, ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν, is the main one, and the demonstrative is on the decline.[6]

2. *Comparison with Other Relatives*. Though ὅς in the N. T. far outnumbers all the other relatives, yet the distinction between

[1] Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 81.

[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 556; Baron, Le Pron. Rel. et la Conj., 1891, p. 25. He notes that ὅς went from dem. to rel. before O did.

[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 186 ff.

[4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 35. **῞Οστε** survives in Pindar, Bacch., Ion. and Trag. choruses. Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 68 f.

[5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 195. Baron, Le Pron. Rel. et la Conj. en Grec, p. 35. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., III, p. 295 f.; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 243.

[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 186. So 65 yap is ambiguous. On the anaphoric demonstr. ὅς cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., III, p. 310; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 241.

ὅς and the other relatives is breaking down. Indeed in the vernacular it may be questioned if it was ever preserved. One may compare the unchangeable Hebrew אֲשֶׁר. Moulton[1] observes that in Polybius the distinction between ὅς and ὅστις has "worn rather thin." In the LXX ὅς is frequent,[2] but in the modern Greek ὅς "is used rarely even in writing."[3] It is wholly absent in the vernacular. The modern Greek vernacular uses **ποῦ** or **ὅπου**. In the oblique cases the conjunctive pronoun **τοῦ, τῆς** is added to **ποῦ** (cf. the Hebrew idiom). See Thumb, *Handb*., p. 93. Jebb (Vincent and Dickson's *Handb*., etc., p. 303) calls it "a curious example of false analogy" and finds an instance in Aristophanes (*Birds*, 1300), **μέλη ὅπου**. Here **ὅπου=ἐν οἷς**. The vernacular carried it further. He cites modern English vernacular, "The men as he met." Indeed in Rev. 2:13 **ὅπου** really points to an unexpressed **παρ᾽ ὑμῖν**. In Col. 3:11 **ὅπου** is almost personal. The occasional apparent confusion between ὅς and interrogative pronouns will be discussed directly. On the whole, ὅς in the N. T., as in the **κοινή** generally, is still used in accord with the classic idiom.

3. *With Any Person*. In itself, of course, ὅς, like all relatives, has no person. So the first person in 1 Cor. 15:10, the second person in Ro. 2:23, the third person in Mt. 5:19; Lu. 6:48 f.; 1 Cor. 4:17. These examples may suffice.

4. *Gender*. This is not so simple. The normal thing is for the relative to agree with the antecedent in gender, as in 1 Cor. 4:17, **Τιμόθεον, ὅς ἐστίν μου τέκνον**. So in Col. 1:24 **ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία**; Col. 2:10 **ἐν αὐτῷ, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή** (cf. Eph. 4:15) Col. 2:17 **σαββάτων, ἅ** (some MSS. **ὅ**) **ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων;** Rev. 5:6 **ὀφθαλμοὺς ἑπτά, οἵ εἰσιν τὰ** [**ἑπτὰ**] **πνεύματα**. In Rev. 21:8, **τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ τῇ καιομένῃ πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ ὅ ἐστιν ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος**, the agreement is regular, but the idea of ὅ may be more inclusive than merely[4] **μέρος**. Cf. 1 Pet. 3 : 4.

On the other hand the relative is assimilated in gender to the predicate substantive. This is also a perfectly natural agreement. Winer[5] considers that this is true particularly when the predicate presents the main idea. See Mk. 15:16, **τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον;** Gal. 3:16, **τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός**; Eph. 6:17, **τὴν μάχαιραν**

[1] Prol., p. 92. [2] Thack., Gr., vol. I, p. 192.

[3] V. and D., Handb., etc., p. 56. "The disuse of ὅς in common speech is characteristic; so simple a form ceased to satisfy the desire of emphasis." Jebb in V. and D., p. 302.

[4] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 231 f. [5] W.-M., p. 207.

τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ; Rev. 4:5, λαμπάδες—ἅ εἰσιν τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα (but some MSS. αἵ). Cf. 2 Th. 3:17. The MSS. vary in a number of instances between agreement with antecedent and predicate. So Col. 1:27, τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου—ὅς (or ὅ) ἐστιν Χριστός. Cf. also 1 Tim. 3:16, where the true text ὅς is changed in the Western class of documents to ὅ to agree with μυστήριον. See also Eph. 1:13 f., τῷ πνεύματι —ὅ (MSS. ὅς) ἐστιν ἀρραβών. So αἵ or ἅ in Rev. 5:8. In Mt. 13:31 f. κόκκῳ is followed first by ὅν and then by ὅ (cf. σπερμάτων).

In another group of passages the change is made according to the real gender rather than the grammatical. Thus in Ac. 15:17 τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ᾽ οὕς (cf. 26:17), Jo. 6:9 παιδάριον ὅς ἔχει, Ro. 9:23 f. σκεύη ἐλέους—οὕς, Col. 2:19 κεφαλὴν ἐξ οὗ, Phil. 10 τέκνου ὅν, Rev. 13:14 θηρίῳ ὅς. In Gal. 4:19 as is preceded by both ὑμᾶς and τεκνία. In 2 Jo. 1, ἐκλετῇ κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, οὕς the grammatical gender (feminine and neuter followed by masculine) is ignored entirely. Cf. Ph. 2:15.

In a passage like 1 Cor. 15:10, εἰμὶ ὅ εἰμι, there is no mistake. See ὅς above in verse 9. It is not *'who* I am,' but *'what* I am,' not exactly οἷος either, but a more abstract idea than that. Cf. ὅ in Jo. 4:22, used twice for the object of worship, God. So in 1 Jo. 1:1 observe ὃ ἦν—ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν (cf. verse 3) for Jesus. One may recall here that the collective abstract neuter, πᾶν ὅ (Jo. 6:37, 39; 17:2), is used for the disciples. Cf. ὅ---κἀκεῖνοι (Jo. 17:24).

Sometimes also the relative agrees neither with the antecedent nor with a predicate substantive, hut gathers the general notion of 'thing.' A good example occurs in 1 Jo. 2:8, ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθές, 'which thing is true.'[1] So Eph. 5:5, πλεονέκτης, ὅ (Western and Syrian classes read ὅς) ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης, 'which thing is being an idolater.' A particularly good example is Col. 3:14 where ὅ comes in between a feminine and a masculine, τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος. In Mk. 12:42 we have a similar example, λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης.

Indeed ὅ ἐστιν comes to be used as a set expression, like τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, without any regard to the antecedent or the predicate, as ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς, Mk. 3:17. Three phrases go together in this matter, ὅ ἐστιν, ὅ ἑρμηνεύεται, ὅ λέγεται. The two latter occur in the periphrastic form also. Indeed the examples just noted above may very well be explained from this point of view. So Mt. 1: 23, ᾽Εμμανουὴλ ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, where ob-

[1] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 302.

serve the neuter participle like ὅ. Cf. Ac. 4:36. In Mt. 27:33, **Γολγοθὰ ὅ ἐστιν κρανίου τόπος λεγόμενος**, the participle is masculine like **τόπος** (cf. Mk. 15:22). In Jo. 1:39 **ὃ λέγεται μεθερμηνευόμενον** connects two vocatives. Cf. 20:16. In Jo. 1:41 note the accusative and nominative connected with neuter participle, **Μεσσίαν ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Χριστός**, occurs between verb-forms, as in Mk. 5:41; 7:34; or genitives as in Heb. 7:2; Rev. 20:12; 21:17; or whole clauses, as in Mk. 15:34. But see Jo. 9:7; Rev. 20:2. In Ac. 9:36, however, the personal construction occurs, **Ταβειθά, ἣ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς**. See also chapter X, VIII, (c).

Once more, ὅ is used to refer to a verbal idea or to the whole sentence. Instance Mt. 12:4, **τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον ὅ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν**. Here probably **τὸ φαγεῖν** is the idea referred to,[1] though in Mk. 2:26 and Lu. 6:4 we have **οὕς**. The neuter gender is only natural here. In Ac. 2:32 **οὗ** is most likely 'whereof,' though 'of whom,' referring to **Ἰησοῦν**, is possible. So as to 3:15. But there is no doubt as to Ac. 11:30, **ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαι**; 26:10, **ὃ καὶ ἐποίησα**; Gal. 2:10, **ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι** (note here the use of **αὐτὸ τοῦτο** in the relative clause); Col. 1:29 **εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ** (cf. **εἰς ὅ** in 2 Th. 1:11; 2:14; 1 Pet. 2:8). Cf. also **ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα** (1 Pet. 3:21). *Per contra* see in the papyri ὅν used like ὅ after analogy of **τοιοῦτο(ν)**.[2] Note in passing **ὅ ὁ** in Lu. 2:15, like **ᾗ ἥ τε** in Heb. 9:2.

5. *Number*. Here again, as a rule, the relative concurs with the antecedent in number, as in **ἀστὴρ ὅν** (Mt. 2:9), **θεοῦ ὅς** (Ro. 2:6). The construction according to sense is not infrequent, as in **πλῆθος οἵ** (Lu. 6:17 f.), **κατὰ πόλιν πᾶσαν ἐν αἷς** (Ac. 15:36, note distributive idea), **μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία ἅ** (Eph. 5:4, where feminine singular could have occurred because of **ἤ), γενεᾶς—ἐν οἷς** (Ph. 2:15), **δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολὴν, ἐν αἷς** (2 Pet. 3:1, referring to both, probably). Cf. **ὅ — λέγοντας** (Rev. 5:13). On the other hand note the change from the plural to the singular in **ἡμέραι δώδεκα ἀφ' ἧς** (Ac. 24:11), and **ἐν οὐρανοῖς — ἐξ οὗ** (Ph. 3:20). For the neuter plural in the relative (cf. **ταῦτα**) to cover a vague general idea see **ὧν**, in 1 Tim. 1:6, **ἀνθ' ὧν** Lu. 1:20, **ἐν οἷς** Lu. 12:1 (cf. Ac. 26:12), **ἐφ' οἷς** Ro. 6:21, etc. Cf. Col. 2:22.

6. *Case*.

(a) *Absence of attraction normal.* The obvious way is for the case of the relative to be due to the construction in which it is used or to follow the same law as other nouns and pronouns (so

[1] W.-Sch., p. 233. [2] Mayser, Gr., p. 310.

with prepositions). That is to say, assimilation of case is not a necessity. It was indeed in a sense an after-refinement. One must not get the notion that assimilation of case had to be. Thucydides,[1] for instance, did not use it so extensively in his rather complicated sentences, where the relative clauses stand to themselves. Indeed the absence of it is common enough in the N. T., outside of Luke. Cf. Mt. 13:31 **κόκκῳ ὅν**, Mk. 13:19 **κτίσεως ἥν** Jo. 2:22 **λόγῳ ὅν**, (cf. 4:50), Jo. 4:5 **χωρίου ὅ** (CD **οὗ**), Tit. 3:5 **ἔργων ἃ,** Mt. 27:60 **μνημείῳ ὅ**, Ac. 8:32 **γραφῆς ἥν.** Not to be exhaustive, one may refer to the rather long list in Winer-Schmiedel[2] (Mt. 13:44, 48; 23:35; Lu. 13:19, 21; Ac. 1:4; 4:10; 1 Tim. 6:21; Heb. 6:19; 8:2; 9:7; 1 Pet. 1:8; Rev. 1:20, etc.). The absence of assimilation in case is not only common in the old Greek, but also in the LXX, the Apocrypha and the papyri. In Aristotle attraction is nearly confined to the more recondite essays (Schindler, *De Attractionis Pronominum Rel. Usu Aristotelico*, p. 94).

(β) *Cognate accusative*. The accusative in Ro. 6:10, **ὃ ἀπέθανεν, ὃ ζῇ,** and Gal. 2:20, **ὃ ζῶ**, may be called adverbial. In reality it reproduces the idea of the verb (cognate acc.). Cf. Mk. 10:38 f.

(γ) *Attraction to the case of the antecedent.* This is very common in the N. T., especially in the writings of Luke. The papyri, even "the most illiterate of them,"[3] show numerous examples of attraction, "a construction at least as popular in late as in classical Greek." This applies to the LXX also. The MSS. naturally vary sometimes, some having attraction, others not. Indeed Blass[4] finds this "always" in the passages in W. H. without attraction save in Heb. 8:2. Cf. **ἥν (ἧς)** in Mk. 13:19, **ὅν (ᾧ)** in Jo. 2:22; 4:50, etc. On the whole attraction seems the more common. But this "idiomatic attraction of the relative" "occurs only twice in Matthew (18:19; 24:50) and once in Mark (7:13)," whereas it "is very common in Luke" (Plummer, *Comm*., p. li). The effect of "this peculiar construction" was to give "a sentence more internal unity and a certain periodic compactness."[5] No instance of attraction of a nominative to an oblique case occurs in the N. T., though this idiom is found in the ancient Greek.[6]

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 173. [2] P. 226.
Moulton, Prol., p. 93. Attraction of the relative to the case of the antecedent is not unknown in Lat. Cf. Draeger, Hist. Synt., Bd. II, p. 507. Hom. shows only one instance. Middleton (Analogies in Synt., p: 19) considers analogy the explanation of the origin of attraction.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 173. [5] W.-Th., p. 163.

[6] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 71; W.-Sch., p. 227,

It is usually the accusative case that is assimilated into another oblique case. Thus the accusative may be attracted into the genitive, as **πράγματος οὗ** (Mt. 18:19), **λόγου οὗ** (Jo. 15:20), **πάντων ὧν** (Ac. 1:1; 3:21; 22:10), **διαθήκης ἧς** (Ac. 3:25), **ἐπαγγελίας ἧς** (7:17), **ἐθνῶν ὧν** (7:45), **πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗ** (Tit. 3:6). Cf. also Ac. 9:36; 22:10; 1 Cor. 6:19; 2 Cor. 10:8, 13; Eph. 1: 8; Heb. 6:10; 9:20; Jas. 2:5. In several instances it is the accusative of the inner object that is attracted. Cf. Eph. 1:19 f. So **παρακλήσεως ἧς παρακαλούμεθα** (2 Cor. 1:4), **χάριτος ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν** (Eph. 1:6), **κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε** (4:1), **φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραξα** (Ac. 24:21), **ἔργων ἀσεβείας ὧν ἠσέβησαν** (Ju. 15).[1] There are examples also of the accusative attracted to the ablative. So **ἐκ τῶν κερατίων ὧν** (Lu. 15:16), **ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ** (Jo. 4:14), **ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὧν** (21:10), **ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος οὗ** (1 Jo. 3:24). Cf. Jo. 7:31. Then again the assimilation of the accusative to the pure dative might have been expected, but curiously enough I find so far no example of it in the N. T. In 1 Cor. 7:39 there is an instance of the relative attracted from the accusative to the dative of an omitted antecedent, **ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι**, unless **γαμηθῆναι** be repeated, when **ᾧ** is the necessary case. However, several examples occur where the accusative is attracted to the locative or the instrumental. Instances of the locative are found in **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ--ἐν ὥρᾳ ᾗ** (Mt. 24:50. This is not an instance of one preposition for antecedent and relative), **ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς** (Lu. 2:20; 9:43; 24:25), **ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ** (Jo. 17:11 f.),[2] **ἐν—θλίψεσιν αἷς** (Ac. 7:16), **ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ** (17:31), **ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ** (20:38), **ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ᾗ** (2 Cor. 12:21), **ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς οἷς** (Eph. 2:10),[2] **ἐν τῷ μνήματι ᾧ** (2 Th. 1:4), **ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ᾧ** (Rev. 18:6). This is probably true also of 1 Cor. 7:20, **ἐν τῇ κλήσει ᾗ ἐκλήθη**, where **ἥν** would have been the cognate accusative.[3] For attraction to the instrumental see **παραδόσει ᾗ** (Mk. 7:13), **δόξῃ ᾗ** (Jo. 17:5, but W. H. have **ἥν** in margin), **σημείοις οἷς** (Ac. 2:22), **θυσίαις αἷς** (Heb. 10:1, but W. H. as). In a few instances it is an open question whether we have attraction or not. Thus in Jo. 13:5, **τῷ λεντίῳ ᾧ ἦν διεζωσμένος,** either the instrumental **ᾧ** or the accusative **ὅ** (cf. Jo. 21:7) is correct. In Ac. 9:17, **ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ᾗ ἤρχου**, the cognate accusative **ἥν** is possible, though the locative originally is more likely. In 1 Th. 3:9, **ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ᾗ χαίρομεν**, a cognate accusative was possible (**ἥν**) attracted

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174; Moulton, Prol., p. 93.

[2] But in W.-Sch. (p. 225) ois is held to be essential to the structure. For attraction in John see Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 298,

[3] But see *per contra* W.-Sch., p. 223.

to the locative or an original instrumental. In Col. 1:23, **τοῦ εὐ-αγγελίου οὗ ἠκούσατε**, either the accusative or the genitive might occur with **ἀκούω**. But in 2 Tim. 1:13, **λόγων ὧν παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας**, the accusative was almost certainly the original form.[1] Cf. Ac. 1:4 **ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου**. Plummer (*On Luke*, p. li) notes that this attraction in Luke is particularly frequent after **πᾶς** (Lu. 2:20; 3:19; 9:43, etc.). In Lu. 5:9, **ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων ὧν (ἧ) συνέλαβον**, the attraction in some MSS. is to the locative, in others to the genitive.

A few instances are found in the N. T. where the attraction is from some other case than the accusative. A clear case of a locative assimilated to a genitive appears in Ac. 1:22, **ἕως τῆς ηπμέρας ἧς ἀνελήμφθη**. This is in accord with the ancient Greek idiom. The very same construction appears in the LXX (Lev. 23:15. Cf. Bar. 1:19). In 1 Tim. 4:6 A reads **διδασκαλίας ᾗ παρηκολούθηκας,** but the rest have **ἧς**. A dative has been attracted into the genitive along with incorporation and the preposition in Ro. 4:17, **κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ= κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ᾧ ἐπίστευσεν**. So the phrase **ἀφ᾽ ἧς** (Ac. 24:11; 2 Pet. 3:4, but Lu. 7:45 **ὥρας**) is an abbreviation of etc, **ἀφ᾽ ἡμέρας ᾗ** (locative attracted to ablative). In Ac. 20:18 we actually have **ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἐπέβην**, but as a point of departure (ablative) rather than a point of location (locative). Cf. also **ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἡμέρας** (Col. 1:6, 9) where the incorporation resolves itself into **ἀφ᾽ ἡμέρας ᾗ.** So likewise **ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας** (Mt. 24:38; Lu. 1:20; 17:27; Ac. 1:2) really comes from **ἄχρι ἡμέρας ᾗ** (locative to genitive). In Heb. 3:9 a can be regarded as adverb 'where' or as relative 'wherewith' (marg. of the American Revision). If it is relative, **ᾧ** was probably the unattracted form (instrumental to genitive like **πειρασμοῦ**). In Mk. 10:38 f., **τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ βαπτίζομαι**, the relative is in the cognate accusative retained with the passive verb.[2] See further chapter on Cases.

(5) *Inverse attraction.* What is called inverse attraction is due to the same tendency to identify antecedent and relative, only the assimilation is that of the antecedent to the relative. In itself this phenomenon is no more peculiar than the other. Plato,, who uses the ordinary attraction very often, seldom has inverse attraction (Cleef, *De Attractionis in Enuntionibus Rel. Vsv Platonico*, pp. 44-46). No inverse attraction is found in Pisidian Greek (Compernass, *De Serm. Gr.*, p. 13). The examples are not very numerous in the N. T., but the ancient Greek amply supports the

[1] W.-Sch., p. 225. Hort in note to text says: "**ὧν** probably a primitive error for **ὃν**."

[2] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 226 f.

idiom.[1] One example, **λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν**, occurs in Mt. 21:42; Mk. 12:10= Lu. 20:17. It is from the LXX (Ps. 118:22). In 1 Pet. 2:7 W. H. read Mos. Cf. also Lu. 1:73, **ὅρκον ὃν ὤμσεν,** which might have been **ὅρκου οὗ** after **μνησθῆναι**.[2] See also 1 Cor. 10:16, **τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν**. Hence also **τὸ ποτήριον ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν**, of verse 16. If **ὅν** is a part of the text (not W. H.) in Ac. 10:36, we have **τὸν λόγον ὅν**.[3] Sometimes anacoluthon occurs also as in **πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργὸν ὅ—περὶ αὐτοῦ**, Mt. 12:36; **πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ—ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ,** Lu. 12:10; **παντὶ ᾧ ἐδόθη—ζητηθήσεται παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ**, 12:48; **πᾶν ὃ δέδωκεν—ἐξ αὐτοῦ**, Jo. 6:39; **πὰν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώσει αὐτοῖς**, 17:2. In 2 Cor. 12:17, **μή τινα ὧν – δι᾽ αὐτοῦ**, we have anacoluthon, but not attraction. In Mt. 25:24, **συνάγεις ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας**, we have **ἐκεῖθεν ὅπου** shortened to **ὅθεν**. There is not inverse attraction in **οὐδεὶς ὅς** (1 Cor. 6:5) since **ἕνι** precedes **οὐδείς**.

(ε) *Incorporation*. But the most striking instance of this close unity between antecedent and relative is the incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause with identity of case. I count 54 such examples in Moulton and Geden.[4] They are fairly well distributed through the different portions of the New Testament. 1) The simplest form of such incorporation is where no change of case is required. Thus Lu. 24:1, **φέρουσαι ἃ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα**; Jo. 6:14, **ἰδόντες ἃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖα** (W. H.); Mt. 7:2, **ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε, καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεατι ὑμῖν**= Mk. 4: 24 = Lu. 6:38; Mt. 24:44, **ᾗ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρᾳ**=Lu. 12:40 (not Mt. 24:50). For further examples of this simple incorporation see Mt. 23:37 = Lu. 13:34 (the set phrase, adverbial accusative, **ὃν τρόπον**), so also Ac. 1:11; 7:28; 15:11; 27:25; Mk. 2:19 (**ὅσον χρόνον**; but not Lu. 12:46= Mt. 24:50); Lu. 17:29 f.; Jo. 9:14; 11:6; 17:3; Ac. 7:20; 25:18; probably 26:7; Ro. 2:16; 7: 19; 9:24 (**οὓς—ἡμᾶς** note); 16:2; Ph. 3:18 (but probably only predicate accusative like Mk. 15:12); 2 Tim. 1:6 (**δι᾽ ἥν**). In 1 Jo. 2:25 there is not exactly incorporation, but apposition to the relative. In Lu. 8:47; Ac. 22:24 and Heb. 2:11 the case is the same also, but the preposition would have been needed only with the relative. Cf. Phil. 10; 2 Tim. 1:12; Heb. 13:11. See **ὧν—πονηρῶν**, Ac. 25:18, where there is incorporation and attraction to the case of the antecedent. The same thing is true

[1] Cf. Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 71.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.

[3] Cf. Blass, ib., and Comm. on Acts *in loco*.

[4] This is more than "occasional," as Blass says (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174). He rightly notes the absence of the article.

of Rev. 17:8, where βλεπόντων agrees with ὧν. In Heb. 13:11, ὧν ζώων—**τούτων**, the substantive is incorporated, but the demonstrative is repeated afterwards. Cf. also **ὃ--αὐτὸ τοῦτο** (Gal. 2:10). It is possible that Ro. 4:17 belongs here, the preposition **κατέναντι**, being understood twice. The same thing may be true of Lu. 1:4, περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν (either λόγων [or περὶ λόγων] περὶ ὧν or περὶ λόγων οὕς).

2) But sometimes besides incorporation there has resulted a change of case also. The antecedent may be drawn into the case of the relative (cf. inverse attraction) as in Mk. 6:16, **ὅν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα ᾽Ιωάνην οὗτος ἠγέρθη**. Here the demonstrative pronoun is resumptive. The change is made from nominative to accusative. The same thing is true of the spurious passage in Jo. 5:4, 4.) **δήποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι** (change from genitive to instrumental). This is probably true of Ac. 21:16, **ἄγοντες παρ᾽ ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ**. The resolution of this passage is not certain, but it may be **ἄγοντες Μνάσωνα παρ᾽ ᾧ** (change from accusative to locative).[1] But **πρὸς Μνάσωνα** may be correct.

In Ro. 6:17, **ὑπηκούσατε εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς**, the resolved form would probably be **τύπῳ διδαχῆς εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε**. In Heb. 7:14, **εἰς ἣν φυλήν**, the substantive would have been in apposition with **ἐξ ᾽Ιούδα** (the ablative). In Heb. 10:10 **ἐν ᾧ θελήματι** the accusative **τὸ θέλημα** is present in the preceding sentence. The same thing is true of 1 Pet. 1:10, **περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας** (**σωτηρίαν** just before). In 2 Cor. 10:13 we have in the same sentence the substantive repeated (once incorporated and attracted to the case of the relative, but the relative itself attracted to the case of **κανόνος**), **κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνους οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρου**.

3) In a few instances the attraction has been that of the relative to the case of the antecedent, transferred to the relative clause. See Ac. 25:18, **ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν πονηρῶν**. For examples with prepositions (see chapter on Prepositions) note: **περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίσηεν πονηρῶν** (Lu. 3:19), **περὶ παῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων** (19:37), where the incorporation is only partial. It is clear therefore that in the great majority of instances there is no change of case required. Very many also are set phrases like **ὃν τρόπον, ᾗ ὥρᾳ, ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ, δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν**, etc. For presence of the antecedent see Jo. 16:17 f.

7. *Absence of Antecedent*. It so often happens that the relative has no antecedent that it calls for special consideration.

[1] Thompson (Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 71 f.) finds this change only in the acc. But this is not Attic.

The clause indeed often becomes a substantive rather than an adjective clause. **Ὅς** thus occurs in general statements as in Mt. 10:14; 23:16, 18 (cf. also **πᾶς ὅς**, Lu. 12:48; 14:33; Ac. 2:21; Gal. 3:10). Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 173) gives a large number of such instances of the general or indefinite use of **ὅς**. So as **ὅς ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω** (Mk. 4:9), where the relative clause is the subject of **ἀκουέτω**. This is the indefinite relative. Cf. Mk. 4:25. Here the relative and the antecedent (if expressed) are in the same case (nominative). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:10, **εἰμί ὅ εἰμι**; Lu. 9:50, etc. Both may be in the accusative as in **ὃ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω πᾶσιν λέγω** (Mk. 13:37), **μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει** (Lu. 9:33). Cf. Mk. 15:12; Lu. 11:6; Jo. 1:45; 6:29; 19:37, etc. But the relative may be in the accusative when the antecedent would have been in the nominative. So **ὃ λαλεῖ γίνεται** (Mk. 11:23). Cf. Jo. 1:26; 4:18, etc.

So both may be examples of the genitive, as **συγγενὴς ὢν οὗ ἀπέκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὠτίον** (Jo. 18:26) where **οὗ= τούτου οὗ.** So in 1 Cor. 7:1 **περὶ ὧν=περὶ τούτων** (or **πραγμάτων**) **περὶ ὧν**. But in **ἄχρι οὗ** (Rev. 2:25) we really have **ἄχρι καιροῦ ᾧ** (or **ἐν ᾧ**). In Lu. 23:41, **ἄξια ὧν ἐπράξαμεν**, the resolution is **τούτων ἅ** (gen. and acc.). So in Jo. 17:9 **περὶ ὧν δέδωκας=περὶ τούτων οὕς**. In Ac. 21:24 **χηνται περὶ σοῦ οὐδέν=τούτων ἅ**, etc. Exactly so **ὧν** in Lu. 9:36; 23: 14; Ac. 8:24; 22:15; 25:11; Ro. 15:18; 2 Cor. 12:17. In Ac. 26:16, **μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδές με ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι**, it is the second **ὧν** that gives trouble. The antecedent would be **τούτων** and the relative before attraction either a (ace. of general reference) or **οἷς** (locative or instrumental). In Ro. 4:7 **ὧν** has as its unexpressed antecedent **οὗτοι**. CF. also Ac. 13:25. In Mt. 6:8 (so Jo. 13:29), **ὧν χρείαν**, the antecedent would be in the accusative. So also **περὶ ὧν**. Ac. 24:13. In Lu. 17:1 **δι᾽ οὗ** is resolved into **τούτῳ δι᾽ οὗ** (dative). In Ro. 10:14, **πῶς πιστεύσωσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν**, we probably have **οὗ=εἰς τοῦτον** (or **τούτῳ**) **οὗ**.

The examples of the ablative are not many. See Jo. 7:31 where **ὧν** after **πλείονα σημεῖα** is to he resolved into **τούτων ἅ** (abl. and acc.). So in Ac. 26:22 **ἐκτὸς ὧν= ἐκτὸς τούτων ἅ**. In Heb. 5:8 **ἀφ᾽ ὧν= ἀπὸ τούτων ἅ**, while in 2 Cor. 2:3 **ἀφ᾽ ὧν = ἀπὸ τούτων ἀφ᾽ ὧν.** Cf. Lu. 6:34, **παρ᾽ ὧν**; 1 Cor. 10:30. In Ac. 13:39, **ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν**, the one preposition covers both ablatives.

For the dative I note **οἷς δέδοται** (Mt. 19:11), where the antecedent like **πάντες** would have been in the nominative. Cf. Lu. 7:43, 47 **ᾧ**; Ro. 15:21 **οἷς** and 2 Pet. 1:9 **ᾧ**. In 1 Cor. 7:39, **ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι**, the antecedent would have been in the dative also. So also 2 Cor. 2 : 10 **ᾧ;** Ro. 6:16 **ᾧ** twice. In 2 Tim. 1.12, **οἶδα ᾧ**

πεπίστευκα, it is the accusative rather followed by dative, αὐτον ᾧ. In Mt. 20:23 (Mk. 10:40) the antecedent of οἷς is probably τούτων. In Ro. 10:14 the antecedent of οὗ would be τούτῳ.

Some few examples of the locative appear also. Cf. ἐφ᾽ οἷς, Ro. 6:21, where the antecedent would have been ἐπὶ τούτοις. So Ro. 2:1 and 14:22 ἐν ᾧ implies ἐν τούτῳ (cf. also 1 Pet. 2:12; 3:16), but not so verse 21 where ἐν ᾧ refers to an involved τι or μηδέν. In Ro. 7:6 ἐν ᾧ may involve τούτῳ ἐν ᾧ. In Heb. 2:18 ἐν ᾧ (=ἐν τούτῳ ἐν ᾧ) really has a causal force. In Ph. 4:11 ἐν οἷς=ἐν τούτοις ἐν οἷς, but in 2 Tim. 3:14 ἐν οἷς=ἐν τούτοις ἃ. Cf. 2 Pet. 2:12 (but ταῦτα ἐν οἷς may be correct).

I have noticed no examples of the instrumental. But great freedom and variety are manifest.

8. *Prepositions with the Antecedent and Relative*. The preposition may be used twice[1] "in the case of a, sharper division of the relative clause." So εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην, εἰς ἣν, Ac. 7:4; ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀφ᾽ ἧς 20:18. Then again the preposition may occur with the antecedent, but not with the relative, though implied, as in ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ ᾧ εἰσῆλθεν Ac. 1:21. So the margin in Ro. 2:16 ἐν ηπμέρᾳ ᾗ. Cf. Lu. 1:25. It is possible also so to understand ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ᾗ ἤρχου Ac. 9:17. But it is clearly true of ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν, Ac. 13:39.

On the other hand the preposition may occur with the relative, but not with the antecedent. Thus ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐν ᾗ, Jo. 4:53. When the antecedent is absent, the preposition may be the one common to both, as in ἀφ᾽ ὧν (2 Cor. 2:3), or which belongs to only one. Cf. παρ᾽ ὧν (Lu. 6:34), ἐφ᾽ οἷς (Ro. 6:21), ἐν οἷς (Ph. 4:11), ὑπὲρ οὗ (1 Cor. 10:30), ἐν ᾧ (Ro. 14:22), as εἰς ὅν (Ro. 10:14), περὶ ὧν (1 Cor. 7:1), etc. This "one" may be the antecedent, as in the following examples, εἰς ὅν (Jo. 6:29) =εἰς τοῦτον ὅν, περὶ ὧν (Jo. 17:9) = περί τούτων οὕς, ὑπὲρ ἅ (1 Cor. 4:6) =ὑπὲρ ταῦτα ἅ, ἀφ᾽ ὧν, (Heb. 5:8)= ἀπὸ τούτων ἅ, εἰς ὅν (Jo. 19:37)= εἰς τοῦτον ὅν, etc. Or the "one" may be the relative, as δι᾽ οὗ (Lu. 17:1)= τούτῳ δι᾽ οὗ, ἐφ᾽ ὅν (Heb. 7:13)= οὗτος ἐφ᾽ ὅν, etc. The use of prepositions is common in the same way with the relative and its incorporated antecedent. See ἐν ᾧ κρίματι (Mt. 7:2), ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας (Lu. 1:20), δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν (Lu. 8:47), παρ᾽ ᾧ--Μνάσωνι (Ac. 21:16), εἰς ὃν—τύπον (Ro. 6:17), ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἡμέρας (Col. 1:9), περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας (1 Pet. 1:10), etc. Cf. Ro. 16:2.

9. *Relative Phrases.* Some of the abbreviated prepositional clauses come to be used at the beginning of principal sentences

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 174.

like the free use of conjunctions and relatives. Cf. Latin use of *qui*. Cf. Draeger, *Hist. Syntax*, Bd. II, p. 512. So ἀνθ᾽ ὧν (Lu. 12:3), ἐν οἷς (12:1), διό (Heb. 3:7), περὶ ὧν (1 Cor. 7:1), οὗ χάριν (Lu. 7:47), δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν (2 Tim. 1:6). Cf. ὅθεν (Heb. 3:1). Indeed (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 228) ἐν ᾧ may be here equal to τούτῳ ὅτι, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν= ἀντὶ τούτων ὅτι, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ=ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι (2 Cor. 5:4), διότι (1 Th. 2:8)= διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι, ἐφ᾽ οἷς (Ro. 6:21), etc. The temporal and causal use of the relative phrases is common. Cf. ἐν ᾧ (Heb. 2:18). Indeed καθό (Ro. 8:26) is καθ᾽ ὅς καθότι (Ac. 2:45) is καθ᾽ ὅτι, καθάπερ (Ro. 4:6) is καθ᾽ ἅπερ. Cf. ἐφ᾽ ὅσον (Mt. 9:15), καθ᾽ ὅσον (Heb. 3:3).

Adverbs show the same phenomena as other relative forms. Thus in Ro. 5:20 οὗ has no antecedent. In 1 Cor. 16:6 οὗ= ἐκεῖσε οὗ. So ὅπου in Jo. 11:32 =ἐκεῖσε ὅπου and in Jo. 20:19 =ἐνταῦθα ὅπου. In 2 Sam. 14:15 ὅ= conjunction.

10. *Pleonastic Antecedent*. The redundant antecedent incorporated into the relative clause has attracted considerable attention. In Herodotus 4, 44 ὃς—οὗτος occurs,[1] and Blass[2] cites Hyper. Eux. § 3, ὧν—τούτων. But in ancient Greek it was a very rare usage. In Winer-Schmiedel[3] examples of pleonastic οὗτος are cited from Xenophon, Diodorus Siculus, Pausanias, Sophocles. Pleonastic αὐτός appears in Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1237, οἷς θυτέον αὐτοῖς. Reference also is made to Sophocles and Lucian. In the LXX the idiom is extremely common, manifestly under the influence of the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר לוֹ (cf. Aramaic דְּ). It "is found in all parts of the LXX and undoubtedly owes its frequency to the Hebrew original. But the fact that it is found in an original Greek work, such as 2 Macc. (xii, 27 ἐν ᾗ . . . ἐν αυττῇ) and a paraphrase such as 1 Esdras (iii, 5, 9; iv, 54, 63; vi, 32), is sufficient to warrant its presence in the κοινή."[4] For numerous examples of the idiom in the LXX see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 200, and Winer-Moulton, p. 185. Cf. also Conybeare and Stock, *Selections*, pp. 65 ff. As a matter of fact the examples are not very numerous in the N. T. It occurs several times in Rev. (3:8 ἣν—αὐτήν, 7:2 οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς, 7:9 ὃν—αὐτόν, 13:8 οὗ--αὐτοῦ, 20:8 ὧν—αὐτῶν). Outside of the Apocalypse, which so strongly bears the influence of the LXX, the usage is infrequent. See Mt. 3:12, οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, an example hardly parallel as a matter of fact. But a clearer instance is Mk. 1:7 (= Lu. 3:16 f.), οὗ--αὐτοῦ, and still more so 7:25, ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς. Cf. also οἵα—τοιαύτη (Mk. 13:19), οἷος—

[1] K.-G., II, p. 433.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
[3] P. ,201. Cf. also W.-M., p. 185.
[4] Mack., Gr. of 0. T. in Gk., p. 46.

τηλικοῦτος (Rev. 16:18), οἵα—οὕτως (Mk. 9:3), ὅπου—ἐκεῖ (Rev. 12:6, 14), ὅπου—ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν, (Rev. 17:9).[1] In Arc. 15:17, ἐφ᾽ οὓς—ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, we have a quotation from the LXX (Amos 9:12). "The N. T. examples are all from places where Aramaic sources are certain or suspected" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 95). One almost wonders, after this admission, why Moulton, p. 94, seems so anxious to prove that the idiom in the N. T. is not a Hebraism. By his own admission it seems a practical Hebraism there, though the idiom had an independent development in the Greek. The early sporadic examples in the ancient Greek[2] blossom out in the later Greek again and in the modern Greek become very common. Psichari[3] considers it rather far-fetched in Moulton to appeal to the modern Greek vernacular, ὁ γιατρὸς ποῦ τὸν ἔστειλα, 'the doctor whom I sent for,' since the modern Greek vernacular just as readily uses ποῦ without αὐτόν. Psichari complains that Thumb[4] also has not explained clearly this idiom. But Psichari, believes that the idiom existed in the vernacular κοινή (and so fell in readily with the Hebrew usage) and has persisted to the present day. He considers[5] the example from a papyrus of the third century A.D. (P.Oxy. I, 117,15) decisive, ἐξ ὧν — ἐξ αὐτῶν. See also P. Amh. II, 11, 26, ὅπερ φανερὸν τοῦτο ἐγένετο. Moulton[6] has given abundant examples from Old English. So in Chaucer (*Knightes Tale*, 1851 f.):

" Namely oon,
That with a spore was thirled *his* brest-boon."

He compares also the German *der du bist.* Simcox[7] cites vernacular English "a thing which I don't like it." Evidently therefore the idiom has had independent development in various languages in the vernacular. According to Jannaris (*Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 353) the relative is in such cases regarded as "a mere, connective."

In Gal. 3:1, οἷς —ἐν ὑμῖν, W. H. reject ἐν ὑμῖν. In Gal. 2:10, ὃ—αὐτὸ τοῦτο, we have the intensive use of αὐτό, but τοῦτο is pleonastic. In 1 Pet. 2:24, ὃς —αὐτός, we have again intensive αὐτός.

11. The Repetition of ὅς. Winer[8] rightly remarks that it is a misapprehension of the Greek genius to expect the relative rather than αὐτός or οὗτος in a case like Jo. 1:7; Lu. 2:36; 19:2; Ac.

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175; Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 59.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175, cites οὗ ἡ πνοὴ αὐτοῦ, from Clem. Cor. 21. 9.
[3] Essai sur le grec de la Sept., p. 182.
[4] Hellen., p. 128.
[5] Cf. also Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 353. [6] Prol., p. 94.
[7] Lang. of the N. T., p. 59. Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p.1113.
[8] W.-M., p. 186.

10:36. The old Greek could, and commonly did,[1] use **οὗτος** or more usually **αὐτός** with **καί** to continue the narrative. Blass[2] rather curiously calls it "negligent usage." Cf. Lu. 13:4, **ἐφ᾽ οὓς ἔπεσεν ὁ πύργος καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτούς**; 1 Cor. 8:6, **ἐξ οὗ--καὶ εἰς αυτόν** and **δι᾽ οὗ — καὶ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ** (cf. Heb. 11:4); 2 Pet. 2:3, **οἷς — καὶ αὐτῶν**; Rev. 17:2, **μεθ᾽ ἧς — καὶ αὐτῆς**. In Lu. 17:31 **καὶ ὁ** occurs rather than **καὶ αὐτός**. Cf. Jo. 13:24. In Jo. 1:33, **ἐφ᾽ ὃν –καὶ ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν**, the repetition of the relative would have been impracticable. But in 1 Cor. 7:13 Paul might very well have written **ἥτις—καὶ ὅς** rather than **καὶ οὗτος** (a sort of parenthesis). It is common,[3] also, to have neither the relative repeated nor the demonstrative. So **ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν**, (Ro. 8:32). Cf. Ph. 4:9.

But the relative may be repeated. A good many such examples occur in the N. T. **Καί** may be used, as **ὧν καὶ ὧν** (Ro. 4:7). Cf. also **οὗ**— **ᾧ καί** (Ac. 27:23) and **ὧν τε –ὧν τε** — (Ac. 26:16). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:1 f., **ὃ--ὃ καὶ -- ἐν ᾧ καὶ -- δι᾽ οὗ καὶ**. See Jo. 21:20. But examples occur also of the repetition of the relative without any conjunction, as in **ὃς — ὃν— παρ᾽ οὗ** (Ac. 24:6). See 1 Cor. 4:17. Cf. **ὅσα –ὅσα**, etc. (Ph. 4:8). This repetition of **ὅς** is specially frequent in Paul. Cf. Col. 1:24, 28 f.; Eph. 3:11 f.; 1 Cor. 2:7 f., though it is not exactly "peculiar" to him (Winer-Moulton, p. 209). In 1 Jo. 1:1 **ὃ** is repeated without conjunction three times, while in verse 3 **ὃ** is not repeated with the second verb. In 1 Pet. 1: 6-12 four sentences begin with a relative. In Ro. 9:4 f. we have **οἵτινες — ὧν— ὧν — καὶ ἐξ ὧν**.

The use of **ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὅσα** together (Lu. 12:3) finds abundant parallel in the LXX, easily falling in with the Hebrew construction[4] with אֲשֶׁר. Thus a double relative occurs.

In Ro. 4:21 the conjunction of **ὅτι ὅ** is merely accidental; but that is not true of **ὅ — ὅτι** in 1 Jo. 4:3. Cf. also **οἷον ὅτι** in Ro. 9:6.

12. *A Consecutive Idea*. This may be implied in **ὅς**. Thus in Lu. 7:4, **ἄξιος ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ τοῦτο**. One is reminded of *qui* in Latin.[5] Cf. also **τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὅς καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἀφίησιν**; (Lu. 7:49). A particularly good example is 1 Cor. 2:16, **τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου, ὃς συνβιβάσει αὐτόν**; See chapter XIX, Mode.

13. *Causal*. **Ὅς** may also introduce a causal sentence. So **ὅς**

[1] Bernhardy, p. 304; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 354; Jelf, 833.2; K.-G., II, p. 432. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175,

[3] "Normal" indeed. Thompson, Synt., p. 70.

[4] Thack., Gr. of 0. T. in Gk., p. 25.

[5] Cf. Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 369.

γε in Ro. 8:32. Cf. Latin *quippe qui.* This is perfectly regular in ancient Attic. Cf. Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek*, p. 374. See also chapter XIX, Mode.

14. *In Direct Questions*. The passage in Mt. 26:50, **ἑταῖρε, ἐφ᾽ ὃ πάρει**, is the only one in the N. T. where such a construction is possible. There is no doubt as to the occasional use of **ὅστις** (see (e), 9), **ὁπόσος, ὁπότερος, ὅπως** in direct questions in the ancient Greek. For examples see Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 473 f. See further chapter XIX, Mode. This double use of relative pronouns is on a par with the double use of interrogative stems (cf. indefinite) so common in the Indo-Germanic tongues.[1] The Latin *qui* and *quis* are kin in root and usage. Moulton[2] rightly considers it "superfluous to say that this usage cannot possibly be extended to direct question." Winer[3] explained the "misuse" as belonging to late Greek. A few examples[4] of **ὅς** in a direct question do occur. So in Euseb., P. E. vi, 7: 257 d, Gaisford edition, **ὧν ἕνεκα**; Just., *Cohort*. 5 (p. 253 A), **δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν — προσέχεις Ὁμήρῳ**; *Apophth*., 105 C, **᾽Αρσένιε, δι᾽ ὃ ἐξῆλθες**. Certainly the idiom was chiefly in the vernacular and rare even there. Blass[5] conjectures a slip in the text, **αἶρε** having been changed to **ἑταῖρε**, and Chrysostom had an imperative in his text. We may suppose "a rather harsh ellipsis" of the principal verb and treat it as an ordinary relative.[6] **Ὅς** may indeed here be demonstrative as suggested by Noah K. Davis.[7] There was undoubtedly in the later Greek considerable confusion in the use of the relatives and the interrogatives. It is not impossible for **ὅς** here to be interrogative. That is as much as one can at present say. Blass thought it "quite incredible."

15. *In Indirect Questions*. Here the matter is much clearer. Even Blass[8] admits that "relatives and interrogatives become confused in Greek as in other languages." In the classical language **ὅς** (still more **ὅστις**) is "frequently" so employed. This use comes from Homer on down and occurs in Aristophanes, Sophocles, Herodotus, Xenophon, Plato, Lysias. Thucydides[9] uses it side by side with **ὅστις**. The papyri have it as Moulton has shown.[10]

[1] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gr., p. 74.
[2] Prol., p. 93. [3] W.-M., p. 208.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 331; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 474.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176. [6] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 68.
[7] Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 178.
[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.
[9] Thompson, Synt., p. 74. Cf. also Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 473; Moulton, Prol., p. 93.
[10] Prol., p. 93; Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 441.

Cf. **φράζοντες ἐν ἧι κώμηι οἰκοῦσιν,** R. L. 29 (iii/B.C.); **φροντίσας δι᾽ ὧν δεῖ ταῦτα ἐργασθῆναι**, P.P. ii. 37 (ii/B.C.). It is a little surprising, however, to find Blass[1] saying that this usage "is wanting in the N. T." W. F. Moulton[2] in his footnote gives undoubted examples of **ὅς** in indirect questions after verbs of knowing, declaring, etc. So **οἶδεν—ὧν χρείαν ἔχετε**, Mt. 6:81; **ἀπαγγείλατε ἃ ἀκούετε**, 11:4; **εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν,** Mk. 5:33; **ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησεν,** Lu. 6:3 (cf. Mt. 12:3 **τί); μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγεί**, 9:33; **δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν**, 8:47 (cf. Ac. 22:24); **διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἅ δεῖ εἰπεῖν**, 12:12. But not 2 Tim. 1:12. And then in 1 Tim. 1:7 we find **ἃ λέγουσιν** and **περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται** used side by side after **μὴ νοοῦντες**. Cf. also Jo. 18:21. One may compare[3] also Lu. 11:6, **οὐκ ἔχω ὃ παραθήσω αὐτῷ**, with Mk. 8:2 (Mt. 15:32), **οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν**. See also **ὡς ἰάθη** in Lu. 8 : 47, and note **ὡς** in Lu. 23:55; 24:35, not to mention **ὅσος, ὁποῖος**.

16. *The Idiom* **οὐδείς ἐστιν ὅς**. It occurs in the N. T., as Mk. 9:39; 10:29; Lu. 1:61; 18:29; 1 Cor. 6:5. For **οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς οὐ** see Mt. 10:26 (cf. Lu. 8:17). Here one is reminded of the old idiom **οὐδεὶς ὅστις**. Mayser (*Grammatik*, p. 310) calls attention to the papyri use of **ὅν=ὅ** after analogy of **τοσοῦτο(ν)**. Cf. **τίς—ὃς οὐ** in Ac. 19:35. The N. T. does not use[4] **ἔστιν ὅς, εἰσὶν οἵ=τὶς, τινές**.

(e) **Ὅστις**.

1. *Varied Uses*. The form is, of course, merely **ὅς** and **τις**. But we have seen a variety of uses of **ὅς**, and **τις** likewise is not entirely uniform. Hence the combination cannot be expected to be so.

2. The Distinction between **ὅς** and **ὅστις**. It was not ironclad in the ancient language, as may be seen by reference to the Epic, Ionic, Attic poets, and to Herodotus (once Thucydides).[5] Blass[6] finds that the distinction between them is no longer regularly preserved in the N. T., least, of all in Luke, best of all in Paul. Moulton[7] finds some examples in the papyri of **ὅστις** in the sense of **ὅς**, but doubts if the two relatives are ever absolutely convertible and thinks that on the whole the classical distinction remains undisturbed, though sometimes during the **κοινή** period it had worn rather thin.[8] But Jannaris[9] holds that **ὅστις**, having a wider scope

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p.1175.
[2] W.-M., p. 207 f.
[3] W.-Sch., p. 237.
[4] Ib., p. 236.
[5] Cf. Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 69, for the exx.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 172 f.
[7] Prol., p. 91.
[8] Ib.; Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 441 f.
[9] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 352.

than ὅς, in postclassical times was used indiscriminately for ὅς. He is supported by Kaelker about Polybius.[1] But in the vernacular modern Greek ὅτι is alone common, other forms of ὅστις being rare, though ὅτινος and ὅτινων are found (Thumb *Handb*., p. 93 f.). Kruger[2] calls ὅς "objective" and ὅστις "qualitative and generic." W. F. Moulton[3] defines ὅστις as properly indicating the class or kind to which an object belongs. But no exact parallel can be drawn nor uniform distinction preserved. Each has its own history. Jebb[4] takes ὅστις to refer to class in ancient Greek and hence is either indefinite or causal. In the modern Greek it is still indefinite, but has also in the vernacular displaced ὅς in the masculine and feminine nominative. In the LXX ὅστις is less frequent than ὅς and is almost confined to the nominative and accusative.[5] In the papyri[6] it is less frequent than ὅς and is usually in the nominative as in the N. T. (Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., 1904, p. 154).

3. *The Indefinite Use*. This is, as a matter of fact, still the least frequent in the N. T. There are about 27 of the indefinite and 120 of the definite use (Scott). Cf. ὅστις σὲ ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα (Mt. 5:39), ὅστις ἀρνήσηταί με (10:33), ὅτι ἂν αἰτήσητε (Jo. 14:13), ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ (Gal. 5:10). Thus it is used with indicative or subjunctive, with or without ἄν (ἐάν). Cf. Mt. 13:12. In Mk. 8:34 εἴ τις does not differ very greatly from ὅστις. Cf. also ἐάν μή, Mk. 10:30. **Πᾶς** ὅστις is, of course, indefinite also. Thus Mt. 7:24; πᾶν ὅ τι ἐὰν ποιῆτε (Col. 3:17), etc. For πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἥτις ἄν see Ac. 3:23 (LXX). In P. Par. 574 (iii/A.D.) note ὅστις ποτ᾽ οὖν εἶ.

4. *The Definite Examples*. These are partly causal clauses. Some indeed seem merely descriptive. Thus Mt. 7:15, τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν ὅτινες ἔρχονται. Cf. also Mt. 7:26; 13:52; 21:33, etc. The value of the pronoun sometimes does not differ greatly from οἷος and expresses quality. Thus εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες, Mt. 19:12; ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς οἵτινες, 21:41; παρθένοις αἵτινες, 25:1, etc. Once indeed we actually have τοιαύτη ἥτις (1 Cor. 5:1). Cf. also ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ ἥτις (Lu. 7:39). See also Gal. 4:24, 26. Then again it may be merely explanatory as in γυναῖκες πολλαὶ--αἵτινες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ ʼΙησοῦ (Mt. 27:55). Cf. Mk. 15:7; Lu. 12:1; Col. 3:5; Rev. 11:8, etc. This use of ὅστις is particularly frequent with proper names.

[1] Quest., p. 245 f.

[2] Gr., p. 139. For the confusion between ὅς and ὅστις see also Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 558 f.

[3] W.-M., p 209, n. 3, where a very helpful discussion occurs.

[4] V. and D., Handb. to Mod. Gk., p. 302.

5 Thack., Gr., p. 192.

[6] Mayser, Gr., p. 310.

So Lu. 2:4, εἰς πόλιν Δαυεὶδ ἥτις καλεῖται **Β**ηθλεέμ. Cf. also Lu. 8:26; Ac. 16:12, etc. Abbott, *Joh. Gr.*, p. 303, takes the explanatory or illustrative examples= 'now he,' one that.' Moulton[1] points out that ὅστις at the beginning of a parable (cf. Mt. 20:1) is really a type and so appropriate. In an example like Lu. 1:20, τοῖς λόγοις μου οἵτινες πληρωθήσονται, Moulton takes it to be 'which for all that' (almost adversative), while in Lu. 10:42 ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτῆς= 'and it shall not be taken away from her.' There is no doubt about the causal use of ὅστις (cf. *qui* and *quippe qui*). See Jo. 8:53, Ἀβραὰμ ὅστις ἀπέθανεν ('seeing that he died'); Ac. 10:47, οἵτινες τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔλαβον ('since they received the Holy Spirit'). Cf. also Ac. 7:53; Ro. 2:15; 6:2; Heb. 8:6; 10:35; Eph. 3:13; Ph. 4:3; Col. 3:5; Jas. 4:14; 1 Pet. 2:11, etc.

5. *Value of* ὅς? It is a matter of dispute whether in the N. T., as usually in modern Greek, ὅστις has come already to have merely the force of ὅς. There are undoubted examples where it is equal to ὅσπερ ('which very'). So Ac. 11:28, ἥτις ἐγένετο, ἐπὶ **K**λαυδίου. Cf. also Ac. 13:31; 16:16; 1 Cor. 3:17, etc. Blass[2] goes further and finds ὅστις in Luke purely in the sense of ὅς. He is supported by Jebb[3] who says that "no natural interpretation can make it more in Lu. 2:4." In Acts at any rate a fairly good case can be made out for this weakened sense of ὅστις. Cf. 8:14 f. **Π**έτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην οἵτινες, 12:10 τὴν πύλην ἥτις, 17:10. See also Rev. 12:13. Moulton[4] gives an exact parallel from the papyri for Mt. 27:62, τῇ ἐπαύριον ἥτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν (αὔριον ἥτις ἐστὶν ιε). He quotes Hort also (*Comm*., 1 Pet. 2:11) in favour of the position that in some places in the N. T. no distinction can be drawn between ὅς and ὅστις. Blass[5] denies that Paul uses ὅστις as the equivalent of ὅς. I confess that I fail to see a great deal of difference between ὅιτινες and οἷς in Ro. 16:4, οἵτινες and οἵ in 16:7. Cf. also ὅς and ἥτις in verses 5 f.

6. *Case*. There is little here that calls for comment. We do not have attraction or incorporation. As a matter of fact only three cases occur (nom., gen., ace.).[6] The stereotyped phrase

[1] Prol., p. 92. Ὅστις as 'who indeed' is common in Pisidia. Cf. Compernass, De Serm. Grace., p. 13.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 173.

[3] V. and D., Handb., p. 302.

[4] Prol., p. 91.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 173.

[6] The pap. show the same situation. Moulton, Cl. Rev., April, 1904, p. 154. Thus ἥντινα BM 77 (viii/A.D.), ὅντινα inscr. J.H.S., 1902, p. 349, ἐξ ὅτου BM 190 (iii/?), ἕως ὅτου NP. 56 (iii/A.D.).

with ἕως and the genitive, ἕως ὅτου, occurs five times. Cf. Mt. 5:25; Lu. 12:50 (Luke three times, Matthew and John once each). This is the only form of the shortened inflection. The LXX once[1] (2 Macc. 5:10) has ἥστινος, elsewhere ὅτου . The accusative is found in the N. T. only in the neuter singular ὅτι (absent from modern Greek). But see (note 6, p. 728) occasional ὅντινα and ἥντινα in the papyri. So Lu. 10:35, ὅτι ἂν προσδαπανήσῃς. Cf. ὅτι ἄν, Jo. 2:5; 14:13; 15:16; ὅτι ἐάν, Mk. 6:23; 1 Cor. 16: 2 f.; Col. 3:17; ὅτι alone, Jo. 8:25; Ac. 9:6. The other examples are all in the nominative. In Ac. 9:6 the clause is nominative.

7. *Number*. In general the number of ὅστις agrees with that of the antecedent. But in a few instances ὅστις agrees with the predicate. So with 1 Cor. 3:17, ναὸς οἵτινες—ὑμεῖς, Eph. 3:13, θλίψεσιν ἥτις—δόξα. Cf. Ac. 16:12.

8. *Gender*. Likewise ὅστις in general agrees with the antecedent in gender. So Eph. 1:22 f. ἐκκλησία ἥτις—τὸ σῶμα, Gal. 4:24 μία ἥτις--῾Αγαρ. Cf. Rev. 11:8. But the gender of the predicate may be followed as in Ac. 16:12, Φιλίππους (fem., H. Scott says, but Thayer has οἵ) ἥτις —πόλις; 1 Tim. 3:15, οἴκῳ θεοῦ — ἥτις — ἐκκλησία. In Ph. 1:28, ἥτις — ἔνδειξις, the antecedent is the general idea of the preceding clause. One example of ὅτι is neuter singular (2 Cor. 3:14, ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται), and several times the neuter plural (Jo. 21:25, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται). So Gal. 4:24; 5:19. Cf. the absence of the neuter in the modern Greek. The masculine and feminine, both singular and plural, are very frequent. Cf. Mt. 2:6; 7:15; Lu. 2:4; 23: 55. See further for number, gender and case, chapter X, VII, VIII, IX.

9. *Direct Questions*. Examples of ὅστις in direct questions are found in Aristophanes and Plato as quoted by Jannaris.[2] An example of it occurs also in 1 Chron. 17:6, ὅτι οὐκ ὠκοδομήσατέ μοι οἶκον κέδρινον; Here the Hebrew has לָמָּה. Cf. also 2 Ki. 8:14 in AB, ὅτι where other MSS. have τί. In Barn. Ep. c. 10 we have ὅτι δὲ Μωϋσῆς εἴρηκεν; Vulgate has *quare*.[3] Jannaris[4] gives a number of instances for the later Greek. And yet Blass[5] calls it "quite incredible," a remark impossible to justify in the light of the facts. It is, indeed, unusual, but there is no *a priori* reason

[1] Thack., Gr., p. 192. [2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 473.

[3] Cf. W.-M., p. 208.

[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 473. It is more usual in the second of two questions. Cf. Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 398.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176.

why the N. T. writers could not occasionally use ὅστις as a direct interrogative. One may note also the use of el in a direct question.[1] The N. T. examples are all confined to ὅ τι. In Mt. 7:14 ὅτι is certainly merely causal, not exclamatory nor interrogative. In Mk. 2:16 ὅτι (sec.) read by BL 33, is accepted by W. H. and Nestle as interrogative. AC al. read τί ὅτι, while ℵD have διὰ τί. It is possible, to be sure, that ὅτι may be an "abbreviation"[2] or "ellipsis"[3] for τί ὅτι. But it is more probable that it is here regarded as tantamount to an interrogative (τί ὅτι or διὰ τί). Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, 1904, p. 154) quotes ὅτι τί in B.U. 607 (ii/A.D.) γράψον μοι ὅτι τί ἔπραξας. But in Mk. 9:11 the Greek uncials all give the first ὅτι. This is all the more remarkable since the second ὅτι is clearly a conjunction. The Latin MSS. give variously *quare, quia*, *quid*, etc., and some Greek cursives πῶς οὖν. 'Why' is the natural and obvious idea.[4] So in Mk. 9:28 ὅτι is read by the great mass of MSS. (including ℵBCL), though AD and a number of others have διὰ τί, some even have ὅτι διὰ τί (conflate reading), a few τί ὅτι. In John 8:25 both W. H. and Nestle print as a question, **Τ**ὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν; The Latin versions have *quod* or *quia*. It is a very difficult passage at best. **Τ**ὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι may be taken to mean 'Why do I speak to you at all?' (τὴν ἀρχήν = ὅλως). But there may be ellipsis,[5] 'Why do you reproach me that (ὅτι) I speak to you at all?' If necessary to the sense, ὅτι may be taken here as interrogative.[6] Moulton[7] admits the N. T. use of ὅστις in a direct question. Recitative ὅτι is even suggested in Winer-Schmiede1,[8] but the occasional interrogative use of ὅτι is sufficient explanation. But the passage in Jo. 8:25 is more than doubtful. Chrysostom takes ὅτι there as relative, Cyril as causal.[9]

10. *Indirect Questions*. In ancient Greek ὅστις is exceedingly common in indirect questions, sharing the honours with τίς.[10] The astonishing thing about this use of ὅστις is its almost entire absence from the N. T. (cf. modern) Greek, where it is not used in this sense). No example has yet been shown from the papyri. Indeed the relative forms, the se-called indirect interrogatives, are not common in the N. T. in that sense. The direct interroga-

[1] Lachmann, Praef., p. 43.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T., p. 176.
[3] W.-M., p. 208.
[4] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 68.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176.
[6] Simcox, Lang. of N. T., p. 68.
[7] Prol., p. 94.
[8] P. 238. The use of ὅτι τί lends colour to the notion of recitative ὅτι.
[9] Abbott, Job. Gr., p. 143.
[10] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 473.

tives are the rule in the N. T. in indirect questions.[1] Only one instance of **ὅτι** in an indirect question is found in the N. T., Ac. 9:6, **λαληθήσεταί σοι ὅτι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν**. Even this reading, though supported by **א**ABC, Blass[2] rejects "in view of the general practice elsewhere," a needless conclusion. Why not call it a "literary" mark in Luke? **Ὅπως** is so used once (Lu. 24:20), **ὅπου** not at all (not even Jo. 14:4), **οἷος** in 1 Th. 1:5, and **ὁποῖος** only in 1 Cor. 3:13; Gal. 2:6; 1 Th. 1:9; Jas. 1:24. See further chapter XIX.

(f) **Οἷος**.

1. *Relation to* **ὅς**. This correlative form is related to **ὅς** as *qualis* is to *qui*. The antecedent **τοιοῦτος** is not, of course, always expressed. But it is qualitative, and not a mere relative like **ὅς** or even **ὅστις**. In the modern Greek the word has disappeared except the form **ὅγιος (ὁ οἷος)**[3] in the dialects and is rare (14 times) in the N. T. Mayser[4] merely mentions it in his *Grammatik d. griech. Papyri.* It is in the N. T. usually without **τοιοῦτος**, as in Mt. 24:21, but it is several times followed by **τοιοῦτος**, as in 1 Cor. 15:48; 2 Cor. 10:11. A rather unusual instance is **οἷος-- τηλικοῦτος σεισμὸς οὕπω μέγας** (Rev. 16:18). In 2 Cor. 12:20 **οἷον** is, of course, first person. So **οἷοι** 1 Th. 1:5.

2. *Incorporation*. No instance of attraction occurs, but an example of incorporation is found in 2 Tim. 3:11, **οἵους διωγμοὺς ὑπήνεγκα**. In Rev. 16:18 the addition of **τηλικοῦτος οὕτω μέγας** after **οἷος** is by way of explanatory apposition. But in Mk. 13:19, **οἵα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη**, the incorporation is redundant after the fashion of **ὃν — αὐτόν**.

3. *Indirect Question*.[5] Like **ὅς** we have **οἷος** so used. Cf. 1 Th. 1:5, **οἴδατε οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν**. In 2 Tim. 3:11 we may have an indirect question also. The Textus Receptus for Lu. 9:55 (D has **ποίου**) has another instance of the use of **οἷος** in an indirect question, **οὐκ οἴδατε οἵου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς**.

4. *Number*. **Οἷος** may agree in number with the predicate rather than the antecedent. So 1 Cor. 15:48, **οἷος — τοιοῦτοι**. Note the difference in the position of the negative in of **οὐχ οἵους** and **οἷον οὐ**, 2 Cor. 12:20. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 179, calls **τὸν αὐτὸν—οἷον** (Ph. 1:30) peculiar.

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175; W.-Sch., p. 236 f.; Viteau, Prop., pp. 62 ff.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175.

[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 87, 168; Thumb, Handb., p. 94.

[4] P. 311.

[5] Cf. K.-G., II, p. 439, for exx. in the older Gk.

5. **Οἷόν τέ ἐστιν**. The only example[1] in the N. T. is in Ro. 9: 6, **οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι**, where note the absence of **τε**. It does not occur in exclamations.

(g) **Ὁποῖος**.

I. *Qualitative*. It corresponds td the interrogative **ποῖος**. It is very rare in the N. T. (see Declensions), but occurs in modern Greek vernacular for 'whoever' (Thumb, p. 93). In the literary modern Greek **ὁ ὁποῖος**, Jannaris[2] thinks that the use of the article was due to the Italian *il quale* and the French *lequel* (cf. Old English the which), since educated scribes objected to the vernacular **ὅπου** and **ποῦ**.[3]

2. *Double Office*. Like **οἷος, ὅσος** and **ἡλίκος** it has the double office of relative and indirect interrogative.[4] Four of the N. T. instances are indirect questions (1 Cor. 3:13; Gal. 2:6; 1 Th. 1:9; Jas. 1:24). In Gal. 2:6, **ὁποῖοί ποτε**, we have the indefinite form ('whatever kind').[5] Note here the use of **τι** and **ὁποῖοι**. In 1 Cor. 3:13 the antecedent is expressed and repeated by redundant **αὐτό**.

3. *Correlative*. Only one instance is correlative, Ac. 26:29, **τοιούτους ὁποῖος**. Cf. *qualiscumque*. Note here the difference in number.

(h) **Ὅσος**.

1. *Quantitative*. It is found in the LXX like **οἷος** and **ὁποῖος**[6] and survives in the modern Greek.[7] There are a hundred and eight instances in the N. T. (W. H. text) which display great variety of usage. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 63) notes that in Philo **ὅσος** is often equal to **οἵ**.

2. *Antecedent*. The presence of the antecedent is not common outside of **πάντες ὅσοι** (Ac. 5:36, 37), **πάντα ὅσα** (very common, as Mt. 7:12; 13:46; 18:25; Mk. 11:24, etc.), **ὅσοι—οὗτοι** (also frequent, as Ro. 8:14; Gal. 6:12, etc.). Cf. **ὅσοι—αὐτοῖς** in Jo. 1:12. But in Mk. 3:28 **ὅσα** has **ἁμαρτήματα** and **βλασφημίαι** as antecedents and naturally is neuter. Cf. Ac. 3:24; 9:39; Rev. 21:16. It is common without antecedent both in the masculine (**ὅσοι** Mt. 14:36) and the neuter (**ὅσα** Mk. 9:13).

3. *Attraction*. This was possible in Jo. 6:11, **ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων**

[1] For a different explanation =**οὐ δή που ἐκπεπτ**. see Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179. [2] Gk. Gr., p. 167.

[3] V. and D., Handb., p. 303. [4] Moulton, Prol., p. 93.

[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 318. It is rare in anc. Gk. in this sense. K.-G., II, p. 439. Cf. **ὅπως** Lu. 24:20.

[6] Thack., Gr., p. 192. [7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Or., p. 168.

ὅσον ἤθελον, but it does not occur. In Lu. 11:8, δώσει αὐτῷ ὅσων χρήζει, the regular construction occurs. In Winer-Schmiedel[1] it is stated that attraction is found in the N. T. with ὅσος. I find no real examples outside of the few cases of incorporation now to be mentioned.[2]

4. *Incorporation*. In Ac. 9:13 ὅσα κακά is an instance. Mk. 2:19 has ὅσον χρόνον. The other examples (Ro. 7:1; 1 Cor. 7:39; Gal. 4:1) are all instances of ἐφ᾽ ὅσον χρόνον.

5. *Repetition*. In Mk. 6:30 we have in W. H. ὅσα καὶ ὅσα (not Tisch.). But in Ph. 4:8 ὅσα is repeated six times without καί. In Heb. 10:37 ὅσον ὅσον (LXX) is in imitation of the Hebrew in Hab. 2:3. Cf. also Is. 26:20 and D on Lu. 5:3 where ὅσον ὅσον=ὀλίγον of the other MSS.[3] But that this is not an essential Hebraism, but a vernacular idiom in harmony with the Hebrew, is now clear.[4]

6. *With* ἄν. Note the use as an indefinite relative (Mk. 6:56; Lu. 9:5; Jo. 11:22; Ac. 2:39; 3:22, etc.) and with ἐάν (Mt. 7:12; 18:18; 23:3; Mk. 3:28, etc.).

7. *Indirect Questions.* The instances are fairly numerous. So ἀκούοντες ὅσα ποιεῖ (Mk. 3:8); ἀπάγγειλον ὅσα—πεποίηκεν (5:19). Cf. 5:20; Lu. 8:39; 9:10; Ac. 4:23; 2 Tim. 1:18, etc.

8. *In Comparison*. **῞Οσον (**ὅσῳ) is used in comparative sentences usually with τοσοῦτο (τοσούτῳ). Cf. Mk. 7:36; Heb. 1:4; 8:6; 10:25.

9. *Adverbial*. **᾽Εφ᾽ ὅσον** (Mt. 9:15; 25:40;. Ro. 7:1, etc.) and καθ᾽ ὅσον (Heb. 3:3; 7:20; 9:27) partake of the nature of conjunctions.

(i) **῾Ηλίκος**. This form was used to express both age and size. Hence the corresponding ambiguity of ἡλικία. Cf. for age Jo. 9:21, for stature Mt. 6:27. The pronoun is absent from the LXX, never very common, but survives in the literary modern Greek.[5] It appears also in the papyri.[6] Like the other relatives it might have had a double use in the N. T. (relative and indirect interrogative). But the few examples are all indirect interrogatives: Col. 2:1 εἰδέναι ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω, Jas. 3:5 ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον πῦρ ἡλίκην

[1] P. 224.

[2] But in the pap. Moulton finds ἀρουρῶν –ὅσων (Prol., p. 93). As a matter of fact in the N. T. ὅσος nowhere occurs outside of the nom. and acc. except in Lu. 11:8 and Heb. 1:4; 8:6; 10:25.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179. Blass also cites Aristoph., Vesp., 213.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 97; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., 330.

[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 168. [6] Mayser, Gr., p. 311.

ὕλην ἀνάπτει. The examples in James may be regarded as exclamatory. Note also that ἡλίκον refers to smallness and ἡλίκην to greatness of the size. In Gal. 6:11 W. and Nestle read πηλίκοις in the text and ἡλίκοις in the margin. This again is indirect question after ἴδετε.

(j) **Ὁ AS RELATIVE.** The use of the **τ** forms of **ὁ, ἡ, τό** as relative is very old in Greek. It appears in Homer[1] and is common in Herodotus. In Arkadian **ὁ** appears as demonstrative, as article and as relative (Meister, *Die griech. Dialekten*, Bd. II, p. 116). Cf. also South Ach. (Hoffmann, *Griech. Dial*., pp. 257, 292-300). Jannaris[2] gives examples of it from Ionic (where very common), Doric and Attic (inscriptions), and sporadically in the later Greek. In modern Greek it survives only in sententious sayings with and in Crete and Southeast Greek (Thumb, p. 94). Mayser[3] finds a few doubtful instances in the papyri. Wilcken (*Archiv*, I) gives some examples from B. M. as **τό μοι δέδωκες** (p. 292), **τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν ποιεῖς** (p. 301), and Moulton (*Cl. Rev*., 1904, p. 155) quotes **πρὸς τὸ δύνομε** from B.U. 948 (iv/v A.D.) "very illiterate." Mayser (*op. cit*.) gives numerous examples of **ὁ καί** which "first in Roman time" appears in the nominative. He compares this with the relative use **ὅς καί** and is inclined to regard **ὁ καί** as relative. The analogy of the Latin *qui et* favours the relative idea, but the article alone is sufficient in Greek. I would not insist on the relative for **Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος** (Ac. 13:9), though admitting the possibility of it. It means (Deissmann), not 'Saul who is henceforth Paul,' but 'also Paul.' Cf. also Hatch, *Jour. of Bibl. Lit.*, Pt. II, p. 141 f., 1908. In truth this use of **ὁ καί** with double names was very common in N. T. times.[4] Dieterich[5] sees no instance of **ὁ** as relative in the N. T. But in Rev. 1:4, 8; 11:17, we have **ὁ ἦν**. One either has to say that here **ὁ** is used as a relative or that it is a relative. It all comes to the same in the end. It may be a bit artificial, **ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος**, but the antique and vernacular relative **ὁ** came in as a resource when John did not wish to use **γενόμενος** of God, and since there is no aorist particinle for **εἰμί**. Psychologically

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 182 ff. For hist. of the matter see K.-B1., I, pp. 608

[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 353. Cf. also Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 560; Meisterh., Gr., p. 156; Dieterich, Byz. Arch., pp. 1, 198 f. [3] Gr., pp. 310 IL

[4] See Schmid, Der Atticismus, p. 338; Volker, Synt. d. griech. Pap., p. 6; Ramsay, Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, XIX,. 429; Deiss., B. S., pp. 313 ff.; Moulton, Prol., p. 83.

[5] Unters., p. 199. Winer (W.-Th., p. 107) rejects **ὁ καί** as relative.

the article is called for here between two articles, but grammar can do nothing with it. If ἦν is treated as a substantive, that would call for τό as in τὸ δέ ἀνέβη (Eph. 4:9). Moulton[1] finds several examples in late papyri of ὁ as relative (for ὁ as demonstrative see pp. 693 ff.), like τὴν χῖρα τὴν δέδωκεν (p. 304). The only real difficulty in Rev. 1:4, 8, etc., is the nominative use, and that was not insuperable when the exigencies of the sentence demanded it. It is possible that this phrase had come to be a set phrase among the Christians for the eternity and unchangeableness of God. For the possible use of τίς as relative see under VIII.

VIII. **Interrogative Pronouns** (ἀντωνυμίαι ἐρωτητικαί)

(a) **Τίς**. The root of the interrogative τίς (Thess. κίς. Cf. Ionic κῶς, κότερος), indefinite τις (cf. τε), is at bottom the same as the Indo-Germanic root *quis* and Latin *quis* (*aliquis, que*).[2] Curiously enough some of the grammars, Monro's *Homeric Grammar*, for example, give no separate or adequate discussion of the interrogative pronouns.

1. *Substantival or Adjectival.* **Τίς** is either adjectival as τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; (Mt. 5:46), or, as more commonly, substantival like τίς ὑπέδειξεν; (Mt. 3:7).

2. *The Absence of Gender.* That it appears only in the nominative and accusative is noteworthy. This fact probably had something to do with the gradual retreat of τίς before ποῖος.[3] The neuter in the N. T. occurs with adjectives only, as τί ἀγαθόν in Mt. 19:16.

3. **Τίς=ποῖος**. An opposite tendency is seen in the use of τίς=ποῖος.[4] Hatzidakis[5] has shown examples of this idiom as early as Euripides. As New Testament illustrations one may note τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὅς (Lu. 7:49), τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε (Lu. 24:17; cf. ποῖα 24:19), τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Jo. 12:34). Cf. Lu. 4:36. Only once[6] is ποῖος used with the article (Jas. 4:14, and here B omits ἡ), while we find τίς ἡ σοφία (Mk. 6:2), τίς ἡ αἰτία (Ac. 10:21); etc. Sometimes τίς and ποῖον are used together. It might seem at first as if the distinction were here insisted on, as in εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρόν (1 Pet. 1:11) and ποῖον οἶκον — ἢ τίς τόπος (Ac. 7:49). But, tautology seems plain in the last example and may be true of 1 Pet. 1:11, but not certainly

[1] Cl. Rev., April, 1904, p. 155.
[2] Cf. Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 194; Brug., Griech. Gr.,.pp. 117, 244.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 163.
[4] lb., p. 164.
[5] Einl., p. 207 f.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 176.

so.[1] In Mk. 4:30 W. H. read ἐν τίνι, but some MSS. have ἐν ποίᾳ. Cf. also τίς καὶ ποταπός in Lu. 7:39, which is not tautological.

4. *Indeclinable* τί. In Jo. 18:38, τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια, the neuter in the predicate calls for no special remark. So Gal. 3:19. Cf. Latin *quid* and English *what* in such a sentence. This idiom belongs to the ancient Greek and distinguishes between the essence of a thing (τί) and the classification of a thing (τίς), as Gildersleeve puts it (*Syntax of Cl. Gk.*, p. 59). Cf. ὑμεῖς τίνες ἐστέ; (Ac. 19:15) and τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος (Heb. 2:6). But this explanation will not hold for 1 Jo. 3:2, τί ἐσόμεθα, nor Ac. 13:25, τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε. The text in Acts is not certain. The κοινή shows this development outside of the N. T.[2] In the modern Greek "the neuter τί, is used with all genders and cases both in the singular and plural" (Vincent and Dickson, Handb., p. 55). Cf. τί ὥρα εἶναι 'what o'clock is it?' **Τί** γυναῖκα; 'which woman?' Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 94. It is not unusual in classical Greek[3] to have τί as predicate to ταῦτα, as in Lu. 15:26 τί ἂν εἴη ταῦτα, Jo. 6:9 ταῦτα τί ἐστιν. So probably τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε; (Ac. 14:15), though τί here may be 'why' and not predicative. The usual construction appears in Ac. 17:20 τίνα θέλει ταῦτα εἶναι (cf. Jo. 10:6), 11:17 ἐγὼ τίς ἤμην; cf. Lu. 8:9. In Ac. 21:33 τίς and τί are sharply distinguished. The use of τί with γίνομαι is hardly in point here (Ac. 5:24; 12:18) as it is found in the Attic[4] τί γένωμαι. In Jo. 21:21 οὗτος δὲ τί; we must supply γενήσεται.

5. **Predicate Use of τί with τοῦτο**. In Ac. 23:19, τί ἐστιν ὃ ἔχεις, we find the full expression. In Lu. 16:2, τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ, we meet the abbreviated idiom. Cf. Ac. 14:15 τί ταῦτα (see also 9). Cf. Lu. 1:66; Ac. 5:24. The phrase τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς (Mt. 27: 4), τί πρὸς σέ (Jo. 21:22) is matched by the Attic τί ταῦτα ἐμοί (Kuhner-Gerth, II, 417; Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 177). Cf. οὗτος τί, (Jo. 21:21). Blass (*ib.*) also cllnpares τί γάρ μοι τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν, (1 Cor. 5:12) with the infinitive in Arrian, *Diss. Epict.*, ii, 17. 14. **Τί** ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί (Jo.12:4, etc.) is in the LXX (2 Ki. 3:13), but it is also a Greek idiom (ellipsis, Kuhner-Gerth, *ib.*).

6. *In Alternative Questions*. Quality in general is nearly gone from the κοινή. **Τίς** when πότερος might have been used is not unknown in ancient Greek.[5] Indeed even in Latin *quis* occurs sometimes instead of the more usual *uter*.[6] In the LXX πότερος

[1] Blass, Gr. of N, T., p. 176.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 164.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 177.
[4] Ib.
[5] Jelf, 874, obs. 4.
[6] Draeger, Hist. Synt., p. 103.

is supplanted by **τίς** and the particle **πότερον** occurs only once, and that in Job (literary).[1] Moulton[2] finds only one example of **πότερος** in the papyri, and that unintelligible. So in the N. T. **πότερος** does not occur as an adjective. So in Mt. 9:5 **τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον εἰπεῖν—ἢ εἰπεῖν**, 21:31 **τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησεν**, 27:21 **τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο**. Cf. also 23:17, 19; 27:17; Mk. 2:9; Lu. 7:42; 22:27; 1 Cor. 4:21; Ph. 1:22. Moulton[3] notes that "whether, adjectivally, is as archaic as **πότερος**," and predicts that "the best of the two" will be the English of the future.

7. *The Double Interrogative*. Cf. **τίς πόθεν** in Soph., *Tr*. 421. It is common in other Indo-Germanic languages.[4] Cf. **τίς τίνος ἐστὶν ἐργάτης**, *Hom. Clem*. 2, 33. So **τίς τί ἄρῃ** in Mk. 15:24. Some MSS. have **τίς τί** also in Lu. 19:15, but not **א**BDL (W. H. and Nestle read **τί**). Cf. **ἡλίκον---ἡλίκην** in Jas. 3:5.

8. *As Relative.* Just as **ὅς** and **ὅστις** came to be used as interrogatives, so **τίς** drifted occasionally to a mere relative. We have seen (1 Tim. 1: 7) how the relative and the interrogative come to be used side by side. "In English, the originally interrogative pronouns 'who' and ‘which’ have encroached largely on the use of the primitive relative 'that.'"[5] Moulton's sketch of the facts[6] makes it clear that in the N. T. **τίς** may be relative if the exigencies call for it. Moulton finds it only in the illiterate papyri, but the usage is supported by inscriptions[7] and by the Pontic dialect today.[8] Moulton[9] gives from the papyri, **εὗρον γεοργὸν τίς αὐτὰ ἐλκύσῃ,** B.U. 822 (iii/A.D.); **τίνος ἐὰν χρίαν ἔχῃς**, B. M. 239 (iv/A.D.). From the inscriptions see **τίς ἂν κακῶς ποιήσει**, J.H.S., XIX, 299. Moulton[9] also quotes Jebb on Soph., 0. T. 1141: "**Τίς** in classical Greek can replace **ὅστις** only where there is an indirect question." The plainest New Testament example of **τίς** as **ὅς** appears to be Mk. 14:36 **οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰ τί σύ**. Cf. Mt. 26:39 **οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς σύ.** But it is not much more so than Mt. 15:32 **οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν** (cf. Mk. 8:1 f.) and Mk. 6:36 **ἵνα—ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν**. Cf. **οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ – κλίνῃ** (Mt. 8:20), but **ὅπου—φάγω** (Mk. 14:14). See in the papyri, **οὐδὲν ἔχω τί ποιήσω σοι**, B.U. 948 (iv/v A.D.), as quoted by Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, 1904, p.155). But even so Xenophon has this idiom, and Sophocles, *Oed*.

[1] Thack., Gr., p. 192.
[2] Prol., p. 77.
[3] Ib.
[4] Thompson, Synt., p. 74.
[5] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 67.
[6] Prol., p. 93 f.; Cl. Rev., Apr., 1904, p. 154 f.
[7] Dieterich, Unters., p. 200.
[8] Thumb, Theol. Literzaturzeit., xxviii, p. 423, (quoted in Moulton, Prol., p. 94).
[9] Prol., p. 93.

Col. 317, has **οὐκ ἔχω τί φῶ**, which looks like an indirect question. Cf. Winer-Moulton, p. 211; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 240. It is not necessary to bring[1] under this construction **οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ** (Mk. 9:6) nor Mk. 13:11. Here the idiom is really that of indirect question (deliberative question). Cf. the direct question in Mt. 6:31 with the indirect in 6:25. So in Mt. 10:19 (first example) and see 9. But the second example in Mt. 10:19 (**δοθήσεται—τί λαλήσητε**) may be the relative use. Cf. also Lu. 17:8. In Ac. 13:25 the punctuation can (so Nestle, but not W. H.) be made so that **τί** is relative, **τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ.** It is possible also thus to construe Lu. 19:3, **ἰδεῖν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστιν**, instead of taking **τίς ἐστιν** as an accusative of general reference. Cf. Mk. 1:24, **οἶδά σε τίς εἶ** (Lu. 4:34 also). Cf. the prolepsis **σὺ τίς εἶ** in Jo. 8:25. So Ro. 14:4, 10. The rhetorical questions in Lu. 11:5; 15:4, 8; Jas. 3:13 are not, of course, instances of this usage.[2] Perhaps the anacoluthon in Lu. 11:11 (**τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει—ἐπιδώσει**) may have arisen because of this idiom. The distinction between **τίς** and **ὅς** is, of course, usually maintained (Jo. 16:18; Ac. 23:19; Heb. 12:7). It is at least noteworthy that in 1 Cor. 15:2 Paul changes from **ὅς** (used four times) to **τίνι λόγῳ**. An indirect question comes with a jolt and makes one wonder if here also the relative use of **τίς** does not occur. In Mt. 26:62 (**οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνῃ τί οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν**) we may have an indirect question (cf. Mk. 14:60), though **πρός** would be usual (cf. Mt. 27:14). It is better to follow W. H. with two separate questions[3] and even so **τί**= **τί ἐστιν ὅ**. The use of **τίς** as relative Blass[4] calls "Alexandrian and dialectical." The LXX (Lev. 21: 17 **ἄνθρωπος τίνι ἐὰν ᾖ,** Deut. 29:18 **ἀνὴρ—τίνος**, Ps. 40:6 **οὐκ ἔστιν τίς**) does show examples of it, but it is not confined to Egypt, as has been already shown.[5] Brugmann (*Griech. Gr.*, p. 561) finds **τίς** as relative in Boeotian and even rarely in the older Attic.

9. *Adverbial Use*. The neuter accusative **τί** is frequently used in the sense of 'why' in the N. T. This is classical and common and calls for little comment. It still appears in modern Greek (Thumb, p. 94). See Mt. 7:3 (**τί βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος**) 8:26 (**τί δειλοί ἐστε;**) 19:17; 20:6, etc. In Ac. 14:15 **τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε** we probably have **τί**= 'why.' Cf. Mk. 11:3. In Mk. 2:24 **τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν**; note 'why,' though **τί** is followed by **ὅ**. It

[1] As Simcox does, Lang. of the N. T., p. 69 f.
[2] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 241; Moulton, Prol., p. 93.
[3] W.-Sch., p. 241; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 331.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 175. [5] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 241.

is interesting to note πῶς ἢ τί, Mt. 10:19 Lu. 12:11. In Jo. 14:22 τί γέγονεν ὅτι we see the full form of the idiom τί ὅτι (Lu. 2:49; Ac. 5:4, 9). Here τί still = 'why.' But in ἵνα τί (1 Cor. 10:29 and Mt. 9:4; 27:46; Lu. 13:7; Ac. 4:25; 7:26) τί is really the subject of γένηται (ellipsis). It is not unknown in Attic Greek.[1] W. H. never print ἱνατί (cf. Mt. 9:4; Lu. 13:7). It is common in LXX.

10. *With Prepositions*. There is very little difference between τί= 'why' and διὰ τί= 'because of what' (Mt. 15:2, 3; 17:19; Lu. 24:38, etc.). Κατὰ τί ('according to what') is practically 'how.' Cf. Lu. 1:18. For ἐν τίνι see Mt. 5:13. But πρὸς τί (Jo. 13:28)= 'for what purpose.' In Jo. 13:22 περὶ τίνος λέγει there is no such idea. But purpose again is expressed by εἰς τί (Mt. 14:31; 26:8; Mk. 14:4; Ac. 19:3).

11. *With Particles.* Paul in particular is fond of the rhetorical use of τί γάρ (Ro. 3:3; 4:2, etc.), τί οὖν (3:1, 9, etc.), τί ἔτι (3:7; 9:19), ἀλλὰ τί (11:4), ἤ τί (11:2). Cf. τίς ἄρα in Lu. 22:23 and τί ἄρα 1:66; Ac. 12:18.

12. *As Exclamation*. In Mt. 7:14 W. H. read ὅτι (causal), not τί στενὴ ἡ πύλη. But in Lu. 12:49 καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη there is no doubt of the text. W. H. punctuate as a question, but Nestle as an exclamation. Examples of exclamatory τί—'how' are found in 2 Sam. 6:20; Song of Sol. 7:6 and in the modern Greek, τί καλὸς ἄνθρωπος! Cf. Mullach, *Vulg*., pp. 210, 321; Winer-Moulton, p. 562. Blass[2] compares the Hebrew מָה. On the whole it is best to take τί in Lu. 12:49= 'how.'

13. *Indirect Questions*. It is, of course, the ancient idiom[3] to have τίς in an indirect question. But in the N. T. the indirect interrogative ὅστις has disappeared in this idiom save in Ac. 9:6 (MSS. divided here). A good example of τίς occurs in Ac. 10: 29 πυνθάνομαι τίνι λόγῳ μετεπέμψασθέ με. In Luke we meet the neuter article rather frequently before the indirect question. So τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι (1:62), τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη (9:46). Cf. 22:23, 24, etc. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 158) sees no special point in the article (cf. English " the which"). Paul sometimes uses it also (Ro. 8:26; 1 Th. 4:1 τὸ πῶς). The question is brought out rather more sharply by the article. The Attic use of τὸ τί, τὸ ποῖον) (Thompson, *Synt*., p. 74) in reference to something previously mentioned is like our "The what?" Cf. Herm., *Sim*., VIII, i, 4, Clem., *Hom*., i, 6.

14. **Τίς** or τίς. Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether τίς

[1] W.-Sch., p. 240. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 177.
[3] Thompson, Synt., p. 74. Cf. Brug., Gliech. Gr., p. 561.

or τὶς is right. So 1 Pet. 5:8 W. H. have ζητῶν καταπιεῖν with τινὰ in the margin. But Nestle actually prints ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν. In Heb. 5:12 W. H. read τινὰ and Nestle τινα (both indefinite). In Jas. 5:13 the reading is, of course, τις, not τίς. So 1 Cor. 7:18.

(b) **Ποῖος**.

1. *Qualitative*. It occurs sixteen times in direct questions. It is still used in its original qualitative sense. Clearly this is true in Jo. 12:33, σημαίνων ποιῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν (cf. 18:32), Ro. 3:27 (διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων;). The same thing is true of 1 Cor. 15:35 (ποίῳ σώματι ἔρχονται), cf. also 1 Pet. 2:20. In 1 Pet. 1:11 we find both τίνα and ποῖον in apparent contrast. Other possible instances are Jo. 10:32; Ac. 7:49 (LXX); Jas. 4: 14. The common ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ. (Mt. 21:23; Mk. 11:28; Ac. 4:7, LXX, etc.) seems also to retain the qualitative force. Cf. also Lu. 24:19. The qualitative sense is clear in ποίου πνεύματός ἐστε (Lu. 9:55), a spurious passage, however.

2. *Non-qualitative*. But some examples clearly have lost the qualitative sense. In the modern Greek ποιός is used regularly[1]= τίς, and is the usual interrogative. Note the accent ποιός. Indeed examples of this weakened sense of ποῖος Jannaris[2] finds as early as AEschylus and Euripides. See (a), 3. In Mt. 24:42 οὐκ οἴδατε ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται there seems to be merely the force of τίς, not quality. Cf. also 24:43 ποίᾳ φυλακῇ, Lu. 12:39 ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ, Ac. 23:34 ποίας ἐπαρχείας, Rev. 3:3 ποίαν ὥραν. This is probably true also of Mt. 22:36 ποία ἐντολή (Mk. 12:28). In Lu. 5:19 ποίας and 6:32 f. ποία χάρις either point of view will answer.

3. *In Indirect Questions.* It occurs sixteen times (not counting Lu. 9:55) in this construction against four for ὁποῖος. Cf. indicative in Mt. 21:24; 24:42; Jo 12:33; 21:19, and the subjunctive in Lu. 5:19 μὴ ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν. **Ποῖος** is found in the LXX and in the papyri.

(c) **Πόσος**.

1. *Less Frequent than* ποῖος. It occurs chiefly in the Synoptic Gospels (twenty-seven times in W. H. text).

2. *Meaning*. It is used in the sense of 'how much' (πόσῳ Mt. 12:12), 'how great' (πόσον Mt. 6:23), and of 'how many' (πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; Mt. 15:34). Eleven examples of πόσῳ occur almost like an adverb (Mt. 7:11; 10:25, etc.). The use of πόσος χρόνος — ὡς (Mk. 9:21) is noteworthy.

[1] Thumb, Handb., p. 94.

[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 163. Cf. Dieterich, Unters., p. 202.

3. *In Indirect Questions.* See **οὐκ ἀκούεις πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν**; (Mt. 27:13). Cf. Ac. 21:20, etc.

4. *The Exclamatory Use*. This is found in Lu. 15:17 **πόσοι μίσθιοι τοῦ πατρός μου**, and in 2 Cor. 7:11 **πόσην κατειργάσατο ὑμῖν σπουδήν**. The exclamatory use of **τῶς** may be mentioned (Mk. 10:23 f.; Jo. 11:36). Cf. **ὡς** in Ro. 10:15 and 11:33. Cf. **πόσος—ὡς** in Mk. 9:21.

(d) **Πηλίκος.**

1. *Rare*. It is found only twice in the N. T. (Gal. 6:11; Heb. 7:4) and W. H. put **ἡλίκοις** in the margin of Gal. 6:11. It is rare also[1] in the LXX (cf. Zech. 2:2), and has disappeared from the modern Greek vernacular.

2. *Indirect Questions*. Both of the N. T. examples are indirect questions. The example in Heb. 7:4 describes greatness of Melchisedek (how great), the one in Gal. 6:11 presents the size of the letters (how large).

(e) **Ποταπός**.

It is the late form for **ποδαπός**. It no longer in the N. T. means 'from what country,' but merely 'of what sort'= **ποῖος**. It is found only once in LXX (Susanna 0 54, "where it keeps something of its original local meaning").[2] It exists in the late Greek vernacular.[3] It occurs once in a direct question (Mt. 8:27) and once probably in an exclamation (2 Pet. 3:11). Four times we find it in indirect questions (Mk. 13:1; Lu. 1:29; 7:39; 1 Jo. 3:1). In Lu. 7:39 it is contrasted with **τίς**.

(f) **Πότερος**.

As a pronoun it has vanished from the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 192) and from the papyri (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 77). The only example in the N. T. (cf. LXX, Thackeray, p. 192) is in an alternative indirect question as the conjunction **πότερον** (Jo. 7:17). Cf. Latin *utrum—an*. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk*., p. 176) cites Herm., *Sim*., ix, 28. 4.

IX. Indefinite Pronouns (**ἀντωνυμίαι ἀόριστοι**).

(a) **Τὶς**.

1. *The Accent.* Jannaris[4] calls it "irrational" to accent the nominative **τὶς** rather than **τίς**. But then the nominative singular never has an accent unless at the beginning of a sentence or in philosophical writings (Thompson, *Syntax*, p. 76) and cannot otherwise be distinguished in looks from **τίς** the interrogative.

2. *Relation to* **τίς**. The same connection is seen in the Latin

[1] Thackeray, Gr., p. 192.
[2] Ib.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 95.
[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 163.

quis, ali-quis and *quis-quis* (cf. **τίστις** in Argive dialect).[1] Brugmann[2] considers —**κι**— in **οὐ-κί, πολλάκι-ς** the same word as **τι** and cites **κὶς** in the Thessalian dialect. Just as in modern Greek **τίς** disappears before **ποιός**, so **τις** vanishes before **κανείς** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 95). But in the N. T. **τις** is still very common, especially in Luke and Acts. In general the usage is in harmony with that of ancient Greek. We do not have **ἔνιοι** in the N. T. In Ac. 25:26 note **τι γράψαι** and **τί γράψω**. Cf. Lu. 7:40. See **τις τί,** Ro. 8:24, in margin of W. H.

3. **Τις** *as Substantive.* As a substantive **τις** may be equal to 'any one,' 'anybody' or 'anything,' as in **οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει**, Mt. 11:27; **πῶς δύναταί τις**, 12:29; **εἴ τις θέλει**, 16:24; **ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ τι** (note both examples like **τινός τι** Lu. 19:8; cf. Mk. 11:25; Col. 3:13), Mt. 21:3. For several instances of **τι**= 'anything' see Ac. 25:5, 8, 11. But the substantive use of **τις** may be = 'somebody' or 'something,' as **ἔρχεταί τις** Lu. 8:49, **δραμὼν δέ τις** Mk. 15:36, **ὑπό τινος** Heb. 3:4. Cf. Lu. 8:46. Often the partitive genitive (or ablative) occurs with **τις** as substantive. So **τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων** Mt. 12:38, **τις τῶν μαθητῶν** Lu. 11:1, **τις ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου** 12:13. The plural is usually = 'some,' as Mk. 9:1; 1 Cor. 9:22. In Homer **τις** was sometimes "public opinion, the man in the street" (Gladstone, quoted in Thompson's *Syntax*, p. 75). This idiom is very nearly represented by **εἶπεν δέ τις ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου**, Lu. 12:13 (cf. 11:1; 7:36). In Heb. 2:6, **διεμαρτύρατο πού τις,** the **τις** is really quite definite in the writer's mind, though he writes thus.

4. *With Numerals* = 'About.' With numerals **τις** sometimes in classical Greek gives an approximate idea rather than exact reckoning, like our "about." No certain instances of this idiom appear in the N. T. Certainly not Ac. 19:14, where **τινος**, not **τινες**, is the correct text. In Lu. 7:19, **προσκαλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν**, the meaning may be 'about two,' but it could mean 'certain two' just as well. The same thing is true of Ac. 23:23, **προσκαλεσάμενός τινας δύο**, where it is even less likely that the idea is 'about two.' Classical also is **εἶς τις** (Lu. 22:50; Jo. 11:49, and probably Mk. 14:47). The adjectival uses of **τις** are quite varied.

5. *With Substantives*. Here **τις** may = a kind of,' as **ἀπαρχήν τινα**, Jas. 1:18. Cf. Ac. 17:20, though this is not true of Col.

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 244.

[2] Ib. Interrogative and indefinite is at bottom the same word. Cf. Hartung, Uber die Casus in der griech. and Sprache, p. 279.

2:23 because of the negative.[1] But the commonest use of **τις** with substantives is= 'certain' (really rather uncertain!). Thus **ἱερεύς τις**, Lu. 1:5; **ἄνθρωπός τις**, Lu. 14:2, 16; 15:11, etc. Cf. **τι ὕδωρ**, Ac. 8:36. Sometimes it is difficult to give more force to **τις** than the English indefinite article. Cf. **νομικός τις**, Lu. 10:25; **κριτής τις ἦν ἔν τινι πόλει**, Lu. 18:2. Indeed it is nearly always true that our "certain" is too emphatic.

6. *With Adjectives*. The effect is rhetorical.[2] There is "a double adjectival sense."[3] Thus Ac. 8:9, **τινα μέγαν**,='a very great man' ('some great man'), in his own estimation. Blass[4] needlessly considers this passage an interpolation. Cf. also Heb. 10:27, **φοβερά τις ἐκδοχή**, where **τις** rather intensifies **φοβερά**. The tone may tend to soften the matter as in Heb. 2:7, 9, **βραχύ τι**. But in Lu. 24:41 **τι βρώσιμον**, Jo. 1:46 **τι ἀγαθόν**, Ac. 25:26 **ἀσφαλές τι**, Ro. 14:14 **τι κοινόν**, 2 Cor. 11:16 **μικρόν τι**, we have rather the substantive use of **τι**. But in **τυφλός τι**, Lu. 18:35, both are adjectives. Cf. **ἄλλος τις** (Lu. 22:59) and **ἕτερός τις** (Ac. 27:1).

7. *As Predicate*. Here **τις** may be emphatic = 'somebody in particular,' as Ac. 5:36, **λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν** (cf. 8:9). See also Gal. 2:6, **ἀπὸ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι**, where note difference between **τι** and **τινες**. In Gal. 6:3 note in **εἰ δοκεῖ τις εἶναί τι μηδὲν ὤν**, both senses of **τις**. But the predicate may have the other meaning of **τι** ('anyone,' 'anything'). So 1 Cor. 3:7; 10:19; Gal. 6:15. In Gal. 2:6 compare **τί** and **ὁποῖοι**.

8. *The Position of* **τις**. It is not material. It naturally follows the substantive or adjective as in **εἰς κώμην τινά**, Lu. 10:38, but we often have the other order as in **τινα χήραν** Lu. 21:2. **Τινές** may indeed begin a sentence (Ph. 1:15; 1 Cor. 8:7).

9. *As Antecedent*. In Mt. 16:28 **τινες** is the antecedent of **οἵτινες**, but here **οἵτινες** is more definite than of would have been. Cf. Lu. 9:27. In 2 Cor. 10:2 note **τινας τοὺς λ.**

10. *Alternative*. It is used to express alternative ideas, as **τινὲς μέν—τινὲς δέ** in Ph. 1:15. Cf. **ὑπὸ τινῶν – ὑπὸ τινῶν—ἄλλων δέ** in Lu. 9:7 f. and **τις — ἕτερος** in 1 Cor. 3:4.

11. *The Negative Forms* **οὔ τις, μή τις**. These are not printed as single words by W. H., except **μήτι** as an interrogative particle expecting the answer No, as in Mt. 26:22, **μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, κύριε;** cf. Jo. 4:33. It is all a matter with the editor whether in **ἵνα μή τις**

[1] W.-Sch., p. 242.
[2] W.-M., p. 212 f.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 178.
[3] Moulton in W.-M., p. 213. [4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 178.

εἴπῃ, 1 Cor. 1:15 (cf. Eph. 2:9), we may not really have μήτις. The separation in Heb. 3:13; 4:11 is against it. Cf., for instance, μή τινα (2 Cor. 12:17) and μήτι in the next verse. The anacoluthou with τινα here is noticeable.

12. *Indeclinable* τι. The use of τις with σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοι, (Ph. 2:1) may be compared with indeclinable τι. Indeclinable τι itself survives in modern Greek κάτι (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 244),

(b) **Εἷς = Τις**.

This is merely one usage of εἷς, the cardinal numeral. The idiom is common after Plutarch, but traces of it occur earlier.[1] Moulton[2] sees no difference between εἷς and τις in Aristophanes, *Av*., 1292. The papyri furnish similar examples. "The fact that εἷς progressively ousted τις in popular speech, and that even in classical Greek there was a use which only needed a little diluting to make it essentially the same, is surely enough to prove that the development lay entirely within the Greek language, and only by accident agrees with Semitic."[3] This use of εἷς alone, with genitives, with substantives, was treated at the close of the chapter on Adjectives. For εἷς τις see **τις.** For εἷς — εἷς as alternative pronoun see later, and for εἷς— **οὐ** and **οὐδείς (μηδείς)** see Negative Pronouns under xi.

(c) **Πᾶς** ='any one' no matter who, 'anything' no matter what. Cf. *quidvis*.[4] We see this construction in Ac. 2:21 (LXX), πᾶς ὃς ἐὰν ἐπικαλέσηται. So Gal. 3:10 (LXX); Lu. 14:33. **Πᾶς** with a participle may have the same force, like παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον, Mt. 13:19 (cf. Lu. 11:4), and πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος, Mt. 5:22, etc. For πᾶς—**οὐ** 'no one' see negative pronouns. For the adjectival uses of πᾶς, see chapter on Adjectives and chapter on Article.

(d) **Ὅ Δεῖνα**. This rare pronoun was current chiefly in colloquial speech (Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 166). It survives in-the modern Greek (Thumb, p. 98). It means "Mr. So-and-So." It occurs only once in the N. T., πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα, Mt. 26:18.

X. **Alternative or Distributive Pronouns** (ἀντωνυμίαι διατηρίαι).

I apply a term from AEschylus in lieu of a better one. The reciprocal pronoun ἀλλήλων has been already treated.

(a) **Ἀμφότεροι**. **Ἄμφω** has vanished[5] from the **κοινή**. **Ἀμφοτεροι** has taken its place. It continues in the later Greek,[6] but Thumb

[1] Hatz., Einl., p. 207; W.-Sch., p. 243.
[2] Prol., p. 97.
[3] Ib.
[4] Thompson, Synt., p. 77.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 57.
[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 320.

does not give it for modern Greek. It is frequent in the LXX,[1] but is found only fourteen times in the N. T. It occurs without the article in all but five instances. So Mt. 9:17. Once the article is used with the substantive, **ἀμφοτερα τὰ πλοῖα**, Lu. 5:7. The other four examples have the article before the pronoun, like **οἱ ἀμφότεροι**, Eph. 2:18. It is possible, even probable, that in two instances duality has disappeared from the word. It seems certain that three items are referred to in Ac. 23:8 and in Ac. 19: 16 the seven sons of Sceva are alluded to. A corruption of the text is possible (cf. the Bezan text for 19:16), but it is hardly necessary to postulate that in view of "the undeniable Byzantine use"[2] of **ἀμφότεροι** for more than two (cf. "both" in old English). The papyri show undoubted examples also and "the Sahidic and some later versions took **ἀμφοτέρων**, as all.'"[3] But Moulton[4] hesitates to admit in Luke "a colloquialism of which early examples are so rare," a rather surprising objection from Dr. Moulton. On the whole one is safe in the two passages in Acts here quoted to admit the free use of **ἀμφότεροι**. The papyri examples bearing on this usage include N.P. 67, 69 (iv/A.D.) "where it is used of four men" (Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., 1904, p. 154), probably also B.M. 336 (ii/A.D.). See Bury, *Cl. Rev.*, XI, p. 393, for the opposite view. Nestle (*Berl. Phil. Woch*., 1900, N. 47) shows that German also uses "beide" for three and more persons.

(b) **Ἕκαστος**. In the LXX **ἑκάτερος** is still used to a limited extent (Gen. 40:5) and occasionally= **ἕκαστος**, without dual idea (cf. **ἀμφότεροι**), as often in the papyri.[5] In O.P. 256 (i/A.D.) and B.M. 333 (ii/A.D.) **ἑκάτερος** is used of three and of four in G. H. 23[a] (ii/B.C.). See Moulton, Cl. Rev., 1901, p. 440, and proper use of **ἑκάτερος** in P.Oxy. 905 (A.D. 170), **πρὸς τὸ ἑκάτερον μέρος**. But in the N. T. **ἑκάτερος** does not appear. **Ἕκαστος** is common in the N. T., but comes to be replaced in modern Greek by **κάθε, καθείς** and **καθένας** (cf. **καθ' εἷς** in the N. T.).[6]

1. *Without Substantive*. This is indeed the usual idiom, as in Mt. 16:27; Jo. 6:7.

2. *With Substantive.* Never with the article. So Eph. 4:16; Heb. 3:13; Rev. 22:2. Thus very rare.

[1] Thack., Gr., p. 192.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 80. [3] Ib. [4] Ib.
[5] Ib., p. 79. Cf. Thack., Gr., p. 192.
[6] Cf. Thumb, Handb., p. 96; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 178. On the whole subject of distrib. pron. see Brug., Die distrib. tend die kollekt. Num. der indoger. Spr., 1907.

3. *With* εἷς. This is very frequent. So εἷς ἕκαστος Mt. 26:22, etc. We even have ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος, Rev. 21:21. But in Ac. 21:19, ἐξηγεῖτο καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον ὧν ἐποίησεν we must not[1] connect ἕκαστον with ἕν.

4. *With Genitive.* It is common also with the genitive, as in Lu. 13:15; Eph. 4:7.

5. Partitive Apposition. This is frequent also. Thus ἀφῆτε ἕκαστος Mt. 18:35, ἐπορεύοντο πάντες---ἕκαστος Lu. 2:3, etc. The same thing is true in Eph. 5:33 ὑμεῖς καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστος. This is a classical construction.[2]

6. *Rare in Plural*. So ἕκαστοι. Ph. 2:4, but even here W. H. have ἕκαστος in the margin.

7. *Repetition*. Note the repetition of ἕκαστος in Heb. 8:11 (from Jer. 31:34). This translation of אִישׁ, by ἕκαστος rather than ἀνήρ is an instance of independence of Hebrew literalism. Cf. Mt. 18:35 with Gen. 13:11; Ro. 15:2 and Eph. 4:25 with Is. 3:5 (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 246). For ἀνήρ=ἕκαστος in the LXX (literal books) see Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 192.

(c)Ἄλλος. Cf. Latin *alius*, English *else*.

1. *Used absolutely* = 'An-other,' 'One Other.' This is the commonest use of the pronoun. Cf. 1 Cor. 12:8-10 where ἄλλῳ occurs six times. So Mt. 13:5-8 where ἄλλα appears three times. But it is found alone also, as ἄλλους, Mt. 27:42. For ἄλλος τις see Lu. 22:59. Cf. οὐδὲν ἄλλο (Gal. 5:10) 'nothing else.' It occurs in modern Greek vernacular.

2. *For Two.* But ἄλλος occurs where the idea of two is present (pair). Here ἕτερος might have been used, but even in Euripides, *I. T*. 962 f., Blass[3] finds θάτερον—τὸ δ' ἄλλο, though he considers it a "most striking encroachment" for ἄλλος to supplant ἕτερος in this fashion. Moulton (*Cl. Rev*., 1901, p. 440) cites τῆς μὲν μιᾶς—τῆς δ' ἄλλης G. H. 23a (ii/B.c.); δύο, τὸν μὲν ἕνα—καὶ τὸν ἄλλον B.U. 456 (iv/A.D.). Moulton[4] explains the existence of καὶ τὴν ἄλλην (σιαγόνα) in Lu. 6:29 as a failure on Luke's part to correct his source, a like failure appearing in Mt. 5:39, unless that was his source. But the matter goes much further than that. In Mt. 12:13 ἡ ἄλλη refers to the other hand (χείρ). In Jo. 19:32 note τοῦ πρώτου—καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου.[5] Cf. also Jo. 18:16; 20:3 f. In Jo. 5:32 ἐγώ and ἄλλος are contrasted. So Mt. 25:16, τὰ πέντε τάλαντα—ἄλλα πέντε, for which Blass6 finds "complete illustration in classi-

[1] W.-Sch., p. 246 f.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179.
[3] Ib., p. 180.
[4] Prol., p. 79.
[5] W.-Sch., p. 245.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 180,

cal authors." There are other N. T. examples such as ἄλλην in Mt. 19:9, τὰ δύο—ἄλλα δύο Mt. 25:17, ἄλλην Mk. 10:11, ἄλλον 10:12, ἄλλον παράκλητον Jo. 14:16.

3. *As Adjective.* Common. Cf. Mt. 2:12; 4:21; and in particular Rev. 14:6, 8, 15, 17, 18 and 1 Cor. 15:39, 41.

4. *With the Article.* It is not frequent. The article sharply refers to a preceding example. Cf. Mt. 5:39; Mt. 27:61. John alludes to himself in his Gospel as ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής (18:16; 20:2, 3, 4). The article may be repeated, as in Jo. 18:16; 19:32.

5. The Use of ἄλλος ἄλλο = 'One One Thing, One Another.' This is classical and is illustrated in Ac. 19:32; 21:34. In Ac. 2:12, ἄλλος πρὸ ἄλλον, the idiom is almost reciprocal like ἀλλήλων.

6. *In Contrast for 'Some — Others.'* We have ἄλλη μέν—ἄλλη δέ, 1 Cor. 15:39 and 41; ἃ μέν –ἄλλα δέ, Mt. 13:4 f. (cf. καὶ ἄλλο, Mk. 4:5); οἱ μέν –ἄλλοι δέ--ἕτεροι δέ, Mt. 16:14; καί ἄλλοι--ἄλλοι δέ, Mk. 8:28; ὑπὸ τινῶν—ἄλλων, Lu. 9:8; ὁ εἷς — ὁ ἄλλος, Rev. 17:10.

7. *Ellipsis of* ἄλλος is possible in Ac. 5:29, **Πέτρος καὶ οἱ** (sc. ἄλλοι) ἀπόστολοι. Blass[1] cites also Ac. 2:14, **Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς** (sc. λοιποῖς) ἕνδεκα. But psychologically this explanation is open to doubt.

8. *The Use of ἄλλος and ἕτερος Together*. Blass[2] finds this "probably only for the sake of variety." Certainly in 1 Cor. 12:9 f. no real distinction can be found between ἄλλος and ἕτερος, which are here freely intermingled. But I am bound to insist on a real difference in Gal. 1:6 f. The change is made from ἕτερον to ἄλλο for the very reason that Paul is not willing to admit that it is a gospel on the same plane (ἄλλο) as that preached by him. He admits ἕτερον, but refuses ἄλλο. The use of εἰ μή by Paul does not disturb this interpretation. The same thing would seem to be true of 2 Cor. 11:4, ἄλλον ᾽Ιησοῦν – πνεῦμα ἕτερον – εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον. It may be that variety (as in 1 Cor. 12:9 f.) is all that induces the change here. But it is also possible that Paul stigmatizes the gospel of the Judaizers as gmpov (cf. Gal. 1:6) and the Spirit preached by them, while he is unwilling to admit another (ἄλλον) Jesus even of the same type as the one preached by him.

9. *='Different.'* Besides, it is not to be forgotten that in ancient Greek ἄλλος itself was used for 'different kind.' Thompson (*Syntax*, p.76) cites ἄλλα τῶν δικαίων from Xen., *Mem*., IV, 4. 25. Cf. also ἀλλά in the sense of 'but.' Cf. ἀλλὰ ἄλλη in 1 Cor. 15:39.

[1] lb. [2] Ib., p. 318.

Indeed in 1 Cor. 15:39, 41, ἄλλη μέν—ἄλλη δέ it is expressly stated that the glory is not ἡ αὐτή. In verse 40 ἑτέρα occurs. Here ἄλλος seems to be used in the sense of 'dfferent,' like ἕτερος. In Latin *alius* was often used where earlier Latin would have used *alter*. Cf. Draeger, *Hist. Synt.*, p. 105.

10. **Ἀλλότριος**. This variation of ἄλλος has the same relation to it that *alienus* has to *alius*. It means 'belonging to another,' and occurs fourteen times in the N. T. Cf. Ro. 15:20. The contrast with αὐτῶν is seen in Mt. 17:25. In Heb. 11:34 it has the notion of *alienus*.

(d) **Ἕτερος**.

1. *Absolutely*. So often as in Lu. 14:19 f., but it is also used more frequently with substantives than is ἄλλος. Cf. Lu. 4:43; Ac. 7:18 (LXX), etc. For ἑτερός τις see Ac. 8:34; Ro. 13:9. For the genitive with ἕτερος cf. Mt. 8:21; Gal. 1:19.

2. *With Article.* The article is also more common with ἕτερος than with ἄλλος. Cf. Mt. 10:23; 11:16, etc.

3. *Second of Pair*. A common, probably the original, use of gmpos is for the second of a pair. Cf. Latin *alter*. It is the only surviving dual pronominal word in the N. T. (except ἀμφότεροι), and is common in the LX.X[1] and the papyri.[2] For σὺν ἑτέρᾳ μιᾷ, see P.Tb. 421 (iii/A.D.). The examples are rather abundant in the N. T. of this dual (comparative) sense (ἕ-τερος). So τὸν ἕνα—τὸν ἕτερον, Mt. 6:24; σύ--ἢ ἕτερον, 11:3; ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ, Lu. 5:7. Cf. also Lu. 7:19 f.; 14:31; 16:13; 17:34 f.; 18:10; 20:11.[3] Not radically different from this conception is the use of it for 'next,' as in Lu. 6:6, ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ, 9:56 εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην Ac. 20:15 τῇ ἑτέρᾳ. Cf. also Mt. 10:23. See also, τὸν ἕτερον in Ro. 2:1; 13:8 = 'neighbour.'

4. = *'Different*.' The sense of 'different' grows naturally out of the notion of duality. The two things happen just to be different. Cf. Latin *alius* and *alienus*. The word itself does not mean 'different,' but merely 'one other,' a second of two. It does not necessarily involve "the secondary idea of difference of kind" (Thayer). That is only true where the context demands it. But note how Latin *alter* lends itself to the notion of *change*. Thompson[4] suggests that this sense may be "an euphemism for κακός." The N. T. examples are rather numerous. So ἐγένετο—τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον, Lu. 9:29. Cf. also Ac. 2:4; Ro. 7:23; 1 Cor. 14 : 21; 2 Cor. 11 : 4; Gal. 1 : 6; Heb. 7 : 11, 13, 15; Ju. 7.

[1] Thack., Gr., p. 192.
[2] Mayser, Gr., p. 312.
[3] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 244.
[4] Synt., p. 77.

Cf. also ἑτέρως in Ph. 3:15 and ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ Mk. 16:12 (disputed part of Mark.)[1] Cf. Ac. 17:21. We have already seen that ἄλλος may be equal to 'different' (1 Cor. 15:39). **Ἕτερος** occurs in verse 40 in the sense of 'different.' Ramsay (on Gal. 1:6) argues that, when ἕτερος occurs in contrast with ἄλλος, it means not 'different' (as Lightfoot *in loco*), but 'another of the same kind.' Moulton (*Prol*., p. 246) stands by Lightfoot in spite of Ramsay's examples.

5. *='Another' of Three or More.* But ἕτερος comes also to be employed merely for 'another' with more than two and with no idea of difference. This usage probably grew out of the use with two groups. So Lu. 10:1, ἀνέδειξεν ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα δύο. In Mt. 12:45, ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ, the notion of difference is present. This difference may also be implied by Luke in 23:32, καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο. Cf. Lu. 8:3. But this is hardly true of Ac. 2:13. In Ac. 4:12 the point of ἕτερον is rather that no other name at all than that of Jesus, not that of difference in kind. In Lu. 19:16-20 we have this order, ὁ πρῶτος, ὁ δεύτερος, ὁ ἕτερος. So in 1 Cor. 4:6, εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου, the third is again presented by ἕτερος. Then, again, ἕτεροι occupies third place in Mt. 16:14 and Heb. 11:36. In Mt. 15: 30 it comes in the fifth place. Blass[2] admits that this use of grepoc "at the close of enumerations may be paralleled from Attic writers." See further Lu. 3:18; Ro. 8:39; 1 Tim. 1:10. But in 1 Cor. 12:8-10 ἑτέρῳ occurs in the third and the eighth places. We are not surprised then to learn that the papyri furnish plenty of examples where ἕτερος refers to more than two.[3] Blass indeed considers this extension not correct, and Moulton seems surprised that Luke should change the correct ἄλλος (Mk. 4:5-8 Mt. 13:5-8) to ἕτερον in Lu. 8:6-8. But Luke is reinforced by Paul in this laxity as to ἕτερος. Cf. πλλὰ καὶ ἕτερα in Lu. 3:18. Moulton (*Cl. Rev.*, 1904, p. 154) calls this "incorrect ἕτερος" and finds it in the papyri, as in O.P. 494 (ii/A.D.). But we do not need to hold grepos in leading strings. The "subtlety" (*Cl. Rev*., 1901, p. 440) is only called for in that case.

6. *In Contrast.* **Ἕτερος** may also be used in contrast for 'the one,' 'the other.' So 1 Cor. 15:40, ἑτέρα μέν—ἑτέρα δέ. It is common in contrasts with other pronouns. Thus with εἷς in Mt. 6:24; ὁ εἷς in Lu. 7:41; Lu. 17:34 ff.; with τις, Lu. 11:15 f.; with ὃ μέν, Lu. 8:5 f.; with οἱ μέν and ἄλλοι, Mt. 16:14. But

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 245.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 179.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 79.

neither **οὐδέτερος (μηδ--)** nor **οὐθέτερος (μηθ--)** occurs in the N. T., though **μηθέτερος** is read in Prov. 24:21. In Clem. Hom. XIX, 12 we have **οὐθέτερος**.

(e) OTHER ANTITHETIC PRONOUNS. For **εἷς—εἷς** (Mk. 10:37), **θεῖς – ὁ δέ** (Gal. 4:24 f.), **ὁ εἷς—ὁ ἄλλος** (Rev. 17:10) see **εἷς** under Numeral Adjectives. So likewise **τις** may be contrasted with **τις** (Ph. 1:15), with **ἄλλος** (Lu. 9:7 f.), with **ἕτερος** (1 Cor. 3:4). For the very common **ὁ μέν—ὁ δὲ, ὃς μέν—ὃς δέ** see Demonstrative Pronouns. The repetition of the substantive is to be noted also. So **οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει**, Lu. 11:17; **ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει**, Mt. 12:26 (= Lu. 11:18). This notion of repetition is seen in **ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ** (2 Cor. 4:16; cf. Heb. יוֹם יוֹם). Cf. also **εἷς καὶ εἷς** (Mt. 20:21; 24:40 f.; 27:38, etc.); **ὁ εἷς –ὁ ἕτερος**, Lu. 7:41. For **εἷς—καὶ εἷς—καὶ εἷς** see Mk. 9:5 = Mt. 17:4 = Lu. 9:33. This threefold repetition of **εἷς** is rhetorical.[1] The distributive use of **εἷς** with **κατά** and **ἀνά (ἓν καθ' ἓν, εἷς καθ' εἷς, ἀνὰ εἷς)** was treated under Numeral Adjectives.

XI. Negative Pronouns (ἀντωνυμίαι ἀρνητικαί).

(a) **Οὐδείς**.

1. *History*. Note this accent rather than **οὐδεῖς**. **Οὐδείς** is supplanted in modern Greek vernacular by **κανείς**, but **οὐδέν** survives as negative particle in form **δέν**. Cf. Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 171.

2. **Οὐθείς**. This is made from are **οὔτε εἷς**. (sometimes also from **οὐδὲ εἷς**, 'not even,' Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 146) and occurs sometimes in the best N. T. MSS. Cf. W. H.'s text for Lu. 22: 35; 23:14; Ac. 15:9; 19:27; 26:26; 1 Cor. 13:2; 2 Cor. 11:9. Jannaris[2] finds it a peculiarity of the Alexandrian school. Meisterhans[3] has shown from the inscriptions how **οὐθείς** and **μηθείς** came to be practically universal during the third century and the first half of the second century B.C. Thackeray[4] has reinforced this position from the uncials for the LXX. The papyri are in full accord.[5] In the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., the date of the great uncials, **οὐθείς** and **μηθείς** had disappeared from current speech, and yet a number of instances survive in the MSS. of the 0. T. and the N. T., though others were probably replaced by **οὐδείς** and **μηδείς**.[6] In-

[1] W.-Sch., p. 246.

[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 170. But see Schwyzer, Perg. Inschr., p. 114, for idea that the change is due to **τ** and **δ** being pronounced alike.

[3] Att. Inschr., p. 259.

[4] Gr., pp. 551f.

[6] Thumb, Hellen., p. 14; Mayser, Gr., p. 150 f.

[6] Thack., Gr., p. 60,

deed **οὐθείς** was a sort of fashion (Moulton, *Cl. Rev.*, Mar., 1910, p. 53) that came in iv/B.C. and vanished ii/A.D. It was nearly extinct in N. T. times. See further chapters VI, III (g), and VII, III 2.

3. *Gender*. The feminine form is less frequent in the N. T. than the masculine and neuter. The word occurs with substantives (Mk. 6:5), with other pronouns (**ἄλλος**, Ac. 4:12; **ἕτερος**, 17:21), but usually alone, as in Mt. 5:13; 6:24. It is common with the genitive (Lu. 18:34). The adverbial use of **οὐδέν** is seen in Gal. 4:1 **οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου**, but the cognate accusative is a possible explanation (Gal. 2:6). Cf. **οὐδεν** in 1 Cor. 7:19. In Rev. 3: 17, **οὐδὲν χρείαν ἔχω**, the neuter is not to be construed with **χρείαν**.

4. **Οὐδὲ εἷς**. This is, of course, more emphatic than **οὐδείς**. The usage appears often in Xenophon, Demosthenes and other classic writers, the LXX and the Atticists.[1] For examples in the N. T. see Mt. 27:14; Jo. 1:3; Ac. 4:32; Ro. 3:10. The same principle appears in **οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός,** Ro. 3:12 (Ps. 14:1, 3). Cf. also the separation of **οὐ—ποτέ** in 2 Pet. 1:21.[2]

5. **Εἷς —οὐ**. It is after the analogy of **πᾶς—οὐ** and distinctly emphatic, and is found in Demosthenes.[3] Cf. Lu. 12:6, **ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν**. So likewise Mt. 10:29, **ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται**. In Mt. 5:18 we have **ἕν—οὐ μή**. For **οὐδεὶς ὅστις** see **ὅστις**.

(b) **Μηδείς**. In general the history of **μηδείς** is parallel to that of **οὐδείς**. It is naturally much less frequent and its use instead of **οὐδείς** belongs to the discussion of Modes and Negative Particles. It follows in that matter the fate of **μή**. **Μηθείς** appears only once in the text of the N. T., Ac. 27:33. The use of **μηδὲν ὤν**, Gal. 6:3, may be compared with **οὐθέν εἰμι**, 1 Cor. 13:2. In 1 Th. 4:12 note **μηδενὸς χρείαν ἔχητε**.

(c) **Οὔτις** AND **Μήτις**. These were treated under **τις**. Following the editors in the separation of these forms, it is to be observed that **μήτι** as mere particle occurs not merely in questions like **μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός**; Jo. 4:29, but also with **εἰ.** So **εἰ μήτι** in 1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 13:5. But in Lu. 9:13, **εἰ μήτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν**, it is possible to take **μήτι** as the object of **ἀγοράσωμεν.** Cf. Jo. 6:12, **ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται**. But note **μήτιγε** 1 Cor. 6:3. The use of **τις** with the conjunction **μή** is not infrequent (Mk. 13:5) and with the negative adverb **μή** also (Jo. 3:3, 5, etc.). So we have, contrary to the usual classic idiom, **οὐ—τις, μή--τις.**[4] The

[1] W.-Sch., p. 248; Schmid, Atticismus, II, p. 137 f.
[2] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 249.
[3] Ib., p. 178.
[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 256.

undoubted separation of **οὐ** and **μή** from **τις** in such examples as Mt. 11:27; 12:19; Lu. 8:51; 12:4; Jo. 7:4; 10:28; Ac. 28:21; of 1 Cor. 4: 5, etc., argues for the same thing where **μή τις** and **μή τι** happen to come together. The **κοινή** (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 246) supports the use of **τις** with the negative: Tb.P. 1 (ii/B.C.) **μηδεμιᾶς κρατήσεως μηδὲ κυριείας τινὸς ἐγγαίου περιγινομένης.**

(d) WITH **Πᾶς.**

1. **Οὐ πᾶς.** Used together the words call for little in the way of explanation. **Οὐ** merely negatives **πᾶς** as in classic Greek and= 'not every one.' Thus in Mt. 7:21, **οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων—εἰσελεύσεται**, Jesus did not mean to say that 'no one' who thus addressed him could enter the kingdom of heaven. He merely said that 'not every one' would. Cf. also **οὐ πᾶσα σάρξ** 1 Cor. 15:39. The same principle applies to the plural **οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον**, Mt. 19: 11. Cf. Ac. 10:41; Ro. 9:6; 10:16. But my friend, Mr. H. Scott, notes that in Ro. 10:16 and 1 Cor. 15:39 **οὐ πᾶς** can well mean 'no,' and that in Mt. 7:21 and the other clauses where **ἀλλά**, occurs the **ἀλλά** negatives the whole of the preceding clause. This is certainly worth considering. Cf. Mt. 7:21 **οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων**, with **πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων**, in 7:26.

2. **Οὐ—πᾶς.** Here we have a different situation. The negative goes with the verb. A negative statement is made as to **πᾶς.** The result is the same as if **οὐδείς** had been used with an affirmative verb. So Mt. 24:22 (Mk. 13:20) **οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ**, the idea is 'no flesh,' not 'not all flesh,' i.e. 'some flesh,' would have been lost. Cf. Lu. 1:37 **οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει — πᾶν ῥῆμα**, Ro. 3:20 (Gal. 2:16) **οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ.** See also Ac. 10:14 **οὐδέποτε—πᾶν**. Cf. **οὐδὲ πᾶν** Rev. 7:16; 9:4. It is true that this idiom is very common in the LXX[1] as a translation of **לֹא—כֹּל**. Cf. Ex. 12:16, 43; 20:10, etc. But it is not without analogy also 'in the papyri use of **πᾶς** "with prepositions and adjectives of negative meaning. Thus **ἄνευ** or **χωρὶς πάσης ὑπερθέσεως**, a recurrent formula, **ἀνυπεύθενοι παντὸς ἐπίμου,** Tb.P. 105 (ii/B.C.); **δίχα πάσης ἐξουσίας**, Plutarch, *Cons. ad Uxor.*, 1 (cf. Heb. 7:7)."[2] Clearly the construction was in harmony with the **κοινή**.

3. **Μή — πᾶς.** The same principle applies. Cf. 1 Cor. 1:29, **ὅπως μὴ καυχήσηται πᾶσα σάρξ.** Here it is 'no flesh' as above with **οὐ – πᾶς.** See also Rev. 7:1. On the other hand **μὴ πᾶς** (1 Jo. 4:1)= 'not every' like **οὐ πᾶς.**

[1] W.-M., p. 215.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 246. Cf. Cl. Rev., Dec., 1901, p. 442; Apr., 1904, p. 155.

4. **Οὐ μή--πᾶν** in Rev. 21:27 does not differ at all from the **οὐ**—πᾶς and **μή--πᾶς** is in construction.

5. **Πᾶς—οὐ**). Here the ancient Greek idiom to a certain extent comes to one's relief.[1] But the **לֹא — כֹּל** lies behind the LXX translation. It is less harsh than **οὐ** —πᾶς. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.,* p. 178. The denial about πᾶς is complete as with **οὐ**—πᾶς. See 1 Jo. 2:21, **πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν**. Cf. 1 Jo. 3:15; Eph. 5:5; Rev. 22:3.

6. **Πᾶς — μή** falls into the same category. Cf. Jo. 3:16; 6:39; 12:46; Eph. 4:29; 5:3. Here also the denial is universal. But most probably **μηδείς** would have pleased an older Greek more.

7. **Πᾶς—οὐ μή.** In Rev. 18:22 the same explanation holds.

8. **Οὐ**—πάντες. With the plural **οὐκ εἰσὶν πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν**, 1 Jo. 2:19, the matter is not so clear. Two translations are possible, as is seen in the American Revision. The text there is: "they all are not of us." The margin has: "not all are of us." The analogy of **οὐ**—πᾶς in the singular favours the first.

9. **Πάντες οὐ**. With **πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα**, 1 Cor. 15:51, the **οὐ** goes with the verb. The effect is the same as πᾶς—**οὐ**, above. 'We all shall not sleep' means that 'none' of us shall sleep. 'We shall all be changed.' *Per contra*, see **οὐ πάντες** Ro. 10:16= 'not all.'

[1] W.-M., p. 215.

CHAPTER XVI

THE ARTICLE (**ΤΟ ᾽ΑΡΘΡΟΝ**)

I. Other Uses of **ὁ, ἡ τό**. For the demonstrative **ὁ** and the relative **ὁ** see chapter on Syntax of Pronouns. It is confusing to say with Seyffart[1]: "Der Artikel hat die ursprungliche demonstrative Bedeutung." It is then just the demonstrative, not the article at all. Why call the demonstrative the article? Great confusion of idea has resulted from this terminology. It is important to keep distinct the demonstrative, the article and the relative.

II. Origin and Development of the Article.

(a) A GREEK CONTRIBUTION. The development of the Greek article is one of the most interesting things in human speech.[2] Among the Indo-Germanic languages it is "a new Greek departure."[3] It is not found in Sanskrit nor in Latin. It does not appear to be pro-ethnic[4] and first shows itself in Homer. Indeed, the existence of the genuine article in Homer is denied by some.[5] But it seems an overrefinement to refuse to see the article in such Homeric phrases as **οἱ πλέονες, οἱ ἄριστοι**, etc.[6] And it is beyond dispute that it is in the Attic prose, particularly in Plato, that the Greek article reaches its perfection.[7] The article has shown remarkable persistency and survives with very little modification in modern Greek.[8] In the N. T. the usage is in all essentials in harmony with Attic, more so than is true of the papyri.[9] But Volker[10] finds the papyri in practical accord at most points with Attic. Simcox[11] points out that even the Hebrew article does not differ radically in use from the Greek article.

[1] Hauptr. der gricch. Synt., p. 1.
[2] Cf. Schneider, Vorles. uber griech. Gr.
[3] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 41.
[4] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., I, pp. 507 ff. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 424.
[5] Delbruck, op. cit. Cf. also Thompson, Synt., p. 41 f.
[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 178 ff. [7] Thompson, Synt., p. 41 f.
[8] Cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 40 ff.; Jebb. in V. and D.'s Handb., p. 193 f.
[9] Moulton, Prol., p. 80 f.
[10] Synt. d. griech. Pap., pp. 5 ff. [11] Lang. of the N. T., p. 45.

(b) DERIVED FROM THE DEMONSTRATIVE. The Greek article is the same form as the demonstrative **ὁ, ἡ, τό**. Indeed the German *der* is used as demonstrative, article, relative. So English *the* is related to the demonstrative that (also relative). Clyde (*Greek Syntax*, p. 6) calls the article a "mere enfeeblement" of the demonstrative. So the French *le*, the Italian *il*, the Spanish *el*, all come from the Latin demonstrative *ille*. But while this is true, the demonstrative, relative and article should not be confused in idea. The Greek grammarians applied ἄρθρον to all three in truth, but distinguished them as ἄρθρον προτακτικόν (dem.), ἄρθρον ὑποτακτικόν (rel.), ἄρθρον ὁριστικόν (art.). Some, however, did not distinguish sharply between the demonstrative and the article. The article always retained something of the demonstrative force (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, Part II, p. 215). It is an utter reversal of the facts to speak of the demonstrative use of the article. It is only of recent years that a really scientific study of the article has been made.[1] Even Brugmann[2] gives no separate treatment for the article. But Part II of Gildersleeve's *Syntax* (1911, pp. 215-332) has a really scientific treatment of the article. Professor Miller collected material for it. But even here I must demur against "the substantive use of the article" (p. 216) instead of plain substantival demonstrative. Gildersleeve uses "article" in two senses (form and idea). The Latin word *articulus* has the same root as the Greek ἄρθρον (αρ– as seen in ἀρ-αρ-ίσκω, 'to fit,' 'join'). The origin of the article from the demonstrative can probably be seen in Homer. Monro[3] thinks it due to apposition of a substantive with the demonstrative ὁ. So Iliad, 4. 501, ἡ δ᾽ ἑτέροιο διὰ κροτάφοιο πέρησεν αἰχμὴ χαλκείη. Here αἰχμή explains ἡ and ἡ wavers between demonstrative and article and illustrates the transition. So with new proper names ὁ anticipates the name which is loosely added later. "In Attic the article shows that a particular known person is spoken of; in Homer it marks the turning of attention to a person."[4] In Homer the article usually marks contrast and not mere definiteness. But this contrast or singling out of the special object is in essence the real article which is thus attributive.

III. Significance of the Article. The article, unlike the demonstrative, does not point out the object as far or near. It is not deictic. There is either contrast in the distinction drawn or allusion (anaphoric) to what is already mentioned or assumed as well

[1] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 794.
[2] Griech. Gr.
[3] Hom. Gr., p. 178.
[4] Ib.

known. The article is therefore τὸ ὁριστικὸν ἄρθρον, the definite article. The article is associated with gesture and aids in pointing out like an index finger. It is a pointer. It is not essential to language, but certainly very convenient and useful and not "*otiosum loquacissimae gentis instrumentum*," as Scaliger[1] called it. The Greek article is not the only means of making words definite. Many words are definite from the nature of the case.[2] The word itself may be definite, like **γῆ, οὐρανός, Ἰησοῦς**. The use of a preposition with definite anarthrous nouns is old, as **ἐν οἴκῳ**. Possessive pronouns also make definite, as do genitives. The context itself often is clear enough. The demonstrative may be used besides the article. Whenever the Greek article occurs, the object is certainly definite. When it is not used, the object may or may not be. The article is never meaningless in Greek, though it often fails to correspond with the English idiom, as in **ἡ σοφίας, ὁ Παῦλος.** It is not a matter of translation. The older language and higher poetry are more anarthrous than Attic prose. Dialects vary in the use of the article, as do authors. Plato is richer in the article than any one. Its free use leads to exactness and finesse (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, Part II, p. 215 f.).

IV. The Method Employed by the Article. The Greek article points out in one of three ways.[3] It distinguishes:

(a) INDIVIDUALS FROM INDIVIDUALS. The article does not give the reason for the distinction drawn between individuals. That is usually apparent in the context. The translators of the King James Version, under the influence of the Vulgate, handle the Greek article loosely and inaccurately.[4] A goodly list of such sins is given in "The Revision of the New Testament,"[5] such as 'a pinnacle' for τὸ πτερύγιον (Mt. 4:5). Here the whole point lies in the article, the wing of the Temple overlooking the abyss. So in Mt. 5:1 τὸ ὄρος was the mountain right at hand, not 'a mountain.' On the other hand, the King James translators missed the point of μετὰ γυναικός (Jo. 4:27) when they said 'the woman.' It was 'a woman,' any woman, not the particular woman in question. But the Canterbury Revisers cannot be absolved from all blame, for they ignore the article in Lu. 18:13, τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. The vital thing is to see the matter from the Greek point of view and

[1] Quoted by Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 57.

[2] The old idea that the article was necessary to make a word definite is seen in Madvig, Synt. of the Gk. Lang., p. 8.

[3] Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 70.

[4] Ib.

[5] Lightfoot, Trench, Ellicott, p. xxx f,

find the reason for the use of the article. In Mt. 13:55, **ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός**, it is the son of the (well known to us) carpenter. In 1 Cor. 4:5 **ὁ ἔπαινος** means the praise due to each one. Cf. **ὁ μισθός** in Ro. 4:4. In 1 Cor. 5:9, **ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ**, Paul refers to a previous letter which the Corinthians had received. In 15:8, **τῷ ἐκτρώματι**, Paul speaks thus of himself because he alone of the Apostles saw Jesus after His Ascension. The examples of this use are very numerous in the N. T. Thus in Mt. 5:15, **τὸν μόδιον, τὴν λυχνίαν,** the article singles out the bushel, the lamp-stand present in the room. In 15:26, **τοῖς κυναρίοις**, Jesus points to the little dogs by the table. In Lu. 4:20, **τὸ βιβλίον ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ**, the roll was the usual one and the attendant was there at his place. So in Jo. 13:5, **βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα**, the basin was there in the room. The article in Jo. 7:17, **γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς**, means the teaching concerning which they were puzzled.

(b) CLASSES FROM OTHER CLASSES. The (generic) article is not always necessary here any more than under (a). See **πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς** (Mt. 5:45); **δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων** (1 Pet. 3:18). Cf. in particular 1 Cor. 12:13 **εἴτε ᾿Ιουδαῖοι εἴτε ῞Ελληνες**, 12:29. So also **ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεύς**; (1 Cor. 1:20). But it is quite common to use the article with different classes. So in Mt. 8:20 note **αἱ ἀλώπεκες, τὰ πετεινά**. So **αἱ γυναῖκες** (Eph. 5:22), **οἱ ἄνδρες** (5:25), **τὰ τέκνα** (6:1), **οἱ πατέρες** (6:4), **οἱ δοῦλοι** (6:5). In these examples the vocative often has the article. Cf. Col. 3:18 ff. A good example of the use with classes is found in Mt. 5:3-10 (the Beatitudes), **οἱ πτωχοί**, etc. Cf. **τοὺς σοφοὺς, τὰ ἀσθενῆ,** etc., in 1 Cor. 1:27. So **οἱ ἀκροαταί** and **οἱ ποιηταί** in Ro. 2:13. Cf. Rev. 11:18; 22:14. It is very common to find the singular used with the article in a representative sense for the whole class. So in **ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου** (Mt. 8:20, and often) Jesus calls himself the Son of Mankind. Cf. Lu. 10:7, **ὁ ἐργάτης**, where the labourer represents all labourers. In Mt. 18:17 note **ὁ ἐθνικὸς καὶ ὁ τελώνης**. The Gospel of John is especially rich in examples of this kind (both ideals and types).[1] Other examples are Mt. 12:35 **ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος**, 12:29 **τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ**, Jas. 5:6 **τὸν δίκαιον**, 2 Cor. 12:12 **τοῦ ἀποστόλου**, Gal. 4:1 **ὁ κληρονόμος**, Mt. 13:3 **ὁ σπείρων**. But even here the article is not always needed. So **᾿Ιουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ ῞Ελληνος** (Ro. 2:9). Cf. **καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ**, Heb. 5:14. In examples like **ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ** (Mt. 24:35), where there is only one of the kind, the explanation is not far from the class from class

[1] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 47. On literature upon the article see E. Schwartz in the Index to Eusebius, p. 209.

idea. So θεός, like proper names, may use the article where we do not need it in English (Jo. 3:16). Volker (*Syntax*, p. 19) notes in the papyri examples like γυνὴ καὶ υἱοί, ἡ γυνὴ καὶ οἱ υἱοί, γυνὴ καὶ οἱ υἱοί, ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ τέκαν. For the generic article see further Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, pp. 255 ff.

(c) QUALITIES FROM OTHER QUALITIES. The English does not use the article with abstract qualities unless they have been previously mentioned. But French and German are like the Greek in the use of the article here. It is not necessary to have the article with qualities. So in 1 Cor. 12 : 9-11 the gifts mentioned have no article. So in chapter 13, ἀγάπην in verses 1-3, but ἡ ἀγάπη in 4, 8; but πίστις, ἐλπίς ἀγάπη (verse 13). In 1 Jo. 4:18 φόβος is first without the article, then is repeated with the article, while ἡ ἀγάπη each time. There is much of the same freedom as to the use or non-use of the article here as elsewhere. Cf. Ro. 12:7, 9; 13:9 f.; Col. 3:5. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 150) from the standpoint of the German sees more difficulty in the absence than in the presence of such articles. But he is correct in saying that the relative in Col. 3:5 explains the use of the article. It is interesting to observe that in the list of attributes of God in the songs in Rev. 4:11; 5:13; 7:12, the article is expressed with each quality, while in 5:12 one article (τήν) is used with the whole list. In Ro. 13:7 the article is used with each thing and quality. It is possible that τῷ here is the article also for which the participle has to be supplied. But for the absence of μέν and δέ one might suspect τῷ to be the demonstrative. In Ro. 16:17, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας κὰ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε ποιοῦντας, note how neatly τούς, τάς, τά τήν come in and illustrate the three uses of the article. Note also the neat classic idiom τοὺς—ποιοῦντας. For the article with abstract nouns see further Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, pp. 257 ff.

V. Varied Usages of the Article.

(a) WITH SUBSTANTIVES.

1. *Context*. Whether the substantive is pointed out as an individual, class or quality, the context makes clear. The English may or may not have need of the article in translation. But that point cuts no figure in the Greek idiom. Thus in Ac. 27:23, τοῦ θεοῦ οὗ εἰμί, the article points out the special God whose Paul is and is to be preserved in English. In the very next verse, ὁ θεός, we in English do not need the article, even if, as is unlikely, the angel has the notion of "the special God.". Cf. also Jo. 1 : 1. In Mt. 23:2, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, the two classes are

distinguished as in English. In Ro. 11:36, ἡ δόξα, it is the glory due to God. See ὁ μισθός, 1 Cor. 9:18 (cf. Ro. 4:4).

2. *Gender of the Article*. It will, of course, be that of the substantive. Cf. τήν — τόν — τό in Lu. 2:16. But sometimes the construction is according to the sense. So in Mt. 4:13, τὴν **Ν**αζαρά, because of the implied πόλιν. Cf. also **Κ**αφαρναοὺμ τήν. But in Gal. 4:25, τὸ δὲ ᾽**Α**γαρ, Paul purposely uses the grammatical gender of the word rather than the natural feminine. Cf. also ὁ ἀμήν (Rev. 3:14), where Jesus is meant. But note the usual τὸ ἀμήν in 1 Cor. 14:16. The N. T. does not have the neuter article with the plural of a Hebrew word, as we occasionally see in the LXX (Thackeray, p. 34). Cf. τῷ βεελείμ, (Ezek. 27:4).

3. *With Proper Names*. This seems rather odd to us in English, since the proper name itself is supposed to be definite enough. But at bottom the idiom is the same as with other substantives. We do not use the article with home, husband, wife, church, unless there is special reason to do so. The word itself is usually sufficient. We must rid ourselves of the notion that any substantive requires the article. But, just because proper names are so obviously definite, the article was frequently used where we in English cannot handle it. But this is very far from saying that the article meant nothing to the Greek. It meant definiteness to him. We often have the same difficulty with the article with classes and qualities. Sometimes we can see the reason for the use of the article with proper names. So τὸν **᾽Ι**ησοῦν ὅν **Π**αῦλος κηρύσσει, Ac. 19:13. But in most instances the matter seems quite capricious to us. The writer may have in mind a previous mention of the name or the fact of the person being well known. In 2 Tim. 4:9-21 the proper names are all anarthrous. The same thing is true of Ro. 16, even when the adjective is not anarthrous, as in **᾽Α**πελλῆν τὸν δόκιμον ἐν **Χ**ριστῷ (verse 10). So in the ancient Greek for the most part the article was not used with proper names (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 229). Its use with persons is a mark of familiar style, but Plato uses it for anaphora or for contrast. In some sections it is common to use the article with titles, as The Reverend Doctor So-and-So. In South Germany der is used with the name alone.[1]

It seems needless to make extended observations about the presence or absence of the Greek article with names of countries, cities, rivers, persons. The usage among Greek writers greatly varies about rivers,, mountains, etc. Cf. Kallenberg, *Stu. uber den*

[1] W.-Th., p. 113.

griech. Art., 1891). See exhaustive treatment by Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, pp. 236-253) and his paper in *American Journal of Philol.*, XI, pp. 483-487. Different words vary. "Names of cities most rarely have the article when connected with prepositions,"[1] but that is true of other words also. **Ἰερουσαλήμ** does not have the article save when an adjective is used (so Gal. 4:25 f.; Rev. 3: 12) except in one instance (Ac. 5:28). Curiously **Ἱεροσόλυμα** has the article (in the oblique cases) only[2] in Jo. 2:23; 5:2; 10:22; 11:18. As instances of the article used with a city mentioned the second time (anaphoric) see Ac. 17:10, **εἰς Βέροιαν**, and 17: 13, **ἐν τῇ Βεροίᾳ**; 17:15, **ἕως Ἀθηνῶν**; and 17:16, **ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις**. For further details see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 152 f.

Substantives in apposition with proper names may have the article, as in **Ἡρῴδης ὁ βασιλεύς**, Mt. 2:1; and **ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης**, Mt. 2:3; or not, as **Ἡρῴδου βασιλεύως**, Lu. 1:5. In **βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα**, Ac. 25:26, it is like our 'King George.' So in Xenophon, when the King of Persia is meant we find **βασιλεύς**. In Mt. 3:6, **ὁ Ἰορδάνης ποταμός**, we have the usual order, but see the order reversed and the article repeated in Rev. 9:14; 16:12. Cf. **τοῦ ὄρους Σινά** (Ac. 7:30) and **ὄρους Σινά** (Gal. 4:24), **τὸ ὄρος Σιών** (Rev. 14:1) and **Σιὼν ὄρει** (Heb. 12:22). For the article with appositive proper names see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 231. Cf. **Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης**, Mt. 10:4; **Ἡρῴδης ὁ τετραάρχης** and **Ἰωάνης ὁ βαπτιστής**, 14:1 f.; **Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός**, Mk. 10:47; Ac. 1:13, **Σίμων ὁ ζηλωτής**, etc. Here the word in apposition has the article, but not the proper name.[3] Cf. 1 Cor. 1:1.

In the Gospels as a rule **Ἰησοῦς** has the article. **Χριστός** in the Gospels usually has the article= the Anointed One, the Messiah. In the Epistles it usually is like a proper name and commonly without the article,[4] illustrating the development of Christology in the N. T. Indeclinable proper names usually have the article if the case would not otherwise be clear. Cf. the list in Mt. 1: 2-16, where the nominative has no article, but the accusative does have it. So **Ἰσραήλ** in Ro. 10:19, but **τὸν Ἰσραήλ** in 1 Cor. 10:18. See also Mt. 22:42; Mk. 15:45; Lu. 2:16; Ac. 7:8; 15:1 f.; Ro. 9:13; Heb. 11:17. The use of **τὸν Βαραββᾶν** in Lu. 23:18 is not abrupt. In Xenophon's *Anabasis* the article is not often used with proper names unless the person is previously

[1] W.-Th., p. 112.
[2] Ib. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 153.
[3] See further W.-Sch., p. 153.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 152.

mentioned.[1] In Homer the article appears only occasionally with a proper name when a new person is introduced, and "marks the turning of attention to a person,"[2] rather than pointing to a particular person as in Attic. "In short the Homeric article contrasts, the Attic article *defines*." But, as a matter of fact, no satisfactory principle can be laid down for the use or non-use of the article with proper names.[3] For good discussion of the matter see Gildersleeve, *Am. Jour. of Philol.*, XI, pp. 483 ff. In modern Greek the article occurs with all kinds of proper names (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 41). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 83) admits the inability of scholars to solve "completely the problem of the article with proper names." Abbott (*Joh. Gr*., p. 57 f.) notes that John generally introduces a proper name without the article and then uses it. The papyri also follow this classical idiom of using the article with proper names when mentioned a second time. So when a man's father or mother is given in the genitive, we usually have the article. Cf. Deissmann, *Phil. Wochenschrift*, 1902, p. 1467; Moulton, *Prol*., p. 83. The papyri throw no great light on the subject. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 95), claims that the papyri confirm the N. T. usage. In the papyri slaves regularly have the article, even when the master does not (Volker, *Syntax*, p. 9). For **Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος** (Ac. 13:9) the papyri show numerous parallels. Cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 313 ff. Mayser (*Gr. d. griech. Pap.*, p. 310 f.), as already shown, takes **ὁ** here as relative. See also Hatch, *Journal of Bibl. Lit*., Part II, 1908, p. 141 f. In Luke's list (Lu. 3:23-38) **᾽Ιωσήφ** has no article, while all the long line of genitives have **τοῦ** including **τοῦ θεοῦ**. Among the ancient writers **ὁ θεός** was used of the god of absolute religion in distinction from the mythological gods.[4] Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, pp. 232-236) gives a full discussion of the subject. In the N. T., however, while we have **πρὸς τὸν θεόν** (Jo. 1:1, 2), it is far more common to find simply **θεός**, especially in the Epistles. But the word is treated like a proper name and may have it (Ro. 3:5) or not have it (8:9). The same thing holds true about **πνεῦμα** and **πνεῦμα ἅγιον, κύριος, Χριστός**. These words will come up for further discussion later.

[1] Zucker, Beobachtungen fiber den Gebr. des Artik. bei Personenn. in Xen. Anabasis, p. 6. [2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 179.

[3] Cf. Schmidt, De Articulo in nominibus propriis apud Att. scriptores (1890); K.-G., I, pp. 602 ff.; Kallenberg, Stu. uber den griech. Artikel (1891).

[4] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 48. Cf. also B. Weiss, Der Gebr. des Artikels bei den Gottesnamen, Th. Stu. Krit., 1911, pp. 319-392.

4. *Second Mention (Anaphoric).* The use of the article with the second mention of a word is very frequent. Thus in Jo. 6:9, ἄρτους καὶ ὀψάρια, but in verse 11 τοὺς ἄρτους--καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων. See Lu. 9:13, 16. Cf. ὕδωρ in Jo. 4:10 and τὸ ὕδωρ in verse 11. So μάγοι in Mt. 2:1, but τοὺς μάγους in verse 7; ζιζάνια in 13:25, but τὰ ζιζάνια in verse 26. Cf. Ac. 9:4, 7; 9:11, 17; Jas. 2:2, 3; Rev. 15:1, 6. In Jo. 4:43, τὰς δύο ἡμέρας, the article refers to verse 40. Cf. Jo. 20:1 with 19:41; 12:12 with 12:1; Heb. 5:4 with 5:1; 2 Cor. 5:4 with 5:1. In Ac. 19:13 we have Παῦλος, but ὁ Παῦλος in 19:15. Volker (*Syntax*, p. 21 f.) finds the anaphoric use of the article common enough in the papyri.

(b) WITH ADJECTIVES. The discussion of the adjective as attributive or predicate comes up later. Thus καλὸς ὁ νόμος (1 Tim. 1:8) is a different construction from τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν (Jo. 10:11).

1. *The Resumptive Article*. The use of the article and the adjective is perfectly normal in τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, (2 Pet. 3:2). Cf. τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Jo. 6:40). See also Lu. 1:70; Jas. 2:7. This repetition of the article with the adjective as in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός above is quite common also. Abbott[1] thinks that this reduplication of the article "adds weight and emphasis to the article." Cf. τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Lu. 9:22) with τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ (18:33). Abbott[2] considers that as a rule John reduplicates the article with the adjective only in utterances of the Lord or in weighty sayings about him. Cf. Jo. 1: 9, 41; 2:1; 3:16; 5:43; 7:18; 10:11, 14. But this is hardly true of Jo. 6:13; 18:10. He notes also that in John the possessive adjective, when articular, nearly always has the reduplicated article. Cf. τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμά, (10:27). So τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον in Jo. 1:41. In Homer the substantive usually comes before the article and the adjective. The resumptive article "repeats the noun in order to add the qualifying word."[3] Cf. Rev. 1:17; 3:7; 22:16, where the article is repeated, twice. Cf. also Ac. 12:10. So τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων (Jo. 1:40). In Lu. 6:45 both the article and adjective are repeated after the form of the first part of the sentence, ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν. See in the papyri τὸ κιτώνιον αὐτῆς τὸ λευκὸν τὸ παρὰ σοί P.Tb. 421 (iii/A.D.).

2. *With the Adjective Alone*. It appears so with all genders and both numbers. Cf. ὁ ἅγιος (Mk. 1:24), τῇ ἐρήμῳ (Mt. 3:2), τὰ ἀγαθόν (Gal. 6:10), οἱ πτωχοί (Mt. 5:3), τὰ νέας (Tit. 2:4), τὸ ὁρατά (Col. 1:16), τὰ πολλά in Ho. 15:22, οἱ σοφοί in 1 Cor. 1:

[1] Joh. Gr., P. 63.
[2] Ib., p. 64.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 181.

27, **αἱ ἕτοιμοι**, in Mt. 25:10, etc. All these examples are obvious enough. The ellipsis is simple and usually supplied from the context. The three uses of the article occur with the adjective alone. The individual use appears in such examples as **ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ** (Jo. 6:69), **ὁ δίκαιος** (Ac. 22:14), **ὁ ἀληθινός** (1 Jo. 5:20), **ὁ πονηρός** (1 Jo. 5:18), **τὸ πολύ** and **τὸ ὀλίγον** (2 Cor. 8:15), **τὸ ἀγαθόν σου** (Phil. 14), **τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ ὀλίγον** (Ro. 8:3), **τὴν ξηράν** (Mt. 23:15), **τοῖς ἁγίοις** (Ph. 1:1), **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** (Eph. 1:3). The generic or representative (class from class) is very common also, more frequent indeed. So **ὁ δίκαιος** (1 Pet. 4:18), **τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ** (Ro. 5:7), **τὸν πτωχόν** (Jas. 2:6), **τοὺς πτωχούς** (2:5), **οἱ πλούσιοι** (5:1). So **τὰ κακά** and **τὰ ἀγαθά** (Ro. 3:8), **τὸ ἀγαθόν** (Lu. 6:45). Cf. in particular Ro. 12:21 **ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν**. Cf. also Ro. 13:3 f., **τὸ ἀγαθόν** (Gal. 6:10), **τὸ ἱκανόν** (Ac. 17:9), **τὸ καλόν** (2 Cor. 13:7), **τὸ ἅγιον** (Mt. 7:6), **τὰ ὅρια** (Mt. 19:1), **τῶν σπορίμων** (Mk. 2 : 23). The use of the neuter singular with the article as the equivalent of an abstract substantive Blass[1] notes as "a peculiar usage of Paul (and Hebrews)" and considers that "this is the most classical idiom in the language of the N. T., and may be paralleled from the old heathen literature, from Thucydides in particular." But he cautions us against thinking that Paul imitated Thucydides, since Strabo[2] and all other writers of the **κοινή**, not to mention the papyri,[3] show the same construction. Deissmann has made it plain from the papyri that **τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως** in Jas. 1:3 (cf. 1 Pet. 1:7) belongs here. See also **τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ** (1 Cor. 1:25), **τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν σύμφορον** (7:35), **τὸ ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως** (2 Cor. 4:17), **τὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης γνήσιον** (8:8), **τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ** (Ro. 1:19), **τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ**, (2:4), **τὸ περισσόν** (3:1), **τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ** (9:22), **τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν** (Ph. 4:5), **τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς** (Heb. 6:17), **τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενές** (7:18). Examples of the plural in this abstract sense occur in **τὰ πνευματικὰ** (Eph. 6:12), **τὰ ἀόρατα** (Ro. 1:20), **τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων** (2:16), **τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους** (1 Cor. 4:5), **τὰ πάντα** (Col. 1:16), **τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα** (ib.). The neuter adjective with the article sometimes appears in the collective sense for persons. So **τὸ ἔλαττον** (Heb. 7:7), **τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν** (Ac. 26:7), **τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου—τὰ ἀσθενῆ τοῦ κόσμου** (1 Cor. 1:27 f.). See further Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 262.

3. *The Article not Necessary with the Adjective*. Blass,[4] who

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 155.
[2] Cf. Schmid, Atticismus, IV, p. 608.
[3] Deiss., B. S., p. 259.
[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 156.

has the best discussion of the use of the article with adjectives, notes that it is not accidental that, while we have ἐν τῷ φανερῷ (Text. Rec., Mt. 6:4), yet εἰς φανερὸν ἐλθεῖν prevails (Mk. 4:22; Lu. 8:17), since the thing is not yet in existence. But it is a rather fine point, since both ἐν κρυπτῷ (Jo. 7:4, 10) and εἰς κρύπτην (a subst. Lu. 11:33) occur as well as ἐν τῷ φανερῷ (Mt. 6:4, Text. Rec.). In Ro. 2:28 ἐν τῷ φανερῷ is genuine. In Jas. 4: 17 note καλὸν ποιεῖν. The adjective alone may express class as in Mt. 5:45; Lu. 10:21; Ro. 1:14; 1 Cor. 1:20.

4. *With Numerals*. The article with numbers is more common in Greek than in English and is a classic idiom (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 228). Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 315) notes that with numerals the article points out a certain number now brought forward. So ἑπτὰ --οἱ πέντε –ὁ εἷς—ὁ ἄλλος (Rev. 17:10).

(c) WITH PARTICIPLES. In all essential respects the article is used with the participle exactly as with the adjective. The article is not necessary to the participle when used as an attribute (Jas. 4:17), though it is most commonly found (Heb. 12:1, 2). For the predicate use see Jo. 10:12. The participle with the article is common without the substantive, as of οἱ πενθοῦντες (Mt. 5:4). The neuter for a person appears in τὸ γεννώμενον (Lu. 1:35). In τὸ ἀπολωλός (Lu. 10:10) we have the collective neuter singular. The abstract singular is seen in τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως (Ph. 3:8) and the abstract plural in τὰ διαφέροντα (Ro. 2:18). Cf. τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου (‘my belongings’) in 1 Cor. 13:3, for the more individual use. The representative or generic sense is found in ὁ σπείρων (Mt. 13:3). The article with the participle is very common as the equivalent of a relative clause.[1] In Mt. 5:32 πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων and ὅς ἐάν—γαμήσῃ are parallel. See also Col. 1:8. So οἱ πεπιστευκότες (Tit. 3:8), ὁ εἰπών (2 Cor. 4:6). Cf. Mt. 7:21. The article is repeated with participles if they refer to different persons (Rev. 1:3) or even if the same person is meant where different aspects are presented (Rev. 1:4, where ὁ ἦν comes in between). But note τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς καὶ λύσαντι ἡμᾶς (1:5).

Winer[2] makes a special point of the use of a definite participle with an indefinite pronoun like τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς (Gal. 1:7), μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν (Col. 2:8), ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν (Jo. 5:32).[3] He also notes the definite subject where the German would have an indefinite one as in οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνίων (Ro. 3:11). Cf. also the article and the future participle in ὁ κατακρινῶν (Ro.

[1] Cf. K.-G., I, p. 594. [2] W.-M., p. 136.
[3] More frequent in John than in the Synoptists. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 59 f.

8:34), Ac. 20:22 τὰ συναντήσοντα. Cf. Is. 1:31, οὐκ ἔσται ὁ σβέσων. More of this when the Participle is reached (ch. XX). For the repeated article see τῇ χάριτι τῇ δοθείσῃ (1 Cor. 1:4). See further VI, Position with Attributives.

(d) WITH THE INFINITIVE. This idiom is so common that it must be merely touched upon here and the discussion of it reserved for the Articular Infinitive. In general it may be said that in the Attic and the **κοινή** the article is used with the infinitive in any case (save vocative) and very much as with any abstract substantive. The Iliad does not have the article and the infinitive, but it occurs once in the Odyssey[1] and is in Pindar. Examples of the articular infinitive may be seen in the nominative τὸ καθίσαι (Mt. 20:23), the accusative τὸ λαλεῖν (1 Cor. 14:39; cf. Ac. 25:11), the genitive ἐλπὶς πᾶσα τοῦ σώζεσθαι (Ac. 27:20; cf. Lu. 24:29), the ablative ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι (Lu. 24:16; cf. 2 Cor. 1: 8), the locative ἐν τῷ σπείρειν (Mt. 13:4), the instrumental τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν (2 Cor. 2:13). The dative does not occur in the N. T. with the article, but see θεάσασθαι (Mt. 11:7). For the articular infinitive with prepositions see pp. 1068-1075. The article is frequently missing with εἰς πεῖν rely in the vernacular **κοινή** (papyri), as Herodotus three times has ἀντὶ εἶναι.[2] Cf. Clyde, *Greek Syntax*, p. 13 f. But enough for the present. The articular infinitive is curiously rare in the Gospel of John, "almost non-existent."[3] It occurs only four times and only with prepositions (Jo. 1:48; 2: 24; 13:19; 17:5).

(e) WITH ADVERBS. This is no peculiarity of the **κοινή** not to say of the N. T. It is common in the older Greek with adverbs of place, time, quality, rank, manner.[4] It is not necessary to repeat what is said under Cases and Adverbs concerning the adverbial expressions (really adjectives), like τὸ πρῶτον (Jo. 12:16), τὸ λοιπόν (Ph. 4:8), τὰ πολλά (Ro. 15:22). The point to note is that the article is used somewhat freely with adverbs as with substantives and adjectives. As examples observe τὰ ἄνω and τὰ κάτω (Jo. 8:23), ἡ αὔριον (Mt. 6:34, ellipsis of ἡμέρα), ἡ ἐπαύριον (27:62), ἡ σήμερον (Ac. 20:26), ὁ ἀμήν (Rev. 3:14), τὸ ἀμήν (1 Cor. 14:16), τὸ νῦν (Lu. 5:10), τὰ νῦν (Ac. 4:29), ὁ πλησίον (Lu. 10:27) and note πλησίον alone 'neighbour' in Lu. 10:29 and 36, τὸ ναί and τὸ οὐ (2 Cor. 1:17), τὸ ἔξωθεν (Mt. 23:25), οἱ ἔξωθεν (1 Tim. 3:7), οἱ ἔξω (Mk. 4:11, W. H. text), τὸ ἐντός (Mt. 23:26), τὰ ἔμπροσθεν and τὰ ὀπίσω (Ph. 3:13 f.), etc. Note two adverbs in Heb.

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 179.
[2] Moulton, Prol., pp. 81, 216.
[3] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 69.
[4] K.-G., I, p. 594 f.

12:27, **τὸ Ἔτι ἅπαξ** (quotation). In some of these examples there is the ellipsis of a word (note different genders), but not always. There are besides the adjectival uses of the adverb, like **ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος** (Eph. 3:16), **ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος** (2 Cor. 4:16), **ὁ νῦν καιρός** (Ro. 3:26). Clyde[1] compares **τὸ νῦν** with Scotch "the noo."

(f) WITH PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES.[2] Cf. of **οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας** (Heb. 13:24), **οἱ ἐκ νόμου** (Ro. 4:14), **οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς** (Ac. 11:2), **οἱ καθ' ἕνα** (Eph. 5:33), **τὸ ἐκ μέρους** (1 Cor. 13:10), **τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν** (Ph. 1:27), **οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ** (Lu. 9:32), **τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν** (Lu. 11:3), **τὸ κατ' ἐμέ** (Ph. 1:12; cf. Ro. 1:15), **τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** (Ro. 9:5), **τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν** (12:18), **τὸ ἀνὰ δηνάριον** (Mt. 20:10, W. H. text); **οἱ περὶ Παῦλον** (Ac. 13:13, classic idiom), **οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ** (Mk. 1:36), **τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ** (Mt. 5:15), **τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον** (Lu. 2:39), **τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** and **τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** (Eph. 1:10), **τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους** (1:15), **τὸ καθ' εἷς** (Ro. 12:5), **ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ** (2:28 f.), etc. In Ac. 18:15 note **νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς**, where the article occurs with the prepositional phrase, but not with the substantive. On **οἱ περί**= a man and his followers see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 264.

(g) WITH SINGLE WORDS OR WHOLE SENTENCES. Here the word is used *verbatim*, as **τὸ ἐγώ** (Plato, *Crat*., 405 .d).[3] Cf. **τὸ Ἔτι ἅπαξ δηλοῖ** above (Heb. 12:27) and **τὸ Ἄγαρ** (the name Hagar, Gal. 4:25). So **τὸ δὲ Ἀνέβη** (Eph. 4:9). With sentences the article sometimes marks the quotation as in **τὸ Εἰ δύνῃ** (Mk. 9:23), **τὸ Οὐ φονεύσεις—ὡς σεαυτόν** (Mt. 19:18 f.), **ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον ὡς σεαυτόν** (Gal. 5:14), **τὸ γὰρ Οὐ μοιχεύσεις** and **ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις κτλ.** (Ro. 13:9), **τὸ Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη** (Lu. 22:37). In particular the article is fairly common in Luke and occurs a few times in Paul with indirect questions. The modern Greek shows this essentially classical idiom.[4] Blass[5] remarks that the article makes no essential difference to the meaning of the question. It does this at least: it makes clearer the substantival idea of the indirect question and its relation to the principal clause. See 1 Th. 4:1 **παραελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς**, Ro. 8:26 **τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα**, Lu. 1:62 **ἐνένευον τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι,** 9:46 **εἰσῆλθεν διαλογισμὸς τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων**, 19:48 **οὐχ ηὕρισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν,** 22:2 **ἐζήτουν τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν,** 22:4 **συνελάλησεν τὸ πῶς παραδῷ** 22:23 **συνζητεῖν τὸ τίς εἴη,** 22:24 **ἐγένετο φιλονεικία τὸ τίς δοκεῖ,** Ac. 4:21 **μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται,** 22:30 **γνῶναι τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται.**

[1] Gk. Synt., p. 14.
[2] Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 263..
[3] Thompson, p. 45. Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 265.
[4] Jebb, V. and D.'s Handb., p. 295 f.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 158.

(h) WITH GENITIVE ALONE. This is also a common idiom in the ancient Greek.[1] The **κοινή** uses this idiom very often (Radermacher, *N. T. Gk.*, p. 94), as seen both in the inscriptions and the papyri. The article stands alone, but the ellipsis is usually very plain, as is shown by the gender and number as well as the context. So **᾽Ιάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου** (Mt. 10:2), where **υἱός** is implied; **Μαριά ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ**, (Jo. 19:25), where **γυνή** is to be supplied; **Μαρία ἡ ᾽Ιακώβου** (Lu. 24:10), where **μήτηρ** is meant; **τὸ τῆς δόξης** (1 Pet. 4:14), where **πνεῦμα** is to be understood; **οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου** (Jo. 21:2), where **υἱοί** is meant, etc. In 1 Cor. 15:23 **μαθηταί** is probably to be supplied (cf. Gal. 5:24), and **ἀδελφός** in Lu. 6:16 (cf. Ju. 1). The neuter plural is common for the notion of "affairs" or "things." So **τὰ ἑαυτῶν** and **τὰ Χριστοῦ ᾽Ιησοῦ** (Ph. 2:21), **τὰ Καίσαρος** and **τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ** (Lu. 20:25), **τὰ τῆς αὔριον** (marg. W. H., Jas. 4:14), **τὰ τοῦ κόσμου** (1 Cor. 7:33), **τὰ τῆς σαρκός** and **τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος** (Ro. 8:5), **τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης** (14:19), etc. One may note also here **ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου** (Lu. 2:49) for 'house of my Father.' Cf. **ἐν τοῖς Κλαυδ(ίου)**, P.Oxy. 523 (ii/A.D.). See **εἰς τὰ ἴδια** and **οἱ ἴδιοι** (Jo. 1:11). The neuter singular has an abstract use like **τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας** (2 Pet. 2:22), **τὸ τῆς συκῆς** (Mt. 21:21).

(i) NOUNS IN THE PREDICATE. These may have the article also. As already explained, the article is not essential to speech. It is, however, "invaluable as a means of gaining precision, e.g. **θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος**."[2] As a rule the predicate is without the article, even when the subject uses it. Cf. Mk. 9:50; Lu. 7:8. This is in strict accord with the ancient idiom.[3] Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 324) notes that the predicate is usually something new and therefore the article is not much used except in convertible propositions. Winer,[4] indeed, denies that the subject may be known from the predicate by its having the article. But the rule holds wherever the subject has the article and the predicate does not. The subject is then definite and distributed, the predicate indefinite and undistributed. The word with the article is then the subject, whatever the order may be. So in Jo. 1:1, **θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος,** the subject is perfectly clear. Cf. **ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο** (Jo. 1:14). It is true also that **ὁ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος** (convertible terms) would have

[1] K.-G., I, p. 268 f.; Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 280 f. The neuter article with the gen. is extremely common in Herod. Cf. Staurac, Uber den Gebr. d. Gen. bei Herod., p. 25.

[2] Milden, The Limitations of the .Pred. Position in Gk., p. 9 f.

[3] Cf. Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 46; Gildersleeve, Synt., p.. 325.

[4] Winer-Moulton, p. 142.

been Sabellianism.[1] See also **ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν** (1 Jo. 4:16). "God" and "love" are not convertible terms any more than " God" and "Logos" or "Logos" and "flesh." Cf. also **οἱ θερισταὶ ἄγγελοί εἰσιν** (Mt. 13:39), **ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν** (Jo. 17:17), **ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία**; (Ro. 7:7). The absence of the article here is on purpose and essential to the true idea. Cf. also **ἀνθρωποκτόνος** and **ψεύστης** (Jo. 8: 44). In Eph. 5:23, **ἀνήρ ἐστιν κεφαλή**, the context makes it clear (W. H. marg. **ἀνὴρ κεφαλή ἐστιν**) that **ἀνήρ** is subject even without the article. In Jo. 9:34, **ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὅλος**, the article with **ὅλος** is not needed, a neat use of the predicate adjective. But the article is quite frequent with the predicate in the N. T. and in strict accord with old usage. It is not mere haphazard, however, as Winer rather implied. Hence W. F. Moulton,[2] in his note to Winer, properly corrects this error. He finds that when the article is used in the predicate the article is due to a previous mention of the noun (as well known or prominent) or to the fact that subject and predicate are identical.[3] The words that are identical are convertible as in the older idiom.[4] If he had added what is in Winer-Schmiedel,[5] that the article also occurs when it is the only one of its kind, he would have said all that is to be said on the subject. But even here Moulton's rule of identity and convertibility apply. The overrefinement of Winer-Schmiedel's many subdivisions here is hardly commendable. In a word, then, when the article occurs with subject (or the subject is a personal pronoun or proper name) and predicate, both are definite, treated as identical, one and the same, and interchangeable. The usage applies to substantives, adjectives and participles indifferently. Cf. **ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός** (Mt. 6:22), **ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς** (Mt. 5:13), **ὁ δὲ ἀργός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος** (13:38), **σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός** (16:16), **εἷς ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός** (19:17), **τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος** (24:45), **τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου** (26:26, 28), **σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεύς** (27:11), **σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου** (Mk. 1:11), **οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων** (6:3), **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος** (12:7), **οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες** (13:11), **ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς** (Jo. 1:4), **ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ** (1:21), **σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος** (3:10), **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης** (6:14), **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος** (6:50; cf. 51), **τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζωοποιοῦν** (6:63), **ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς** (8:12), **οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος** (9:8; cf. 19 f.), **ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα** (10:7), **ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμήν** (10:11), **ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή** (11:25, note both articles), **ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ**

[1] See *per contra,* Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 48.
[2] W.-M., p. 142.
[3] Cf. Donaldson, New Crat., p. 522; Middleton, Gk. Art., p. 54.
[4] Thompson, Synt., p. 46.
[5] P. 159.

ἡ ζωή (14:6, note three separate articles), **ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με** (14:21), **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος** (Ac. 4:11), **οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις** (8:10), **οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας** (9:21), **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος** (21:28), **οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος** (21:38), **ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν** (1 Cor. 11:3), **ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν** (2 Cor. 3:17), **αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν** (Eph. 2:14), **ἡμεῖς ἡ περιτομή** (Ph. 3:3), **ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή** (3:3), **ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡπ ἀνομία** (1 Jo. 3:4), **ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ ᾿Αλφα καὶ τὸ ῎Ω** (Rev. 1:8), **ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος** (1:17, note both articles), **σὺ εἶ ὁ ταλαίπωρος** (3:17), etc. This list is not exhaustive, but it is sufficient to illustrate the points involved. Note **ὁ βασιλεύς** (Mt. 27:11) and **βασιλεύς** (Jo. 1:49). Even the superlative adjective may have the article as in Rev. 1:17 above. But see **οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι** (Mt. 20:16) for the usual construction. Cf. **ἐσχάτη ὥρα** (1 Jo. 2:18). See further **ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις**, Jas. 5:3; 2 Tim. 3:1; **ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ**, 1 Pet. 1:5, and **τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ**, Jo. 6:39. For the common predicate accusative see chapter XI (Cases), vii, (i). In the N. T. most examples are anarthrous (Jo. 5:11; 15:15), and note 1 Cor. 4:9 **ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐστάτους ἀπέδειξεν**. Cf. Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 326.

(j) DISTRIBUTIVE. Cf. **ἐκ δηναρίου τὴν ἡμέραν** (Mt. 20:2), **ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ** (Heb. 9:7), **δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου** (Lu. 18:12), **ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας** (Lu. 17:4). This is, to be sure, an ancient idiom familiar also to the English (cf. our "by the yard," "by the pound," etc.). It is found in the papyri.[1] But **ἕκαστος** is not used in the N. T. with the article. Cf. **οἱ καθ᾽ ἕνα ἕκαστος** (Eph. 5:33). We have once **ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα** (Lu. 5:7), and several times **οἱ ἀμφότεροι** (Eph. 2:18), **τὰ ἀμφότερα** (2:14). Cf. **τοὺς δύο** in Eph. 2:15. Cf. Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Gk.*, p. 51.

(k) NOMINATIVE WITH THE ARTICLE =VOCATIVE. This matter was sufficiently discussed in the chapter on Cases. It is an occasional Greek idiom repeated in the Hebrew and Aramaic regularly and frequent in N. T. As examples see **ναί, ὁ πατήρ** (Mt. 11:26) **τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα** (Mk. 9:25), **ἡ παῖς** (Lu. 8:54), **ὁ βασιλεύς** (Jo. 19:3).

(l) As THE EQUIVALENT OF A POSSESSIVE PRONOUN. The article does not indeed mean possession. The nature of the case makes it plain that the word in question belongs to the person mentioned. The French can say *j'ai mal a la tete,* **ἀλγῶ τὴν κεφαλήν**.[2] The examples in the N. T. are rather numerous. See,

[1] Volker, Synt. d. griech. Pap., p. 8. Volker notes also the presence of **ἕκαστος** or of **ἀνά, κατά, ἐκ, πρός**.

[2] Cf. Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 16. See K.-G., I, p. 556.

for instance, ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας (Mt. 27:24; cf. Lu. 13:13). In Mt. 4:20 we have τὰ δίκτυα, while in verse 21 we find τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν. Cf. κατέσεισε τῇ χειρί. (Ac. 21:40; cf. Mk. 7:32), τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ (Jo. 3:16), τῷ νοΐ δουλεύω (Ro. 7:25), τοῦ πατρός (1 Cor. 5:1). **Τίτον καὶ τὸν ἀφελφόν**, (2 Cor. 12:18; cf. also 8:18).[1] Cf. Mt. 8:3; Jo. 1:41.

(m) WITH POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS. The article is always used in the N. T. with these pronouns unless the pronoun is predicate. So τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σά ἐστιν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά (Jo. 17:10) ἡμέτερος (Ac. 2:11) and ὑμέτερος (Jo. 7:6; cf. Lu. 6:20). The article is frequently repeated as in ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός (Jo. 7:6). It was usual with possessives in the ancient Greek.[2] The Gospel of John shows ὁ ἐμός very frequently. Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 65 f. With ἴδιος the article is customary, as in εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν (Mt. 9:1). This construction is very common in the N. T. A few times we meet ἴδιος without the article, as in ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις (1 Cor. 9:7), καιροῖς ἰδίοις (1 Tim. 2:6). The anarthrous examples may be only members of a class, not the particular individual in the case. See further ch. XV, Pronouns.

(n) WITH **Αὐτός**. It is only necessary to mention the order αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις (Ro. 8:21), and ἡ αὐτὴ σάρξ (1 Cor. 15:39), to set forth the distinction in the position of the article with αὐτός. So αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα (Ro. 8:26), but τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα (1 Cor. 12:8). See Pronouns.

(o) WITH DEMONSTRATIVES. The essential facts have been already stated in the chapter on Pronouns. Here a bare summary is sufficient. **Ὅδε** occurs in the N. T. once with the article, εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν (Jas. 4:13). The usual position of the demonstrative with the article has already been discussed also. It may be repeated here that we must not confuse this predicate (appositional) position of **οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος** with the ordinary predicate position of adjectives. The construction may be paralleled to some extent by the French *la republique francaise*. Still in Homer[3] **τοῦτον τὸν** ἄναλτον= 'this man,' ἄναλτος, 'that he is.' Here we probably see the origin of the idiom **οὗτος ὁ.** So fixed did the usage become that in the Attic inscriptions the construction is uniform.[4] The Boeotian inscriptions reveal the same thing.[5] The order is immaterial, whether ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος (Lu. 2:25) or οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος (14:30).

[1] Cf. A. Souter, art. Luke, Hastings' D.C.G., who takes τόν = 'his,' i.e. Luke. For pap. exx. see Volker, Synt. d. griech. Pap., p. 7.

[2] Thompson, Gk. Synt., p. 51.

[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 181.

[4] Meisterh., Att. Inschr., p. 231.

[5] Claflin, Synt. of B.D. Inscr., p. 42.

In general it may be noted that the absence of the article with the noun means that **οὗτος** is a real predicate, as in Jo. 2:11, **ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων**. Cf. Lu. 24:21; Ac. 1:5. Even with proper names the article occurs, as in **οὗτος ὁ ᾿Ιησοῦς** (Ac. 1:11). For further details see chapter on Pronouns. It may be remarked that the rigidity apparent in the use of the article in connection with **οὗτος** and **ἐκεῖνος** does not exist in the case of the correlative demonstratives. The article is wanting in the N. T. in connection with **τοιόσδε** and **τηλικοῦτος. Τοσοῦτος** occurs once only with the article, a true attributive, **ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος** (Rev. 18:16). **Τοιοῦτος**, on the other hand, usually appears with the article and in the attributive position, as in **τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων** (Mk. 9:37), though once the predicate position is found, **αἱ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται** (Mk. 6:2). Most of the examples have no substantive, like **οἱ τοιοῦτοι** (Ro. 16:18), **τὰ τοιαῦτα** (Gal. 5:21).

(p) WITH **᾿Ολος, Πᾶς** (**᾿Απας**). **᾿Απας** is found chiefly in Luke and Acts. The MSS. vary greatly between **ἅπας** and **πᾶς.** The text of W. H. now has **πᾶς** in the margin (Lu. 9:15), now **ἅπας** (15:13). Blass[1] fails to find any satisfactory rule for the use of **ἅπας**, the Attic distinction of **ἅπας** after a consonant and **πᾶς** after a vowel not holding (cf. Lu. 1:3), though in general **ἅπας** does occur (when used at all) after a consonant (cf. Mt. 6:32). **᾿Απας**, when used with a substantive in the N. T., is always with the article. Once only does it appear in the attributive position, **τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν** (1 Tim. 1:16), 'the total sum of his long-suffering.' Elsewe have either the order **ὁ λαὸς ἅπας** (Lu. 19:48) or **ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν** (Lu. 3:21). If **οὗτος** also is used, we have **τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν** (Lu. 4:6). Cf. **οἱ αὐτοῦ ἅπαντες** (Ac. 16:33).

The construction of **πᾶς** is varied and interesting. It is an exceedingly common adjective in all parts of the N. T. In general it may be said that the idiom of the N. T. is in harmony with the ancient Greek in the use of rag and the article.[2] In the singular **πᾶς** may be used without the article in the sense of 'every.' So **πάντα πειρασμόν** (Lu. 4:13), **πᾶν στόμα** (Ro. 3:19), **πᾶσαν συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπων** (2 Con 4:2), **πᾶν στόμα** (Mt. 3:10), etc. Blass[3] distinguishes between **ἕκαστος**= 'each individual' and **πᾶς** ='any one you please.'

Πᾶς ὁ= 'all.' So **πᾶσα ἡ πόλις** (Mt. 8:34) = 'all the city' (*die ganze Stadt*).[4] This is the order and it is very common. Cf. **πᾶσαν τήν**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 161. Cf. Diels, Gott. Gel.-Anz., 1894, pp. 298 ff.
[2] Cf. K.-G., I, pp. 631 ff.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 161.
[4] W.-Sch., p. 187.

γὴν (Mt. 27:45), παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ (Ac. 10:2). Even without the article πᾶς may be 'all,' if it is a proper noun, like πᾶσα **Ἰ**ερoσόλυμα (Mt. 2:3), πᾶς **Ἰ**σραήλ (Ro. 11:26). In Ac. 2:36, πᾶς **οἶκος Ἰ**σραήλ, there is only one "house of Israel," so that 'all' is the idea. Winer[1] says that it is treated as a proper name. Abstract substantives also may be used with or without the article. There is very little difference in idea between πάσῃ **γνώσει** (1 Cor. 1:5) and πᾶσαν **τὴν γνῶσιν** (1 Cor. 13:2). With the abstract word "every" and "all" amount practically to the same thing. There is an element of freedom in the matter. So πᾶσαν **τὴν πίστιν** (1 Cor. 13:2), but πάσῃ **σοφίᾳ** (Ac. 7:22). There may indeed be occasionally the difference between a specific instance like πάσῃ **τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν** (2 Cor. 1:4) and a general situation like πάσῃ **θλίψει** (*ib*.).[2] But see πάσῃ **ὑπομονῇ** (2 Cor. 12:12), πάσῃ **ἁγνίᾳ** (1 Tim. 5:2), **μετὰ** παρρησίας πάσης (Ac. 4:29), etc. See also πᾶσα σάρξ= כָּל־בָּשָׂר (Lu. 3:6), usually with **οὐ** (Mt. 24:22). But note again πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν **δικαιοσύνην** (Mt. 3:15) and πάσης **τῆς** προσδοκίας (Ac. 12:11). See πᾶσα **ἐξουσία** (Mt. 28:18), πάσης **πλεονεξίας** (Lu. 12:15). Cf. 2 Tim. 1:15. In Ph. 1:3, πάσῃ **τῇ μνείᾳ**, the article is pertinent as in πᾶσα **ἡ κτίσις** (Ro. 8:22). But in Col. 1:15, 23; 1 Pet. 2:13 πᾶσα **κτίσις** has its true idea of 'every created thing.' But what about **πρωτότοκος** πάσης **κτίσεως** (Col. 1:15)? See also Co1.1:9 ff. and πᾶσαν **χαράν** (Jas. 1:2). Other examples somewhat open to doubt are πᾶσα **οἰκοδομή** (Eph. 2:21) which is most probably 'every building' because of **εἰς ναόν**. So in Eph. 3:15 πᾶσα **πατριά** is 'every family,' though 'all the family' is possible. In 2 Tim. 3:16 πᾶσα **γραφή** is 'every Scripture,' if separate portions are referred to. Cf. Jo. 19:37, **ἑτέρα γραφή**. Usually in the singular in the N. T. we have **ἡ γραφή**, but twice **γραφή** occurs alone as definite without the article, once in 1 Pet. 2:6, **ἐν γραφῇ**, once in 2 Pet. 1:20, **γραφῆς**. Twice in the plural (Ro. 1:2; 16:26) the article is absent. In Col. 4:12 **ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ** it is 'every,' 'whatever be the will of God for you' (Moffatt). In Jas. 1:17, πᾶσα **δόσις**, we have 'every,' as in **παντὸς προσώπου** (Ac. 17 : 26).3

Πᾶς ὁ and the participle is a very common construction in the N. T. Here the idea is 'every,' and **ὁ** and the participle are in apposition. Thus **πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων** (Mt. 7:26) is practically equivalent to **πᾶς ὅστις ἀκούει** (7:24). Cf. **πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος** (Mt. 5:22), **πᾶς ὁ**

[1] W.-Th., p. 111. Cf. 1 Sam. 7:2 f. Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 162) calls this imitation of Hebrew.

[2] Blass. Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 162. [3] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 187.

βλέπων (5:28), πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων (5:32), πᾶς ὁ αἰτῶν (7:8), etc. But sometimes we find πᾶς without the article as in παντὸς ἀκούοντος (Mt. 13:19), παντὶ ὀφείλοντι (Lu. 11:4), where some MSS. read τῷ. See παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι (Ro. 1:16). The abstract neuter πᾶν τό is regular. So πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον (Mt. 15:17), πᾶν τὸ ὀφειλόμενον (18:34). Cf. πᾶν ὅ in Jo. 6:37, 39.

The idiom ὁ πᾶς= 'the whole,' 'the totality,' is not frequent in the singular. It occurs twice.[1] See τὸν πάντα χρόνον (Ac. 20:18), ὁ πᾶς νόμος (Gal. 5:14), *das gesamte Gesetz*.[2] Cf. also Barn. 4:9, 6 πᾶς χρονος. Here the whole is contrasted with a part. **῾Ο** πᾶς νόμος= 'the entire law,' 'the whole law.' It was never so common a construction in the ancient Greek[3] as πᾶς ὁ.

In the plural πάντες is used sometimes without the article. The article is not necessary with proper names, like πάντες **᾽Αθηναῖοι** (Ac. 17:21). Cf. πάντες **᾽Ιουδαῖοι** (26:4). But the article is absent elsewhere also, as in πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας (Lu. 13:27), πάντας ἀνθρώπους (Ac. 22:15; cf. Ro. 5:12, 18), πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς (Gal. 6:6; cf. πᾶσιν τοῖς in 3:10), πάντων ἁγίων (Eph. 3:8), πάντες ἄγγελοι (Heb. 1: 6). These examples are not numerous, however. Cf. 1 Pet. 2:1; 2 Pet. 3:16. Blass[4] considers it a violation of classical usage not to have the article in Eph. 3:8 and 2 Pet. 3:16, because of the adjectives, and in Lu. 4:20, πάντων ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, because of the adjunct. But that objection applies chiefly to the literary style. See of **οἱ** ἅγιοι πάντες (2 Cor. 13:12). The usual construction is πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί. (Mt. 1:17), πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς (2:4), etc. Sometimes we have the other order like τὰς πόλεις πάσας (Mt. 9:35). Cf. 2 Cor. 13:12. **Π**ᾶς may be repeated with separate words (Mt. 3:5). For the use with the participle see Mt. 8:16. A few examples of the attributive position are found, like **οἱ** πάντες ἄνδρες (Ac. 19:7)= 'the total number of the men,' as in the ancient idiom. See, also, αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαί (Ac. 27:37), τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους (Ro. 16:15), **οἱ** σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί (Gal. 1:2), τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς (2 Cor. 5:10). The last example= 'we the whole number of us.' Cf. Ac. 21:21.

But we also find **οἱ** πάντες without a substantive, as in 2 Cor. 5: 15; 1 Cor. 9:22; Ro. 11:32; Eph. 4:13; Ph. 2:21. In 1 Cor. 10:17, **οἱ** πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν, note the contrast with **τοῦ** ἑνός. Still more common is τὰ πάντα for 'the sum of things,' the all.' Cf. Ro. 8:32; 11:36; 1 Cor. 11:12; 12:6, 19 (cf. here τὰ πάντα

[1] Green, Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 192. Cf. W.-Sch., p. 189.
[2] W.-Sch., p. 189.
[3] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 52 f. [4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 161.

and ἕν); 2 Cor. 5:18; Col. 1:17, etc. The use of πάντες alone (1 Cor. 12:29), or of πάντα (1 Cor. 13:7), calls for no comment.

The story of ὅλος is brief. It is never attributive in position in the N. T. It has also an indefinite meaning which πᾶς does not have. Thus ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον (Ac. 11:26)= 'a whole year.' **Πᾶς** does not have this idea apart from the article. So Jo. 7:23, ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ, 'a whole man sound.' Cf. Lu. 5:5; Ac. 28:30. In Mk. 12:30 compare ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας (ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ Mt. 22:37) with ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς. In this sense the plural also is found as in ὅλους οἴκους (Tit. 1:11). One may compare ὅλη ᾽Ιερουσαλήμ (Ac. 21:31), with πᾶσα ᾽Ιεροσόλυμα (Mt. 2:3). We usually have in the N. T. the order ὅλη ἡ πόλις (Mk. 1:33), but sometimes ἡ πόλις ὅλη (Ac. 21:30). Sometimes we have ὅλος and πᾶς in the same sentence as in 2 Cor. 1: 1; 1 Th. 4:10. The word may be repeated several times (Mt. 22:37; Mk. 12:30, 33). It occurs alone also as a predicate (Jo. 9:34), or with τοῦτο (Mt. 1:22).

(q) WITH **Πολύς**. There is a peculiar use of the article with πολύς that calls for a word. The regular construction with the article (attributive) like τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος (1 Pet. 1:3) occurs in the singular (cf. ὁ τὸ πολύ, 2 Cor. 8:15) and much more frequently in the plural. So οἱ πολλοί alone (Ro. 5:15; 12:5; Heb. 12:15; 1 Cor. 10:17), τὰ πολλά (Ro. 15:22). With the substantive added note ὑδάτων πολλῶν (Rev. 17:1), αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αἱ πολλαί (Lu. 7:47), τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα (Ac. 26:24). This is all in harmony with classic idiom[2] as well as the frequent use of πολύς without the article in an indefinite sense. But in ὁ ὄχολος πολύς (Jo. 12:9, 12) Moulton[3] finds "a curious misplacement of the article." Moulton cites a piece of careless Greek from Par.P. 60, ἀπὸ τῶν πληρωμάτων ἀρχείων. It is possible that ὄχλος πολύς came to be regarded as one idea. Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 284) cites a few rare attributive examples of the type ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός from Homer and AEschylus where the adjective is appositive rather than predicative. The Homeric examples may be demonstrative. One may note also ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου (1 Pet. 1:18) and ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου (Eph. 2:11). See VI, (c), 5. We do find the usual order ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος in Mk. 12 : 37. But it is a fact that ὄχλος πολύς is the usual order in the N. T. (Mt. 26:47 Mk. 5:24;. Lu. 7:11; 9:37; Jo. 6:2, 5). The analogy of πᾶς, ὅλος, οὗτος may have played some part in the matter. For ὄχλοι πολλοί see Mt. 19:2; Lu. 14:25. In Mt. 21:8 (parallel

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 190.
[2] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 53.
[3] Prol., p. 84.

with Mk. 12:37, **ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος**) we have **ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος**, but it is difficult to lay much stress on this point of variation. One is reminded of the constant French idiom, but that is merely an independent parallel. The idiom **οἱ πλείονες** may be seen in 1 Cor. 9:19. See further ch. XIV.

(r) **ᾼκρος, ῾Ημισυς, ᾽Εσχατος, Μέσος**. As to **ἄκρος**, it does not appear as an adjective in the N. T. In Lu. 16:24 and Heb. 11:21 **τὸ ἄκρον** is a substantive. The same thing is probably true of **ἄκρου** and **ἄκρων** in Mk. 13:27 and Mt. 24:31. This is in harmony with the Septuagint (Ex. 29:20; Is. 5: 26).[1] The same situation is repeated in the case of **ἥμισυς**. Cf. **ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας** (Mk. 6:23), **ἥμισυ καιροῦ** (Rev. 12:14). Cf. **ἥμισυ** alone (Rev. 11:9, 11). But **ἐσχάτῃ** is used attributively as in **ἡ ἐσχάτη πλάνη** (Mt. 27:64), **τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ** (Jo. 6:39, etc.), **τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτόν** (Lu. 12:59), etc. The construction **ὁ ἔσχατος** alone (Rev. 2:8) and **τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου** (Lu. 11:26) is classical.[2] So is indeed also **πάντων ἔσχατος** (Mk. 9:35), **ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ** (1 Pet. 1:5). **᾽Επ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν** (Heb. 1:2) is probably a substantive use. But in 2 Pet. 3:3 **ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν** we may have the partitive construction in the predicate position. There is no doubt of it as to **μέσος**. Here also we find usually **τὸ μέσον** (like **τὸ ἄκρον** above) absolutely (Mk. 3:3), or the various prepositional phrases like **εἰς μέσον** (Mk. 14:60), **ἐνμέσῳ** (Mk. 6:47), **διὰ μέσου** (Lu. 4:30), **ἀνὰ μέσον** (Mk. 7:31), **κατὰ μέσον** (Ac. 27:27), **ἐκ μέσου** (Mt. 13:49) or **μέσον** as preposition (Ph. 2:15). But the old partitive construction occurs in **μέσης νυκτός** (Mt. 25:6), **ἡμέρας μέσης** (Ac. 26:13) without the article. The true predicate is found in **τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον** (Lu. 23:45). So **μέσος** in Ac. 1:18. Cf. also **τὸ πλοῖον μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης** (Mt. 14:24, marg. W. H.), where **μέσον** is probably a preposition. In Jo. 19:18, **μέσον τὸν ᾽Ιησοῦν**, we have 'Jesus in the midst.' There is, however, no example in the N. T. like the old classic idiom which is seen in the LXX. Cf. **ἐκ μέσης τῆς πόλεως** (Ezek. 11:23).[3] See also ch. XIV.

(s) WITH **ᾼλλος** AND **῾Ετερος**. The article is frequent with **ἄλλος** but never in the sense of 'the rest of,' like ancient Greek. But **οἱ ἄλλοι**. (1 Cor. 14:29) is close to it. It is used where only two are meant, as in **ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής** (Jo. 20:3), **ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία** (Mt. 28 : 1). The order **ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος** occurs (Jo. 18:16). Cf. also **τοῦ ἄλλου τοῦ συνσταυρωθέντος** (Jo. 19:32) where the article is repeated, like **τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς**, etc. (Rev. 2:24). Blass[4]

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 190.
[2] Ib.
[3] Ib.; Thompson, Synt., p. 53.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 180.

says that no Attic writer would have said ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν= 'the remaining cities' (Lu. 4:43). He considers εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν (Mt. 10:23 אB) "incorrect" for 'the next' city, as well as ὁ ἕτερος= 'the third' in Lu. 19:20. But it is not the use of the article here that displeases Blass, but the free interchange of ἄλλος and ἕτερος in the κοινή. See ch. XV, Pronouns.

(t) **Μόνος**. This need detain us but a moment. The essential facts are succinctly given by Winer-Schmiedel.[1] Without the article **μόνος** occurs usually even with proper names, as **Ἰησοῦς μόνος** (Lu. 9:36). So **μόνῳ θεῷ** (Ro. 16:27; 1 Tim. 1:17). But the predicate use occurs also. So Mt. 12:4 **τοῖς ἱερεῦσι μόνοις**; (24:36) **πατὴρ μόνος** (**א**BD); **μόνοι οἱ μαθηταί** (Jo. 6:22); **μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς** (Heb. 9:7). The articular attributive use is found a few times, as in **τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ** (Jo. 5:44). Cf. Jo. 17:3; 1 Tim. 6:15 f.; Ju. 4. See ch. XIV.

VI. *Position with Attributives.* The article does not make a word or phrase attributive. It may be attributive without the article. It is necessary to go over much of the same ground again (Adjectives and Participles, Genitives, Adverbs and Adjuncts) in order to get the subject clearly before us.

(a) WITH ADJECTIVES. So ἔργον ἀγαθόν (Ph. 1:6) is attributive= 'a good work,' though it is anarthrous. Cf. also ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς (Eph. 2:10). Cf. **μικρὰ ζύμη** (1 Cor. 5:6). But when the article is used before a word or phrase there is no doubt about its being attributive.

1. *The Normal Position of the Adjective.* It is between the article and the substantive, as in **τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα** (Jas. 2:7), **ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος** (Mt. 12:35), **τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα** (18:20). In this normal attributive type the adjective receives greater emphasis than the substantive.[2] Cf. correct text Lu. 12:12; 1 Cor. 10:3 (correct text); 1 Jo. 5:20. So **τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ** (1 Tim. 1:11). There must be a special reason for the other construction.[3]

2. *The Other Construction (Repetition of the Article)*. In the order[4] **ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός** (Jo. 10:11) both substantive and adjective receive emphasis and the adjective is added as a sort of climax in apposition with a separate article.[5] Cf. **ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός** (Mt.

[1] P. 190. [2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 158.

[3] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 47.

[4] For copious classical exx. of both positions see Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 281 f.

[5] In Jas. 3:7, **τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ**, the repeated article makes for greater clearness.

17:5), **τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθήν** (Lu. 8:8), **τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν**, (Jo. 1:9), **τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν** (4:11), **ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός** (7:6), **ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή** (15:1), **τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρόν** (Ac. 19:15). Cf. also Mt. 6:6; Lu. 7:47; Jo. 6:13; 1 Cor. 12:31; 2 Cor. 6:7; Eph. 6:13; Col. 1:21; Heb. 13:20; 1 Jo. 1:2; 2:25; 4:9. There is an apparent difficulty in Heb. 9:1, **τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν**, which may be compared with **ὁ ὄχλος πολύς**, p. 774 (Jo. 12:9).[1] Perhaps both **ἅγιον** and **κοσμικόν** were felt to be adjectives.

3. *Article Repeated Several Times*. So in Ac. 12:10, **τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν τὴν φέρουσαν**. Cf. **τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον** (Mt. 25:41), **ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος ὁ γνωστός** (Jo. 18:16), **τὴν ῥομφαίαν τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν** (Rev. 2:12). In particular note the repetition of the article in Heb. 11:12; Rev. 3:14; 17:1; 21:9. In Rev. 1:5 note four articles, **ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, ὁ πρωτότοκος— καὶ ὁ ἄρχων**. Cf. Rev. 12:9; 1 Pet. 4:14. For this common classic idiom see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, pp. 328 ff. In Ph. 1:29, **ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ**, the two infinitives following, each with **τό** explain the first **τό**.

4. *One Article with Several Adjectives*. When several adjectives are used we find an article with each adjective if the adjectives accent different aspects sharply. So **ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος καὶ ὁ ζῶν** (Rev. 1:17; cf. 22:13). Cf. also **ὁ ὤν — καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος** (1:4, 8). But ordinarily the one article is sufficient for any number of adjectives referring to the same substantive. So **ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ ἐλεινὸς καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμνός** (Rev. 3:17). In Mt. 24: 45, **ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος**, the **καὶ** carries over the force of the article.[2] So likewise the presence of another attribute may explain the probable predicate position **πατροπαραδότου** (1 Pet. 1: 18) and **χειροποιήτου** (Eph. 2:11).[3] See further (c), 5.

5. *With Anarthrous Substantives.* There is still another order.[4] It is **εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμήν** (Jo. 14:27). Here the substantive is indefinite and general, while the attribute makes a particular application. Cf. **νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος** (Gal. 3:21). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 93) finds this idiom frequent in **κοινή**. So **γυναῖκα τὴν εὐγενεστάτην** (I. G., XII, 7 N. 240, 13).

6. *With Participles*. The participle may come between the article and the substantive like the attributive adjective, as in **τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν** (Mt. 25:34). Cf. 1 Tim. 1:10; Ro. 8:18; 1 Cor. 12:22; 1 Pet. 1:13. On the other hand (cf. 5),

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 177.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 160. [3] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 181.
[4] It is common enough in classic Gk. Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 283.

all else may come between the article and the participle, as in 1 Pet. 1:10, **οι—προφητεύσαντες**. A long clause (including a relative clause) may come between the article and the participle, as in Ro. 16:17, **τοὺς—ποιοῦντας**. Once more, the participle may come in the midst of the attributive phrases, as in 1 Pet. 1:3, **ὁ—ἀναγεννήσας**, or immediately after the article, as in 2 Pet. 1:3. Either the participle or the modifier may occur outside of the attributive complex (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 289 f.). Gildersleeve gives copious illustrations of the various constructions of the attributive participle. The article may be repeated after the substantive, like **τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν** above (Jo. 4:11), **οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ -- καταβάντες** (Mk. 3:22). Cf. Jo. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:54; 1 Pet. 1:25; 5:10; Ac. 7:37; Heb. 13:20. The article may occur with the participle when not with the substantive. This supplementary addition of the article is more common with the participle than with other adjectives.[1] Cf. **παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις** (Lu. 7:32), **γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ** (23:49), **ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ** (Ac. 7:35), **χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου** (1 Pet. 1:7), and in particular **οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον τὸ δεδομένον** (Ac. 4:12). Cf. also Ac. 1:12; Gal. 3:21; Ro. 2:14 **(ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα**). But in **θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος** (Gal. 1:1), **Χριστοῦ τοῦ δόντος** (1:4), the proper names are definite without the article. So **Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον** (1 Th. 1:10), etc. Participles in apposition with personal pronouns may also have the article. Cf. **ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ λαλῶν σοι** (Jo. 4:26), **τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοί** (Ro. 7:21), **σὺ ὁ κρίνων** (Jas. 4:12), **ἡμῖν τοῖς περιπατοῦσιν** (Ro. 8:4), **ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας** (Eph. 1:19), **αὐτοῖς τοῖς πιστεύουσιν** (Jo. 1:12), etc. Note two articles in 1 Th. 4:15, 17, **ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι**. Cf. Eph. 1:12; 1 Jo. 5:13 **(ὑμῖν —τοῖς π.**); 1 Cor. 8:10. The artic. part. may be in appos. with the verb, as in **ἔχωμεν οἱ καταφυγόντες** (Heb. 6:18; cf. 4:3). Cf., on the other hand, **ἡμεῖς, ἀπορφανισθέντες** (1 Th. 2:17). The article and participle may follow **τινές,** as in **τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας** (Lu. 18:9), **τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες** (Gal. 1:7). If the substantive has the article and the participle is anarthrous, the participle may be (cf. above) predicate. So **τὴν φωνὴν ἐνεχθεῖσαν** (2 Pet. 1:18), **τοῖς πνεύμασιν—ἀπειθήσασιν** (1 Pet. 3:19 f.), **ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον** (2 Cor. 12:2), **τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλλημφθέντα** (Ac. 23:27). Cf. Lu. 16:14; Jo. 4:6; Ro. 2:27; 1 Cor. 14:7; 2 Cor. 3:2; 11:9; Heb. 10:2; 1 Pet. 1:12. The presence of the article with the participle here would radically change the sense. The same article may be used with several par-

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 243.

ticiples, as in **τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος** (Gal. 2:20), **τῷ ἀγαπῶντι καὶ λύσαντι** (Rev. 1:5). The use of the article with the participle in the predicate is illustrated by **θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν· τίς ὁ κατακρινῶν**; (Ro. 8:33; cf. Jo. 5:45). In questions the pronoun, though coming first, may sometimes be really predicate. Then again the article may be absent from both substantive and participle (predicate or attributive), as in **γυνὴ οὖσα** (Mk. 5:25), **θεῷ ζῶντι** (1 Th. 1:9), **ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι** (Lu. 6:48).

(b) WITH GENITIVES. From the nature of the case the genitive as the genus-case is usually attributive. In general the construction in the N. T. follows the ancient idiom.[1]

1. *The Position between the Article and the Substantive*. This is common enough, and especially so in 1 and 2 Peter. So **ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία** (1 Pet. 3:20); 1:17; 2:15, 3:1. See in particular demonstrative pronouns like **τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι** (Tit. 3:7). Plato (*Soph*., 254a) has **τὰ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ψυχῆς ὄμματα**. For a series of such genitives in this position see **ὁ — κόσμος** (1 Pet. 3:3). For adjective and genitive see 3:4, **ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος**. Cf. Mt. 12:31; 1 Pet. 5:1. In 1 Pet. 4:14 the article is repeated, **το. τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα**. See also Jo. 1:40, **τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντον**.

2. *Genitive after the Substantive without Repetition of the Article*.[2] This is even more common. Thus **τὸν φόβον τῶν ᾽Ιουδαίων** (Jo. 20:19), **τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ** (Ro. 8:39). Cf. 2 Cor. 4:4; Ro. 8:2; 1 Th. 1:3. Sometimes the two types are combined, thus **ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους** (2 Cor. 5:1), **τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος** (2 Pet. 3:2). The personal pronouns illustrate either order except that you is nearly always outside (but see **τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων**, Gal. 1:14, and **ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου ἀπολογίᾳ**, 2 Tim. 4:16); either, as is usual, **ὁ κύριός μου** (Jo. 20:28) or **μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς** (Jo. 9:11). We find **τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι** (Ro. 3:24) and **τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ** (Mt. 1:21) and **αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ** (Jo. 15:10. Cf. 9:6; 11:32), **τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν** (Lu. 11: 21) and **τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ** (Gal. 6:8), **τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ** (Lu. 16: 8) and **ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια** (Mt. 21:8). Cf. also **τὸ ὄνομά σου** (Mt. 6:9), **ἡ δεξιά σου χείρ** (Mt. 5:30; but not 5:29). Cf. also 1 Tim. 5:23), **σου τὴν κεφαλήν** (Mt. 6:17), **τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν** (6:11), **ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου** (1 Th. 1:3), **τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην** (Col. 1:8), etc. With the partitive the usual (but see Jo. 6:70; 9:16, 40) position is this: **τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς** (Rev. 8:7). Cf. 1 Cor. 15:9.

[1] Cf. K.-G., I, p. 597; Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 49,
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159,

3. *Repetition of Article with Genitive*. The genitive may follow the other substantive with a repeated article. Here the article closely resembles the original demonstrative. So **ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ** (1 Cor. 1:18), **τῷ ἔθει τῷ Μωυσέως** (Ac. 15:1), **τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν** (Tit. 2:10). This construction is not very common.[1]

4. *The Article Only with Genitive*. Cf. **ἐξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς τῶν ἀρχιερέων** (Ac. 26:12). Cf. Ac. 1:12, **ὄρους τοῦ**, with Lu. 19:29, **τὸ ὄρος τό**. Here again the article is almost pure demonstrative as in Jas. 1:25, **νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας**= 'perfect law, that of liberty.' Volker (*Syntax*, p. 16) finds abundant illustrations of these positions in the papyri. So with proper names like **Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου** (Mk. 15:40), **Δαυεὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί** (Ac. 13:22), etc. Cf. Mt. 4:21.

5. *Article Absent with Both*. The genitive may still be attributive and both substantives definite. Cf. **πύλαι ᾅδου** (Mt. 16:18), **σημεῖον περιτομῆς** (Ro. 4:11), **νόμου πίστεως** (3:27), etc. The context must decide whether the phrase is definite or not. Cf. **θεοῦ υἱός** (Mt. 27:54), **εὐεργεσίᾳ ἀνθρώπου** (Ac. 4: 9).

6. *The Correlation of the Article*. In such cases, according to Middleton,[2] if two substantives are united by the genitive, the article occurs with both or is absent from both.[3] But note (H. Scott) that (1) the genitive may be anarthrous if it is a proper name, (2) the governing noun may be anarthrous if it depends on a preposition. The normal type may be well illustrated by **τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας** (Ro. 7:23) and **νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας** (7:25). The genitive **ἁμαρτίας** is an abstract noun which may or may not have the article. But **νόμῳ** is definite in either instance in 'the law of sin.' See again **τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ** (7:22) and **νόμῳ θεοῦ** (7:25). Θεός can be definite with or without the article. So, again, **τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος** (8:6) and **πνεῦμα θεοῦ, πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ** (8:9), **ὁμοιώματι σαρκός** (8:3) and **τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός** (8:6). Cf. also **ὁ νομός τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς** (8:2), **τὴν ἐλεύθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ** (8:21), **τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος** (Ac. 2:38), **βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Mt. 1:1). Cf. 1 Th. 1:3;. Rev. 1:1. These examples could be multiplied indefinitely. If one member of the group is a proper name, the article does not always appear. So **τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ θεσσαλονικέων** (1 Th. 1:1), but **ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας** (Gal. 1:2). Note also **θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν** (Eph. 1:2) and **ὁ θεὸς**

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159.
[2] The Doctrine of the Gk. Art., 1833. Cf. Mk. 10:25 W. H. text and marg.
[3] Cf. W. F. Moulton' remarks, W.-M., pp. 146, 174, 175.

καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (1:3). Cf. also **τὸ ἔργον Κυρίου** (Ph. 2:30), **τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ** (1 Pet. 1:11; cf. Ac. 16:7). Such examples as these with proper names are after all "very rare."[1] See Mt. 1: 12; 16:13; Ac. 2:38; Rev. 12:17. Then again other phrases otherwise definite do not require the article. So the prepositional phrase **ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ** (Ro. 8:34; cf. Heb. 1:3), but note **τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ** (Ac. 2:33). In general, where the word without the article is not otherwise definite, it is indefinite even when the other one has the article. One is indefinite, the other definite. So **ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων** (Jo. 2:11)— 'a beginning of miracles.' In Mk. 1: 1, **ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ᾽Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ**, the notion may be the same, though here **ἀρχή** is more absolute as the title of the book. In Ro. 3:25 it is possible to take **εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ**= 'for a showing of his righteousness,' while in 3:26 **πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσυνης αὐτοῦ** may refer to the previous mention of it as a more definite conception. Compare also **τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην** (Ro. 10: 3) and **δικαιοσυνη θεοῦ** (3:21), where, however, as in 1:17, the idea may be, probably is, 'a righteousness of God,' not 'the righteousness of God.' In examples like this (cf. **θεοῦ υἱός**, Mt. 27:54) only the context can decide. Sometimes the matter is wholly doubtful. Cf. **υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου** (Heb. 2:6) and **τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου** (Mt. 16:13). In an example like **διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Col. 1:7), therefore, the idea is a minister of the Christ, not the minister of Christ. So **σφραγῖδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης**s (Ro. 4:11), **ἁπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας** (2 Cor. 9:13). Hence **υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ** (Mt. 4:3, 6; Lu. 4:3) and **ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ** (Jo. 1:49; Mt. 16:16; Jo. 11:27) do not mean the same thing. The devil is represented as admitting that Jesus is a son of God, not the Son of God. In Jo. 5:25 Jesus claims **ὅτι οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ**. In Jo. 10:36 Jesus uses *argumentum ad hominem* and only claims to be **υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ**. Cf. the sneer of the passers-by in Mt. 27:40 (W. H.), **υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ**, and the demand of Caiaphas in 26:63, **ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ**. In Jo. 5:27 **υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου** may be either 'the son of man' or 'a son of man.' Cf. a similar ambiguity in the Aramaic *barnasha*. The point may become very fine indeed. Cf. **παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός** and **κεφαλὴ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνήρ** (1 Cor. 11:3). At any rate man is not affirmed to be woman's head in quite the same sense that Christ is man's head. But see also **κεφαλὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός**. In these examples the anarthrous substantive is predicate as is the case with **ἀνήρ ἐστιν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας** (Eph. 5:23). Hence the matter is not to be stressed here, as another

[1] W.-M., footnote, p. 146.

principle comes into play. It is possible also that the qualitative force of anarthrous nouns comes in here (Eph. 5:23, **κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος**). See VIII, (j). Cf. **ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας** (Eph. 2:12). So **ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων** (Jo. 5:1) = 'a feast of the Jews,' **ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων** (3:1). Cf. Ac. 6:1. Cf. **βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν** (Mk. 1:4) and **εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν** (Ac. 2:38), **εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ** (1 Cor. 1:9), prepositional phrase. But enough of a somewhat thorny subject.[1]

(c) WITH ADJUNCTS OR ADVERBS. In general the same usage applies to adjuncts as to adjectives.

1. *Between the Article and the Noun*. Thus **ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις** (Ph. 3:14), **ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις** (Ro. 9:11), **ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη** (11:27), **ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος** (Lu. 16:10), **τὴν ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκόν** (Mt. 7:3), **οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοί** (Ac. 10:45), **ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις** (1 Pet. 1:14). Cf. Ro. 2:27.

2. *Article Repeated*.[2] Thus **πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** (Mk. 4:31), **αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** (13:25), **τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** (Ro. 3:24), **τὰ παθήματα τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου** (7:5), **ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν** (7:10). See further Mt. 5:16; Lu. 20:35; Jo. 1:45; Ac. 8:1; 24:5; 26:4; Ro. 4:11; 8:39; 15:26; 16:1; 1 Cor. 2:11 f.; 4:17; 2 Cor. 2:6; 9:1; 11:3; Ph. 3:9; 1 Th. 1:8; 1 Tim. 1:14; Rev. 5:5; 11:2, 19, etc. In Eph. 1:15 we find both constructions **τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους**. In Rev. 8:3 (9:13), **τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου**, the article is repeated with both adjective and adjunct.

3. *Only with Adjunct*. So **οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει** (1 Tim. 1:4), **δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ πίστεως** (Ro. 9:30), **ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** (2 Tim. 1:13). For numerous classic illustrations of these three positions see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, pp. 285 ff.

4. Only with the Noun. In such cases the adjunct may be either attributive or predicate. Only the context can decide. In conversation the tone of voice, the manner, the inflection make clear what in written speech is ambiguous. Still in most instances in the N. T. the point is plain.[3] The cases here dealt with are those that occur without other defining phrases. In Eph. 6:5 some MSS. read **τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα**. So in Lu. 16:10 we find both **ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος** and **ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ**. I see no point in Blass'

[1] Cf. K.-G., I, p. 607 f.
[2] Cf. W.-Th., p. 133, for long list of exx.
[3] Ib., pp. 135 ff.; p. 179 f.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159 f.

remark[1] that "the closely connected predicative clause could not be severed by the insertion of the article." The article could easily have been repeated or the same order preserved in both clauses. It is much simpler and truer to say that the need of another article was not felt. The same remark applies to **τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι** (1 Tim. 6:17), **τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ** (Ro. 15:31), **τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα** (1 Cor. 10:18), **τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σακρί** (Eph. 2:11), **τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν** (2:15), **ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ** (4 : 1), **οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ** (1 Th. 4:16), **τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτούς** (2 Cor. 9:13), **τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ** (Ro. 16:10), **οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ** (1 Cor. 15: 18). Cf. Ph. 1:1. In Col. 1:4, **τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ**, and Ph. 4:19, **τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ ἐν δόξῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** more than one adjunct occurs outside the article. Cf. Eph. 3:4, 13. Blass[2] considers this idiom peculiar to the N. T., but pertinent examples are cited[3] from Herodotus V, 108, **ἡ ἀγγελία περὶ τῶν Σαρδίων**, Thucydides, II, 52. 1, etc. The vernacular character of the N. T. diction renders it more frequent. It is not common in classic Greek.[4]

5. *When Several Adjuncts Occur*. "It often becomes inconvenient and clumsy to insert all of these between the article and the substantive."[5] Even so, but at bottom the matter does not differ in principle from the examples above. We have seen the same freedom with a second attributive adjective (cf. Mt. 24:45). See a good example of two adjuncts in Eph. 1:15, **τὴν καθ᾽ ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ**. The first attribute may be adjective, genitive, adverb or adjunct. So **τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν** (Col. 2:14), **τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς** (Ph. 1:26), **τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστιει** (3:9), **τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ** (Gal. 1:13). Cf. Ph. 1:5. The article and the participle readily yield examples like **ὁ κατὰ πολὺ ἀναγεννήσας εἰς ἐλπίδα** (1 Pet. 1:3), **τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως** (1:5). But sometimes the several adjuncts (cf. adjectives and genitives) are inserted between the article and the substantive. So **τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς** (2 Pet. 1:4). Cf. Ac. 21: 28. For similar position of several genitives and adjuncts see 2 Pet. 2:7; Lu. 1:70. In particular note Ro. 16:17 for the various phrases between **τούς** and **ποιοῦντας**. Note the many adjuncts in Ro. 3:25 f. See further VI, (a), 6.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 160.
[2] p. 159. [3] W.-Sch., p. 180.
[4] The three regular positions are common. Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 286.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 160.

6. *Phrases of Verbal Origin*. Phrases that are consciously verbal in origin readily do without the repeated article.[1] So in Ro. 6:3 we have **εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν** and in the next verse we read **συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον**. It is plain, therefore, that here **εἰς τὸν θάνατον** is to be construed with **βαπτίσματος,** not with **συνετάφημεν**. In other examples the verbal construction appears in other contexts. It is, however, possible that the usage with the verb renders the anarthrous construction more frequent. So Ph. 1:26, **τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς**, may be compared with **παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς** (Gal. 4:20). Cf. also **παθήματα ὑπέρ** (Col. 1:24) with **πάσχειν ὑπέρ** (1 Pet. 2:21), **θλίψεσιν ὑπέρ** (Eph. 3:13) with **θλιβόμεθα ὑπέρ** (2 Cor. 1:6). The classic idiom shows similar examples.[2]

7. *Exegetical Questions*. Sometimes it is quite important for doctrinal reasons to be careful to note whether the adjunct is attributive or predicate. Thus in Ro. 8:3, **κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί,** if **ἐν τῇ σαρκί** is attributive with **ἁμαρτίαν**, there is a definite assertion of sin in the flesh of Jesus. But if the phrase is predicate and is to be construed with **κατέκρινε**, no such statement is made. Here the grammarian is helpless to decide the point. The interpreter must step in and appeal to the context or other passages for light. One conversant with Paul's theology will feel sure that **ἐν σαρκί** is here meant to be taken as predicate. The same ambiguity arises in verse 2, **ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἠλευθέρωσέν σε ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου.** Here it is reasonably clear that **ἐν Χριστῷ** is predicate with **ἠλευθέρωσεν**. So in Ro. 3:25 probably **ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι**, as well as **εἰς ἔνδειξιν** is predicate with **προέθετο**. Another example from Romans is found in 5:8, where **εἰς ἡμᾶς** belongs to **συνίστησιν**, not **ἀγάπην**. So in Jo. 15:11 **ἐν ὑμῖν** is construed with **ᾖ** not **ἡ ἐμή**. For further illustration see Ac. 22:18; 1 Cor. 2:7; 9:18; Eph. 2:7; 3:12; 5:26; Ph. 1:14; 3:9; Col. 1:9; Phil. 20; Heb. 13:20.

8. *Anarthrous Attributives.* Examples occur also of attributives when the article is absent from both substantive and adjunct. Thus **ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς** (Jo. 9:1), **ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ** (Mk. 1:23), **χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ** (Ro. 14:17), **ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδόν** (1 Cor. 12:31), etc. Note in particular 2 Cor. 11:23, 27. The older Greek furnishes illustration of this idiom.[3]

[1] W.-Th., p. 136; W.-Sch., p. 180.
[2] W.-Sch., p. 180.
[3] Ib. But Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 159) doubts it.

(d) SEVERAL ATTRIBUTIVES WITH **Καί**.

1. *Several Epithets Applied to the Same Person or Thing*. See already under VI, (a), 4. Usually only one article is then used. For classic examples see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 330. So, for instance, **ὁ ταλαιπωρος καὶ ἐλεινὸς καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμνός** (Rev. 3:17). This is the normal idiom in accord with ancient usage. So Mk. 6:3 **ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας καὶ ἀδελφὸς ᾽Ιακώβου**, Lu. 6:49 **ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας**, Ac. 3:14 **τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον**, Jas. 3:9 **τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα**, 2 Pet. 2:20 (3:2) **τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος**, 1 Tim. 4:3 **τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσι.** also Gal. 1:7; Eph. 6:21; 1 Tim. 6:15; Heb. 3:1; Rev. 1:9 (both **ὁ** and **τῇ**). When a second article does occur, it accents sharply a different aspect of the person or phase of the subject. So in Rev. 1:17 **ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, καὶ ὁ ζῶν**, one article would have been sufficient, but would have obscured the separate affirmations here made. Cf. also **τὸ ᾽Αλφα καὶ τὸ ῎Ω** in 1:8; 21:6. In Jo. 21:24 W. H. read **ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ ὁ γράψας ταῦτα**, but they bracket **καὶ ὁ**. The second article is very doubtful. A similar superfluity of the second article appears in the second **ἡ** (brackets W. H.) in Ac. 17:19, and in the second **τό** in 1 Pet. 4:14, **τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα** (due probably to the second genitive to emphasize each). So Jo. 1:40. See pp. 762, 782. Outside of special cases like these only one article is found when several epithets are applied to the same person. The presence of a genitive with the group of words does not materially alter the construction. The genitive may occur with either substantive and apply to both.[1] So **ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν** (1 Th. 3:11) and **τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος** (2 Pet. 1:11). As a matter of fact such genitives (see above) occur either inside or outside of the regimen of the article. Cf. **τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν** (Ph. 4:20), **ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυίου ἡμῶν** (1 Pet. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:3; Eph. 1:3). The presence of **ἡμῶν**, with **κυρίου** does not affect the construction any more than the use of **κυρίου** itself or **ἡμῶν** above. In Ph. 3:3 one adjunct comes before one participle, the other after the other participle, but only one article occurs. A most important passage is 2 Pet. 1:1, **τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος ᾽Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. Curiously enough Winer[2] endeavours to draw a distinction between this passage, "where there is not even a pronoun with **σωτῆρος**" and the identical construction in 2 Pet. 1:11, **τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος ᾽Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ**, which he cites[3] as an example of "merely predicates of the same person." Stranger

[1] Cf. W.-Sch., p. 155.
[2] W.-Th., p. 130.
[3] Ib., p. 126.

still, he bases his objection on doctrinal grounds, a matter that does not *per se* concern the grammarian. The matter is handled in Winer-Schmiedel,[1] where it is frankly admitted that the construction in 2 Pet. 1:1 is the same as that in 1:11 and also in 2:20; 3:2, 18. Schmiedel says also that "grammar demands that one person be meant." In Ju. 4, **τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν**, the same point holds, but the fact that **κύριος** is so often anarthrous like a proper name slightly weakens it. The same remark applies also to 2 Th. 1:12, **τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**, and Eph. 5:5, **ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ**; (since **θεοῦ** often occurs without the article). One person may be described in these three examples, but they are not so clear as the type **τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος** (2 Pet. 1:1, 11). In Tit. 2:13, **τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**, it is almost certain that one person is again described. Cf. also **τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης** where the one article unites closely the two substantives. Moulton[2] quotes most pertinently papyri examples of vii/A.D., which show that among Greek-speaking Christians "our great God and Saviour" was a current form of speech as well as the Ptolemaic formula, **τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ εὐεργέτου καὶ σωτῆρος** (G. H. 15, ii/B.C.). He cites also Wendland's argument[3] that the rival rendering in Titus is as great an "exegetical mistake" as to make two persons in 2 Pet. 1:1. Moulton's conclusion[4] is clear enough to close the matter: "Familiarity with the everlasting apotheosis that flaunts itself in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times lends strong support to Wendland's contention that Christians, from the latter part of i/A.D. onward, deliberately annexed for their divine Master the phraseology that was impiously arrogated to themselves by some of the worst of men."

2. *When to be Distinguished*. Then the article is repeated. So Mt. 23:2 **οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι**, Mk. 2:18 **οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάνου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι**, 6:21 **τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις** 11: 9 **οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες** 11:18 (cf. 14:43) **οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γρταμματεῖς,** Mk. 12:13 **τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἡρῳδιανῶν**, 11: 39 **τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος,** 15:6 **στοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς γείτονας**, 23:4 **τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ὄχλους,** Jo. 4:37 **ὁ σπείρων καὶ ὁ θερίζων**, 1 Cor. 3:8 **ὁ φυτεύων καὶ ὁ ποτίζων,** Jas. 3:11 **τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρόν,** Ac. 26:30 **ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμών,** Rev. 18:20 **οἱ ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται.** Cf. Rev. 11: 4;

[1] P. 158.
[2] Prol., p. S4.
[3] On **Σωτήρ** in ZNTW, v. 335 f.
[4] Prol., p. 84.

13:16; 2 Th. 1:8. The list can be extended almost indefinitely.[1] But these are examples of the same number, gender and case. Nor have I referred to abstract words of quality like the list in Rev. 7:12, or examples like **τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας** (Lu. 12:11). It is not contended that these groups are all absolutely distinct (cf. **οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι**), but that they are treated as separate. Even with the scribes and Pharisees they did not quite coincide. Cf. Mt. 21:45; Ac. 11:6. The use of another attributive may sometimes be partly responsible for two articles. So Lu. 8:24 **τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος**, Mk. 2:18 **οἱ μαθηταὶ ᾽Ιωάνου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι**, 11:15 **τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων**. Cf. also Lu. 20:20; Ac. 25:15; 1 Cor. 11:27; Rev. 13:10.

3. *Groups Treated as One*. Sometimes groups more or less distinct are treated as one for the purpose in hand, and hence use only one article. Cf **τὰς φίλας καὶ γείτονας** (Lu. 15:9), **τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους** (14:3), **τὰ πλατείας καὶ ῥύμας** (14:21), **τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων** (Mk. 15:1), **τῶν ᾽Επικουρίων καὶ Στωκῶν** (Ac. 17: 18), **τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων** (Ac. 23:7), **τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν** (Eph. 2:20), **τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου** (Ph. 1:7), **τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ βάθος καὶ ὕψος** (Eph. 3:18), **τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν** (2 Pet. 1:10). Cf. **τήν** in Tit. 2:13. So in Mt. 17:1 (W. H. text) we have **τὸν Πέτρον καὶ ᾽Ιάκωβον καὶ ᾽Ιωάνην**, where the three are one group. This is probably more frequent in examples where a genitive occurs also, or some other attribute.[2] So Ph. 1:20 **τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου**, 1:19 **τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως καὶ ἐπιχορηρίας τοῦ πνεύματος**, 2:17 **τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως**. Cf. also 1 Th. 2:12; 3:7; Mt. 24:3; Ro. 1:20; Col. 2:8; Eph. 3:5; 2 Cor. 1:6; 1 Pet. 2:25; Ph. 1:25. These are all the simplest and clearest illustrations.

4. *Point of View.* Obviously, therefore, whether one or more articles are to be used depends on the point of view of the speaker or writer. In geographical terms the matter of freedom is well illustrated. Thus in 1 Th. 1: 7 we have **ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ᾽Αχαίᾳ**, while in the very next verse we meet **ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ᾽Αχαίᾳ**, as in Ac. 19:21. These two Roman provinces are distinct, but adjacent. Cf. also **τῆς ᾽Ιουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρίας** (Ac. 8:1; cf. 1: 8), **τῆς ᾽Ιουδαίας καὶ Φαλιλαίας καὶ Σαμαρίαν** (9:31), where these sections of Palestine are treated together. Cf. Ac. 27:5. In Ac. 15:3 note **τήν τε Φοινίκην καὶ Σαμαρίαν**, the two sections treated together are not even contiguous. In Ac. 15:23, **κατὰ τὴν ᾽Αντιό-**

[1] Cf. W.-Th., p. 128. [2] W.-Sch., p. 156 f.

χειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ **Κ**ιλικίαν, we have a city grouped with two countries (as in Lu. 5:17; Mt. 4:25), while in 15:41 we meet τὴν Συρίαν καὶ τὴν **Κ**ιλικίαν (W. H. text). Hence no absolute conclusions can be drawn from the one article in Ac. 16:6, τὴν **Φ**ρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν (cf. reverse order in 18 : 23) as to the separateness[1] of the terms "Phrygia" and " Galatic region." Cf. also Lu. 3:1, τῆς **Ἰ**τουραίας καὶ **Τ**ραχωνίτιδος χώρας. But the matter is not wholly whimsical. In Ac. 2:9 f. note the τήν with **Μ**εσοποταμίαν, which stands alone, while we have also **Π**όντον καὶ τὴν **Ἀ**σίαν, probably because the province of Asia (not Asia Minor as a whole) is meant. Then again we meet τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ **Κ**υρήνην, because of the details stated. In Ac. 6:9 the use of τῶν twice divides the synagogues into two groups (men from Cilicia and Asia on the one hand, men from Alexandria, Cyrene and Libertines (?) on the other). The matter is simple geography but for **Λ**ιβερτίνων, and may be after all if we only knew what that term means. See Winer-Schmiedel, p. 158. Cf. also Rev. 14:7, where two words have articles and two do not, and Ac. 15:20, where three words in the list have articles and one, πνικτοῦ, does not. So in Ac. 13:50 we have τὸν **Π**αῦλον καὶ **Β**., while in 15:2 we find τῷ **Π.** καὶ τῷ B. Then (cf. 4) in Mt. 17:1 observe the one article with Peter, James and John, while in Heb. 11:20 we see εὐλόγησεν **Ἰ**σαὰκ τὸν **Ἰ**ακὼβ καὶ τὸν **Ἠ**σαῦ. The articles here emphasize the distinction between subject and object as in Mt. 1:2-16. Cf. also τῶν ἀπ. καὶ τῶν πρ. (Ac. 15:4) and **οἱ** ἀπ. καὶ **οἱ** πρ. (15:6) with τῶν ἀπ. καὶ πρ. τῶν (16:4).

5. *Difference in Number.* If the words combined differ in number, usually each one has its own article. The reason is that they generally fall into separate classes. So ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες (Rev. 1:3), τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν (Eph. 2:3), τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας (Tit. 2:12). But one article may also be found, as in τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις (1 Cor. 4:9). Here, however, the anarthrous words "particularize the τῷ κόσμῳ."[2] Yet in 1 Jo. 2:16 πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is "particularized" by three words each with the article.

6. *Difference in Gender*. So, if the gender is different, there is likewise usually the repetition of the article. Cf. Ac. 17:18 τὸν **Ἰ**ησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, Mt. 22:4 οἱ ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστά, Lu. 10:21 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, Ac. 13:50 τὰς εὐσχήμονας καὶ τοὺς πρώτους, Ro. 8:2 τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, Col. 4:17 τὸ δίκαιον

[1] Cf. W. M. Ramsay, Expos., 1895, July, pp. 29-40,
[2] W.-Th., p. 127.

καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα, Eph. 2:1 τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις, Heb. 3:6 τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα. Though usual, the repeated article is not necessary.[1] See τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς (Lu. 14:23), τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν (Mk. 12:33), τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας (Col. 2:22).

If indeed the words differ in both gender and number, in that case it is still more customary to have separate articles. Cf., for instance, Lu. 14:26, τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀδελφάς. So also Ac. 15:4, 20; 26:30; Col. 2:13; 1 Tim. 5:23; Rev. 2:19. The papyri illustrate the N. T. usage of the article with several substantives (cf. Volker, *Syntax*, p. 20). So ὁ ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη, Pap. L, Dieterich, *Abraxas*, p. 195. 9.

7. *With Disjunctive Particle*. If a disjunctive preposition be used, there will naturally be separate articles (even when καί is the connective), whatever be true about number and gender. So μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου (Mt. 23:35 = Lu. 11:51). So when the conjunction occurs as in τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας (Mt. 5:17), τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ (15:5), τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς (Jo. 3:19), ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἢ ὑπὸ την κλίνην. (Mk. 4:21), τῷ λαῷ ἢ τοῖς ἔθεσι (Ac. 28:17). Blass[2] makes the point that outside of Ac. 14:5, τῶν ἐθνῶν τε καὶ ᾿Ιουδαίων, we generally find the repeated article with τε καί. Even here ᾿Ιουδαίων as a proper name does not need the article. Cf. ᾿Ιουδαίων τε καὶ ῾Ελλήνων in 14:1, but ὅ τε στρατηγὸς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς (5:24) with difference in number also.

VII. Position with Predicates. It is not the use of the article with the predicate noun, like οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος (Mk. 12:7), that is here before us. That point has already been discussed under v, (i). When the article occurs with the substantive, but not with the adjective, the result is the equivalent of a relative clause. Cf. μεγάλῃ φωνῇ (Ac. 14:10) and φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (7:57)= 'with a loud voice,' with μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ (26:24)= 'with the voice elevated.' See also ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ (2 Cor. 3:18)— 'with unveiled face' and ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ (1 Cor. 11:5) = 'with the head unveiled.' Cf. Mk. 3:1, ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα. Other examples are πεπωρωμένην τὴν καρδίαν (Mk. 8:17), τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω (Jo. 5:36), τὴν ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ (1 Pet. 4:8), τὴν ἀναστροφὴν καλήν (2:12), ἀπαράβατον τὴν ἱερωσύνην (Heb. 7:24), τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα (5:14). In all these and similar examples the point is quite different from that of the attributive position of the article. Most of the instances occur with ἔχω. Note the absence of the

[1] Ib. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 163.

article with ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη (Lu. 2:2) because it is in the predicate. Cf. τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας (Jo. 4:18). The position of αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ (Lu. 1:36) may be noted. D in Mk. 7:5 reads κοιναῖς ταῖς χερσίν.[1] Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 292) considers this use of the predicate position "a gnomon of artificial style" outside of the more simple combinations. See also Milden, The *Limitations of the Predicative Position in Greek* (1900, p. 43). It is noticeable in prepositional phrases, as in Xen., *Anab*., 1, 3, 14, διὰ φιλίας τῆς χώρας.

VIII. The Absence of the Article. I do not care to use the term "omission" in connection with the article. That word implies that the article ought to be present. As has been already shown, the article is not the only means of showing that a word is definite. This luxury in language did not become indispensable. The servant never became master. There remained in the classic period many parallel phrases which were intelligible without the article. Indeed, new phrases came into use by analogy without the article. I do not think it is necessary to devote so much space to this phase of the subject as is done in most grammars. Most of the cases have already come up for discussion in one way or another. It is sufficient here to give a résumé of the chief idioms in the N. T. which are without the article and are still definite. Much of the modern difficulty about the absence of the Greek article is due to the effort to interpret it by the standard of the English or German article. So Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 119) speaks of "appellatives, which as expressing definite objects should have the article"! Even Gildersleeve, in discussing the "Absence of the Article" (note the phrase, *Syntax*, p. 259), says. that "prepositional phrases and other formulae may dispense with the article as in the earlier language," and he adds "but anaphora or contrast may bring back the article at any time and there is no pedantical uniformity." Admirably said, except "dispense with" and "bring back," dim ghosts of the old grammar. Moulton[2] cites Jo. 6:68, ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου, which should be translated ‘words of eternal life’ (as marg. of R. V.). There are indeed "few of the finer points of Greek which need more constant attention"' than the absence of the article. The word may be either definite or indefinite when the article is absent. The context and history of the phrase in question must decide. The translation of the expression into English or German is not determined by the mere

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 315.
[2] Prol., p. 83. Ib.

absence of the Greek article. If the word is indefinite, as in Jo. 4:27; 6:68, no article, of course, occurs. But the article is absent in a good many definite phrases also. It is about these that a few words further are needed. A brief summary of the various types of anarthrous definite phrases is given.[1] A sane treatment of the subject occurs in Winer-Schmiedel.[2]

(a) WITH PROPER NAMES. Here the article is used or not at the will of the writer. So **τὸν ᾽Ιησοῦν ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει** (Ac. 19:13), but **τὸν Παῦλον** in verse 15. The reason is apparent in these three examples. Words in apposition with proper names are usually anarthrous. Cf. Mt. 3:6 = Mk. 1:5. See further v, (a), 3.

(b) WITH GENITIVES. We have seen that the substantive may still be definite if anarthrous, though not necessarily so. Cf. **πύλαι ᾅδου** (Mt. 16:18), **ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν** (Ac. 23:6), **χάριτι θεοῦ** (1 Cor. 15:10), **λόγον θεοῦ** (1 Th. 2:13), **ποτήριον κυρίου** (1 Cor. 10:21), **υἱὲ διαβόλου** (Ac. 13:10), etc.[3] In particular, personal pronouns in the genitive were not always felt to need the article. Cf. **κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ** (Lu. 13:19). See further v, (h). The LXX uses this idiom freely (Blass-Debrunner, p. 151). English can show the same construction.

> "Eye of newt and toe of frog,
> Wool of bat and tongue of dog,
> Adder's fork and blind worm's sting,
> Lizard's leg and hornet's wing." — *Macbeth*.

(c) PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES. These were also often considered definite enough without the article. So **ἐν οἴκῳ** (1 Cor. 11:34. Cf. **ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ**, 'in the house,' Jo. 11:20)= 'at home.' So we say "go to bed," etc. Moulton[4] pertinently cites English "down town," "on change," "in bed," "from start to finish." This idiom is not therefore peculiar to Greek. It is hardly necessary to mention all the N. T. examples, so common is the matter.

Thus with **ἀνά** observe **ἀνὰ μέρος** (1 Cor. 14:27). With **ἀπό** note **ἀπ᾽ ἀγροῦ** (Mk. 15:21), **ἀπ᾽ ἀγορᾶς** (Mk. 7:4), **ἀπ᾽ οὐρανοῦ** (Lu. 17:29), **ἀπ᾽ οὐρανῶν** (Heb. 12:25), **ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς** (Rev. 21:13), **ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν**, (Mt. 2:1), **ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς** (1 Jo. 1:1), **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς** (Mt. 13: 35), **ἀπὸ μέρους** (Ro. 11:25), **ἀπὸ νεκρῶν** (Lu. 16:30). Cf. Rev. 21:13, **ἀπὸ βορρᾶ, ἀπὸ νότου, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν**. So **ἄχρι καιροῦ** (Lu. 4:13).

For **διὰ** note **διὰ νυκτός** (Ac. 5:19), **διὰ μέσου** (Lu. 4:30), **διὰ μέσον** (17: 11).

[1] See on the whole subject K.-G., I, pp. 598
[2] Pp. 162 ff.
[3] See extensive list in W.-Sch., p. 166 f.
[4] Prol., p. 82.

For εἰς see εἰς ᾅδην (Ac. 2:27), εἰς οὐρανόν (1 Pet. 3:22), εἰς ἀγρόν (Mk. 16:12), εἰς θάλασσαν (Mt. 17:27), εἰς οἶκον (Mk. 3:20), εἰς πρόσωπον (Mk. 12:14), εἰς μέσον (Mk. 14:60), εἰς οἰκίαν (2 Jo. 10), εἰς τέλος (Mt. 10:22).

For ἐν may be noticed ἐν οὐρανῷ (Mt. 6:20), ἐν οὐρανοῖς (Heb. 12:23), ἐν ὑψίστοις (Lu. 2:14), ἐν δεξιᾷ (Heb. 1:3), ἐν κόσμῳ (Col. 2:20), ἐν ἀγρῷ (Lu. 15:25), ἐν ἀγορᾷ (Lu. 7:32), ἐν οἴκῳ (1 Cor. 14:35), ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ= 'at church' (1 Cor. 14:19), ἐν προσώπῳ (2 Cor. 5:12), ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (Ro. 13:13), ἐν καιρῷ (Mt. 24:45), ἐν ἀρχῇ (Jo. 1:1), ἐν σαρκί (2 Cor. 10:3), ἐν ἀνθρώποις (Lu. 1:25), ἐν νυκτί (Ac. 18:9).

Examples of ἐξ are ἐκ μέρους (1 Cor. 12:27), ἐκ ψυχῆς (Eph. 6:6), ἐκ νεότητος (Ac. 26:4), ἐξ ἀρχῆς (Jo. 6:64), ἐκ δεξιῶν (Mt. 27:38), ἐξ εὐωνύμων (Mt. 25:41), ἐξ ἀριστερῶν (Lu. 23:33), ἐκ μέσου (2 Th. 2:7), ἐκ καρδίας (Ro. 6:17), ἐκ νεκρῶν (Lu. 9:7), ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (Jo. 1:32).

For ἕως observe ἕως ᾅδου (Mt. 11:23), ἕως οὐρανοῦ (Mt. 11:23), ἕως δυσμῶν (Mt. 24:27), ἕως ἑσπέρας (Ac. 28:23), ἕως τέλους (1 Cor. 1:8).

Examples of ἐπί are ἐπὶ γῆς (Lu. 2:14), ἐπὶ θύραις (Mt. 24:33), ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (Lu. 5:12).

For κατά see κατ᾽ ὀφθαλμούς (Gal. 3:1), κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον (Ac. 27:12), κατὰ μεσημβρίαν (Ac. 8:26), κατ᾽ ἀρχάς (Heb. 1:10), κατὰ πρόσωπον (Ac. 25:16), κατὰ μέρος (Heb. 9:5), κατὰ σάρκα (2 Cor. 10:3), κατὰ ἀνθρώπους (1 Pet. 4:6).

For μέχρι observe μέχρι μεσονυκτίου (Ac. 20:7), μέχρι τέλους (Heb. 3:6).

For παρά note παρὰ θάλασσαν (Ac. 10:32), παρὰ ποταμόν (Ac. 16:13).

For περί see περί μεσημβρίαν (Ac. 22:6).

For πρό see πρὸ καιροῦ (Mt. 8:29).

For πρός observe πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον (1 Cor. 13:12), πρὸς ἑσπέραν (Lu. 24:29).

For ὑπό see ὑπ᾽ οὐρανόν (Lu. 17:24).

It will be noted that this usage after all is confined to a rather narrow range of words, some of which, like οὐρανός and γῆ, represent single objects. More of this a little later. Most of these examples have articular parallels. See also v, (f). For classic examples see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 259 f. The papyri furnish abundant parallels (Volker, *Syntax*, pp. 15-17) as do the inscriptions (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 92).

(d) WITH BOTH PREPOSITION AND GENITIVE. It is not surprising to find no article with phrases which use both preposition

and genitive like **εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ** (Ro. 1:1), **ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου** (Lu. 19:42), **ἐκ δεξιῶν μου** (Mt. 20:23), **ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς κόσμου** (Mt. 24:21), **παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας** (Heb. 11:11), **ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ** (Lu. 8:13), **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** (Mt. 25:34), **ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ** (Lu. 1:51), etc.

(e) TITLES OF BOOKS OR SECTIONS. These may be without the article, being already specific enough. So **Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον** before the Gospel in many MSS., **ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου** (Mk. 1:1), **βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Mt. 1:1), **Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Rev. 1:1). A good example of anarthrous headings may be seen in 1 Pet. 1 f. (cf. Hort, 1 Peter, p. 15), where no article occurs in the whole opening sentence of five lines. The article is used quite idiomatically in 1 Peter.

(f) WORDS IN PAIRS. These often do without the article. Very often, of course, the article is used. Words for day and night (as in English) frequently occur together. Cf. **νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας** (Mk. 5:5), **ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός** (Rev. 4:8). They occur singly also without the article, as **νυκτός** (Jo. 3:2), **ἡμέρας** (Rev. 21:25), **μέσης νυκτός** (Mt. 25:6). See also other pairs like **ἐν οὐρανῳ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς** (1 Cor. 8:5; cf. 2 Pet. 3:5), **πατέρα ἢ μητέρα** (Mk. 7:10), **ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς** (1 Pet. 4:5). Indeed the anarthrous construction is common in contrast with **ἤ, εἴτε, οὔτε, μήτε, οὐ**—**ἀλλά** (cf. Ro. 6:14). For long lists of anarthrous words (definite and indefinite together) see Ro. 8:35; 1 Cor. 3:22; 12:13, 28; 2 Cor. 11:25 f.; 1 Pet. 1:2; Heb. 12:18, 23; 1 Tim. 3:16.[1] Cf. also **ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικός** (1 Cor. 11:8). Some of these usages belong to proverbs, formulae and enumerations. See Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 260. The **κοινή** (inscriptions and papyri) shows the idiom (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 94).

(g) ORDINAL NUMERALS. The article is usually absent in expressions of time. The ancient idiom is here followed.[2] The ordinal was often felt to be definite enough alone. This was true of the predicate. Cf. **ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη** (Lu. 2:2), **ἦν ὥρα τρίτη** (Mk. 15:25), **ἦν ὡς ἕκτη** (Jo. 19:14). Cf. Eph. 6:2; Ac. 2:15. But it was not confined to the predicate by any means, nor even to prepositional phrases like **ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας** (Ac. 20:18), **ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ** (2 Cor. 12:2), **ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας** (Ac. 10:30), **περὶ ὥραν ἕκτην**, (Ac. 10:9), **ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ** (Lu. 3:1), **ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης** (Mk. 15:33), etc. Cf. Ac. 23:23. The same construction occurs also

[1] Cf. W.- Sch., p. 168; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 149.

[2] Thompson, Synt., etc., p. 54; W.-Th., p. 126. See further J. Thompson, Cl. Rev., 1906, p. 304; Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 261.

in διελθόντες πρώτην φυλακὴν καὶ δευτέραν (Ac. 12:10). Cf. Mk. 15:33, γενομένης ὥρας ἕκτης. Examples with the article are not wanting. Cf. Mt. 27:64; Lu. 12:38; Ac. 10:40.

(h) IN THE PREDICATE. As already shown in v, (i), in the predicate the article is often absent. See v, (i). Cf. θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος (Jo. 1:1), ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν (1 Jo. 4:8), etc. This is the rule unless the terms be convertible or the predicate is singled out as prominent. For the superlative without the article see also 1 Jo. 2:18. Cf. 1 Pet. 1:5, ἐν ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ.

(i) ABSTRACT WORDS. In English the presence, not the absence, of the article with abstract words needs explanation. Hence the anarthrous lists in Gal. 5:20 f., 22 f., seem to us much more in harmony with our idiom than the lists with the article in Rev. 5:12, 13; 7:12. In German,[1] however, the opposite is often true. The article is often absent in the Greek, where the German would have it. Cf. Ro. 1:29. See iv, (c), for discussion of article with abstract nouns. No vital difference was felt between articular and anarthrous abstract nouns (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 259).

(j) QUALITATIVE FORCE. This is best brought out in anarthrous nouns. So εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι (Mk. 10:2; cf. 1 Cor. 7:10), παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον—τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς (13 : 12), ὡς μονογονοῦς παρὰ πατρός (Jo. 1:14), γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς (Ro. 1:30). Cf. also Eph. 5:23, ἀνήρ ἐστιν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας and αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. In αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν (verse 24) note the generic article, class and class. See υἱός—πατήρ (Heb. 12:7).[2]

(k) ONLY OBJECT OF KIND. These partake of the nature of proper names and often occur without the article. They also often have the article. Some of these anarthrous examples appear in prepositional phrases like ἐξ ἀριστερῶν (Lu. 23:33), ἐκ δεξιῶν (*ib.*), etc. These may be passed by (already discussed). The point is best illustrated by such words as ἐξ ἀριστερῶν (2 Pet. 3:5). Cf. English "heaven and earth." Cf. (f), Words in Pairs. θαλάσσα we find sometimes anarthrous with prepositions (Ac. 7:36; 10:32) and in Lu. 21:25 ἠχοῦς θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου. But it has the article in contrast with γῆ.[3] See also Lu. 21:25 ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις, Mt. 13:6 ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος, 1 Cor. 15:41 δόξα ἡλίου. So we can say "sun, moon and stars," etc. θάνατος should also be noted. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:21; Mt. 16:28; 20:18; Lu. 23:15; Ph. 1:20, etc. It is anarthrous as subject, object, with adjectives and with preposi-

[1] Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 150.
[2] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 82 f.; W.-Sch., p. 170.
[3] W.-Th., p. 121.

tions. Many of these examples occur with prepositions like Lu. 21: 25 above, or with a genitive like **υἱὲ διαβόλου** (Ac. 13:10).[1] Cf. 1 Pet. 5:8. The word **θεός**, like a proper name, is freely used with and without the article. But it is "beyond comparison the most frequently in the Epistles without the article."[2] I doubt that. As subject **ὁ θεός**, but as a predicate, **θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος** (Jo. 1:1); as genitive, **γνώσεως θεοῦ** (Ro. 11:33); with prepositions, **ἐν θεῷ** (Jo. 3:21); with adjectives, **θεὸς εὐλογητός** (Ro. 9:5); with participles also, **θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ** (1 Th. 1:9); in conjunction with **πατήρ** (Gal. 1:1). These illustrations can be greatly multiplied. So also **πνεῦμα** and **πνεῦμα ἅγιον** may occur with and without the article. Garvie[3] quotes Bartlet on Acts as saying that when **πνεῦμα ἅγιον** is anarthrous it describes the human condition, not the divine agency. But it may be questioned if this is not a purely artificial rule, as there are evident exceptions to it. The use of **πνεῦμα** with a genitive like **πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ** (Ro. 8:9) and with a preposition, **ἐκ πνευματος** (Jo. 3:5), accounts for some examples. An example like of **οὔπω ἦν πνεῦμα** (Jo. 7:39) merely illustrates the use of **πνεῦμα** like **θεός** as substantially a proper name. As for Middleton's rule that the article is present when the personality of the Holy Spirit is taught,[4] that is illustrated by Jo. 14:26, **τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον**, where the Holy Spirit is spoken of in distinction from the Father and the Son. Cf. also 15:26. See also **τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον** (Lu. 3:22), at the baptism of Jesus. **Κύριος**, like **θεός** and **πνεῦμα**, is often practically a proper name in the N. T. In the Gospels it usually refers to God, like the 0. T. Lord, while in the Epistles of Paul in particular it nearly always means the Lord Jesus.[5] It is not merely in a prepositional phrase like the common **ἐν κυρίῳ** (1 Cor. 7:22), or the genitive like **τὸ ἔργον κυρίου** (1 Cor. 16:10), but especially **κύριος ᾿Ιησοῦς Χριστός** (Ph. 1:2; 2:11, etc.). In the Gospels **ὁ Χριστός** is usually a verbal adjective= 'the Anointed One,' the Messiah (Mt. 2:4; Jo. 1:41). In Mt. 1:1; Mk. 1:1, we have **Χριστός** as a proper name and even in the words of Jesus as reported in Mk. 9:41, **Χριστοῦ**, and in the address of Peter in Ac. 2: 38, **᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. It was a natural growth. In Paul's Epistles **Χριστός** is more frequent than **ὁ Χριστός**.[6] There is even a development in Paul's use of **᾿Ιησοῦς Χριστός** and **Χριστὸς ᾿Ιησοῦς**.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 148.
[2] W.-Th., p. 122.
[3] Expos., Oct., 1909, p. 327.
[4] Cf. W.-M., footnote, p. 151.
[5] W.-Th., p. 124.
[6] See Rose's list for Paul's use of **κύριος Χριστός**, etc., in Middleton's Doctrine of the Gk. Art., pp. 486 ff. It is based on Textus Rec.

In his earlier Epistles the former is the rule (cf. 1 Th. 1:1), while in the later Epistles he prefers **Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς** (2 Tim. 1:1). Other examples of this idiom are seen in **κόσμος**, which even in the nominative is anarthrous, **ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται** (Gal. 6:14). Cf. Ro. 4:13. See also **ἐν κόσμῳ** (Ro. 5:13) and **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** (Lu. 11:50), etc. **Νόμος** is a word that is used with a deal of freedom by Paul. In general when **νόμος** is anarthrous in Paul it refers to the Mosaic law, as in **ἐπαναπαύῃ νομῳ** (Ro. 2:17). So **ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς** (2:25), etc. It occurs so with prepositions, as **ἐν νόμῳ** (2:23), and in the genitive, like **ἐξ ἔρων νόμῳ** (Gal. 2:16). Cf. **ἐγὼ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον** (2:19), **ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν** (Ro. 6:14). In **ἕτερον νόμον** (7:23) **νόμος** = 'principle,' and is here indeterminate. In 2:14, **ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα**, the Mosaic law is meant, but not in **ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶν νόμος**. It is at least problematical whether **νόμος** in 2:13, of **οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου**, and **οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου** (note the article with the other words) means the Mosaic law and so really definite or law as law (the hearers of law, the doers of law).[1]

IX. The Indefinite Article. The Greek had no indefinite article. It would have been very easy if the absence of the article in Greek always meant that the noun was indefinite, but we have seen that this is not the case. The anarthrous noun may *per se* be either definite or indefinite. But the Greek made an approach to the modern indefinite article in the use of **εἷς** and **τις**. The later writers show an increasing use of these words as the practical equivalent of the present indefinite article. This matter has already been discussed under these two words (ch. XV). An example of **τις** is seen in **νομικός τις** (Lu. 10:25). The tendency was constantly for **εἷς** to displace **τις**, so that "in modern Greek the process is complete,"[2] i.e. **εἷς** drives out **τις** in this sense. This use of **εἷς** is seen in the papyri and need not be denied in the N. T.[3] As a N. T. example of **εἷς**= 'a' see **εἷς γραμματεύς** (Mt. 8:19).[4] The indefinite article does not appear with predicates in the modern Greek.[5] *Unus* in the sense of the indefinite article is one of the peculiarities of the Latin Vulgate (Jacquier, *Le N. T. dans l' Egl*. Chr., Tome II, p. 122).

[1] For a full and detailed discussion of the whole matter see W.-Sch., pp. 174 ff.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 96. See Thumb, Handb., p. 41.

[3] Moulton, ib., p. 97. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 164 f.

[4] Cf. for LXX use, C. and S., Sel., p. 25.

[5] Thumb., Handb., p. 42.

CHAPTER XVII

VOICE (**ΔΙΑΘΕΣΙΣ**, Genus)

1. Point of View. For a discussion of the nature of the verb see chapter VIII, Conjugation of the Verb, I and II.

(a) DISTINCTION BETWEEN VOICE AND TRANSITIVENESS. See (b), and chapter VIII, for a discussion of this point. The matter might have been well reserved for syntax, but it seemed worth while to set forth at once the fundamental facts about voice. It is here assumed, therefore, that one understands that voice *per se* does not deal with the question of transitive or intransitive action. That point concerns the verb itself, not the voice. Active and middle verbs may be either transitive or intransitive. Passive verbs may even be transitive, though usually intransitive, in one sense of "transitive." But Gildersleeve[1] holds that "a transitive verb is a verb that passes over to a passive rather than one that passes over to an object." That is truer of Latin than of Greek, which, "with a lordliness that reminds one of English;" makes a passive out of any kind of an active. Terminology in syntax is open to dispute at many points, but I see only hopeless confusion here unless voice is kept to its real meaning. In Kuhner-Gerth[2] it is held that "the active has a double meaning," either intransitive or transitive. My point is that the voice *per se* has nothing to do with that question. Some verbs are intransitive, some are transitive, some are used either way. This freedom in the use of verbs increased till in the later Greek verbs that were once intransitive become transitive.[3] Brugmann[4] properly separates the question of transitive and intransitive verbs from that of voice (cf. iterative, intensive, inchoative, desiderative verbs). Some of the intransitive uses of verbs were due to the absence of the reflexive pronoun, as in περιῆγε (Mk. 6 : 6), ἀπορρίψαντας (Ac. 27:43).[5] The modern Greek preserves the same

[1] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 279.
[2] Bd. I, p. 89.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 357.
[4] Griech. Gr., p. 467.
[5] Jebb.,V. and D.'s Handb., p. 318.

freedom in the use of transitive and intransitive verbs and has peculiarities of its own.[1]

(b) MEANING OF VOICE. Voice relates the action to the subject. The use of voice then is to direct attention to the subject, not to the object. That concerns transitive and intransitive verbs. Stahl[2] puts it crisply: "The voice of the verb describes a relation of the verb-idea to the subject."

(c) NAMES OF THE VOICES. Cf. chapter VIII, VI, (b). The names come from Dionysius Thrax (about B.C. 30), but "he has no inkling of a middle sense,"[3] showing that already the middle is disappearing before the passive. The terminology is very poor. Gildersleeve[4] calls the fashion of the Germans "a positively indecent nomenclature," since they call the voices *genera* (γένη), "based on a fancied resemblance to the genders." We in English follow the French *voix* (Latin *vox*), found first in this sense in the *Grammatica graeca nova* of J. Weller (A.D. 1635).[5]

(d) HISTORY OF THE VOICES. See chapter VIII, vi, (c), (d), (e). Cf. also Jannaris, *Historical Gr*., p. 362 f.; Moulton, *Prol*., p. 152. In the pro-ethnic language there were probably both active and middle. Cf. Delbruck, *Vergl. Syntax*, Bd. II, p. 413. There was no passive as there was none in the Sanskrit, save in the present system.[6] The rise of the passive meaning with the use of middle and active endings was sure to bring confusion and a tendency towards simplification. It was inevitable that the three voices should go back to two. In the actual outcome, the passive, though an interloper, ousts the middle of its forms and of most of its uses.[7] In the modern Greek vernacular, therefore, we find only two voices as to form, for the passive has taken over the meaning of the middle also (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 111 f.). In the beginning there were only active and middle. In the end we find only active and passive.

(e) HELP FROM THE SANSKRIT. The verb development in the Indo-Germanic languages has been more independent than that of nouns. Latin, for instance, has recast its verb-system, and it is quite difficult to compare the Greek and Latin voices. Sanskrit

[1] Thumb., Handb., p. 112 f.
[2] Krit.-hist. Synt. d. griech. Verbums, p. 42.
[3] Thompson, Synt., p. 158.
[4] Notes on Stahl's Synt. of the Gk. Verb in Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 275.
[5] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 233.
[6] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201.
[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 362.

and Greek have preserved the voices best of all. Hence the Sanskrit can throw a good deal of light on the Greek voices.[1]

(f) DEFECTIVE VERBS. Not all verbs were used in all the voices. Some were used only in one, some in two, some in all three. Then again, some verbs had one voice in one tense, another voice in another tense. This is just like the Sanskrit,[2] and just what one would expect from a living language in contrast with an artificial one. Brugmann,[3] indeed, divides verbs, as to voices, according to this principle (those with active only, middle only, with both, etc.). In the N. T. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 180) finds the same general use of the voices as in the older Greek, the same difficulty in differentiating the voices, and the same "arbitrariness" in the use of individual verbs. But much of this difficulty is due to coming at the matter with preconceived rules. Blass' treatment of the voices is quite unsatisfactory. Cf. further for this matter, chapter VIII, VI, (d).

II. **The Active Voice** (διάθεσις ἐνεργετική). The Stoics called the active ὀρθή also.

(a) MEANING OF THE ACTIVE VOICE. In this voice the subject is merely represented as acting or existing, for state (cf. **εἰμί**) must be included as well as action. It is not certain whether the active or the middle is the older; but the active is far the more common.

(b) EITHER TRANSITIVE OR INTRANSITIVE. There is nothing peculiar in the N. T. about this. Each verb has its own history. One originally transitive may become intransitive and *vice versa*.[4] Cf. ἄγω which may be intransitive ἄγωμεν (Mt. 26:46; cf. the interjectional ἄγε, Jas. 4:13) or transitive ἤγαγον αὐτόν (Lu. 19:35). In ἄραντες (Ac. 27:13, 17) the object is probably understood (τὴν ναῦν). Cf. also αὐξάνω in Mt. 6:28 and 2 Cor. 9:10. **Β**άλλω is usually transitive, even in Jo. 13:2 (cf. Ac. 22:23), but it is intransitive in Ac. 27:14 (ἔβαλεν, 'rushed'). Cf. βλαστάνω in Jas. 5:18 (tr.) and in Mt. 13:26 (intr.). So βρέχω is transitive in Lu. 7:38, but intransitive in Mt. 5:45. **Ἐ**γείρω is usually transitive (Mt. 10:8), but see Mt. 26:46. **Εὐ**αγγελίζω, is transitive in Rev. 10:7, but intransitive in 14:6. **Ἔ**χω is transitive except when used with adverbs, when, as in ancient Greek, it may be intransitive. Cf. τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας (Mt. 4:24), ἐσχάτως ἔχει (Mk.

[1] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 404 f.
[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 200.
[3] Griech. Gr., pp. 459ff. Cf. Thompson, Synt., p. 159.
[4] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 357.

5:23), ἤδη ἔχοντα (Jo. 11:17), οὕτως ἔχει (Ac. 7:1), τὸ νῦν ἔχον (Ac. 24:25). **K**λίνω is transitive in Mt. 8:20, but intransitive in Lu. 9:12. In Ac. 7:42 στρέφω is intransitive, though also transitive elsewhere. In the N. T. θριαμβεύω is transitive and the same is true of μαθητεύω. But in Text. Rec. ἐμαθήτευσε is intransitive in Mt. 27:57. Cf. δύνω intransitive in Lu. 4:40 and φύω in Heb. 12:15. Let these serve as specimens of many such verbs in the N. T. Modern Greek is specially rich in intransitive active verbs (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 112) and verbs that oscillate from one use to the other.

(c) EFFECT OF PREPOSITIONS IN COMPOSITION. These may make the verb transitive or the result may be just the opposite. As examples of transitive compounds from an intransitive simplex take διαβαίνω (Heb. 11:29), but intransitive in Lu. 16:26. So διήρχετο τὴν Ἰερειχώ (Lu. 19:1), παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν (11:42). On the other hand, intransitive compounds abound. The compounds of ἄγω (simplex either tr. or intr.) which are often intransitive are ἀπάγω (Mt. 7:13), παράγω (Mt. 9:9), περιάγω (Ac. 13:11), προάγω (Lu. 18:39), ὑπάγω (Jo. 3:8); but not ἀνάγω. Cf. also παραδίδωμι in Mk. 4:29. With βάλλω note ἐπιβάλλω in Mk. 4:37 and the peculiar ἐπιβαλών, in 14:72. Examples of several intransitive compounds of ἔχω occur in the N. T. Thus ἀπέχω (Mk. 14:41), ἐνέχω (Mk. 6:19), ἐπέχω (Lu. 14:7; Ac. 19:22), περιέχω (1 Pet. 2:6), προσέχω (Mt. 7:15), ὑπερέχω (Ph. 4:7). Here the substantive has dropped out in most cases and the verb comes to stand alone (cf. προσέχω νοῦν). Cf. ἀνακάμπτω (Mt. 2:12), ἐκκλίνω (Ro. 16:17) and προσκόπτω (Jo. 11:9). **K**αταπαύω is transitive in Ac. 14:18, but intransitive in Heb. 4:4, 10. Cf. ἀπορρίπτω in Ac. 27:43. **Σ**τρέφω shows intransitive compounds with ἀνα– (Ac. 5:22), ἀπο– (Ac. 3:26), ἐπι– (Lu. 2:39). The modern Greek surpasses even the **κοινή** in its facility for making all sorts of compound verbs (tr. and intr.) and in particular verbs compounded . with nouns, like ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν and ἐξενοδόχησεν (1 Tim. 5:10). Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 112.

(d) DIFFERENT TENSES VARY. Thus where both second and first aorists occur, the second is intransitive and the first transitive. Cf. ἔστη (Lu. 6:8), but ἔστησεν αὐτό (Mk. 9:36). This distinction applies to all the compounds of ἵστημι. Acts 27:28 (διαστήσαντες) is no exception, as τὴν ναῦν is to be supplied. Some of the "strong" or primitive perfect actives are intransitive when the present is transitive. Thus ἀνέῳγα (1 Con 16:9) from ἀνοίγω, ἀπόλωλα (Mt. 10:6) from ἀπόλλυμι, ἑστάναι (Lu. 13:25) from ἵστημι, πέποιθα

(Ro. 2:19) from πείθω, σέσηπα (Jas. 5:2) from σήπω. Moulton[1] seems to confuse "transitive" with "active," and "intransitive" with "middle" in his discussion of these perfects: "We have a number of cases in which the 'strong' perfect active attaches itself in meaning to the middle." The middle is not in itself intransitive, nor is the active in itself transitive. "The conjecture that the perfect originally had no distinction of active and middle, its person-endings being peculiar throughout, affords the most probable explanation of the facts: when the much later —κα perfect arose, the distinction had become universal." It is doubtless true that in the primitive —α perfect there was no distinctive middle form. But why seek for a middle sense in the primitive perfect active because it happens in many cases to be intransitive? It does happen that γέγονα (Jo. 1:4) is found with γίνομαι and ἐλήλυθα (Jo. 17:1) from ἔρχομαι, two intransitive middles. It is also true that future middles are the rule with a few verbs which have this primitive, but not always intransitive, perfect. So it is with ἀκήκοα (trans., Ac. 6:11), εἴληφα (trans., Rev. 11:17), πέπονθα (intr. as the verb itself is, Lu. 13:2), τέτυχα (trans., Heb. 8:6). So with κέκραγεν (Jo. 1:15, intr. like the verb itself), though κεκράξομαι (some MSS. in Lu. 19:40) is future perfect middle. **Οἶδα** (Jo. 10:4) is transitive, though defective, while ἔοικα (Jas. 1:6), like εἴωθα (Mk. 10:1), is intransitive. But γέγραφα (Jo. 19:22) is transitive.

(e) THE ACTIVE AS CAUSATIVE. But this usage is not due to the voice, and is, besides, common to all languages.[2] Cf. the Hebrew Hiphil conjugation. Viteau (" Essai sur la Syntaxe des Voix dans le Grec du N. T.," *Revue de Philologie*, 1894, p. 2) says that the Greek voices would not be strange to a Jew who was used to the seven conjugations of the Hebrew verb. But the point is not strictly parallel. In one sense this idiom is due to the fact that what one does through another he does himself.[3] Cf. **τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει**. (Mt. 5:45), strictly causative. But in Jo. 19:1, **ἔλαβεν ὁ Πιλάτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐμαστίγωσεν**, the other kind of causative occurs. So also with περιέτεμεν (Ac. 16:3). There was indeed a remarkable increase in the LXX in the number of verbs used in the causative sense, many of which had been usually intransitive. Cf. βασιλεύω, which occurs 36 times in the causative sense in the LXX (cf. Judg. 9:6).[4] The Hebrew Hiphil is partly

[1] Prol., p. 154. [2] Cf. Jann., list. Gk. Gr., p. 359.
[3] Gildersleeve, Synt. of Cl. Gk., p. 63.
[4] C. and S., Sel., p. 76.

responsible for this increase.[1] See further verbs in –οω, like καταδουλόω (Gal. 2:4).

(f) ACTIVE WITH REFLEXIVES. Certainly there is nothing unusual in this construction. Cf. σῶσον σεαυτόν (Mk. 15:30), ἔβαλεν ἑαυτόν (Jo. 21:8), προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lu. 17:3). Cf. Jo. 21:18. Blass[2] indeed says that the "active for middle" occurs. One hesitates to subscribe to that dictum. It is indeed true that the use of the reflexive pronoun with the active brings out much more sharply the reflexive relation than the mere middle. It is not necessary to say that καταδουλοῖ (2 Cor. 11:20) is used "for" the middle. It is true that πειράζω in the κοινή supplants the Attic πειράομαι, but this is not due to a confusion of voice. With ποιέω the N. T. does show a number of examples of the active where the middle was more common in the Attic, though the N. T. generally has ποιεῖσθαι ἀναβολήν, λόγον, πορείαν, σπουδήν. And the MSS. vary greatly between active and middle of ποιέω with words like μονήν (Jo. 14:23), κοπετόν (Ac. 8:2), συνωμοσίαν (23:13), but not with συμβούλιον (Mk. 15:1), ἐκδίκησιν, (Lu.18:7 f.), συστροφήν (Ac. 23:12), πόλεμον (Rev.11:7). But this is precisely what we find in the (inscriptions and papyri). Cf. Rader-macher, *N. T. Gr.,* p. 120. So even βιάζω and ἐπιλανθάνω (Mayser, *Gr*., p. 386). The same tendency appears in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 114). Cf. διέρρηξεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ (Mt. 26:65). In these examples Blass has in my judgment read too much into the active voice. But it is certain that in προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς (Lu. 12:1) there is more emphasis on the reflexive idea than in φυλάσσεσθε (12:15). Cf. Moulton, *Prol*., p. 157.

(g) IMPERSONAL ACTIVE. Some impersonal verbs occur in the active. Cf. περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ (1 Pet. 2:6), and ἔβρεξεν (Jas. 5:17).

(h) INFINITIVES. These do not always reflect the force of the voice, especially in the " epexegetic" use,[3] like our English "fair to see," "good to eat." Cf. κριθῆναι and λαβεῖν, Mt. 5:40. The infinitive has no voice in Sanskrit. See further under Infinitive (ch. XX, Verbal Nouns).

(i) ACTIVE VERBS AS PASSIVES OF OTHER VERBS.[4] Thus ἀπο-θνήσκω is more common than the passive of ἀποκτείνω (--κτέννω) though examples of this passive occur in the N. T. (Rev. 6:11, etc.). W. H. read κακῶς ἔχει in Mt. 17:15 rather than κακῶς πάσχει (cf. ποιῶ καλῶς, etc.). So ἐκπίπτω (Ac. 27:17, 26, 29) occurs

[1] Thack., Gr. of the 0. T. in Gk., p. 24.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 183.
[3] Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 63.
[4] Thompson, Synt., p. 172.

as passive of ἐκβάλλω, but note ἐκβάλλεσθαι in Mt. 8:12. Cf. Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 75. In 1 Cor. 11:18 ἀκούω has the classic turn I am told.' But in 5:11 ἀκούεται the passive itself occurs in the sense 'It is reported.' But in all such cases the distinction between the voices is not really lost.

III. The Middle Voice (διάθεσις μέση)

(a) ORIGIN OF THE MIDDLE. See chapter VIII, vi, (c), for the uncertainty as to the priority of active and middle. That question is an open one and must be left open. Both active and middle appear in Sanskrit and in Homer. The prehistoric situation is purely speculative. Logically the active would seem to come first, though the difference in form may be due to variation in sound (*ablaut*).[1] Probably at first there was neither active nor middle, the distinction being a development. In the Sanskrit[2] we meet a full system of both active and middle forms for all the tenses (not all the modes), the participle, however, having only a partial system and the infinitive no voice at all. But each verb has its own development and that was by no means uniform. Some had a very limited use as to voice, tense and mode. In Homer indeed the middle is rather more common than in later Greek.[3] It is only in the Sanskrit, Zend (Old Persian), Greek and Gothic that the middle is kept as a distinct voice.[4] In the Gothic only remnants of the middle are found,[5] while in Latin the middle as a separate voice disappears.[6] It is very difficult to run a parallel between the Latin and Greek voices. But there is a considerable remnant of Latin middles like *miror, sequor, utor* (cf. Draeger, *Hist. Syntax*, pp. 145 ff.). The final disappearance of the Greek future and aorist middle before the passive is well sketched by Jannaris.[7] But at first we are not to think of the passive at all, that interloper that finally drove the middle out of use.

(b) MEANING OF THE MIDDLE. It is urged that the term "middle" is good because the voice in meaning stands between the active and the passive.[8] But, unfortunately for that idea, the middle is older than the passive. It is true that the passive arose out of the middle and that the middle marks a step towards

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 152.

[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 200.

[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 7.

[4] Cf. 0. Hoffmann, Das Prasens der indoger. Grundspr., 1889, p. 25. In the Bantu language Mr. Dan Crawford finds 16 voices (reflexive, reciprocal, intensive, etc., all having special forms).

[5] Giles, Comp. Philol., p. 406.

[6] Ib p. 405.

[7] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 362 f.

[8] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 57.

the passive. The passive idea existed before there was a separate passive form, a thing never true of all tenses and all verbs. The Hebrew Hithpael conjugation is somewhat parallel,[1] but not wholly so. The only difference between the active and middle voices is that the middle calls especial attention to the subject. In the active voice the subject is merely acting; in the middle the subject is acting in relation to himself somehow. What this precise relation is the middle voice does not say. That must come out of the context or from the significance of the verb itself. Gildersleeve[2] is clearly right in holding that the interpretation of the difference between active and middle is in many cases more lexical than grammatical. "The middle adds a subjective element."[3] Sometimes the variation from the active is too minute for translation into English. This "word for one's self" is often very difficult of translation, and we must not fall into the error of explaining the force of the middle by the English translation.

(c) OFTEN DIFFERENCE FROM ACTIVE ACUTE. As examples note: **αἱρέω**, 'I take'; **αἱρέομαι,** 'I take to myself' ('choose'); **ἀναμιμνήσκω**, 'I remind'; **ἀναμιμνήσκομαι**, 'I remind myself' ('remember'); **ἀπέχω**, 'I hold off'; **ἀπέχομαι**, 'I hold myself off' ('abstain'); **ἀποδίδωμι**, 'I give back'; **ἀποδίδομαι**, 'I give back of my own' ('sell'); **ἀπόλλυμι**, 'I destroy'; **ἀπόλλυμαι**, I perish'; **ἅπτω,** 'I fasten'; **ἅπτομαι**, 'I touch'; **ἄρχω**, 'I rule'; **ἄρχομαι**, 'I begin'; **βουλεύω**, 'I counsel'; **βουλεύομαι**, 'I take counsel' ('deliberate'); **γαμέω**, 'I marry' ('bridegroom'), **γαμέομαι** ('bride'); **γεύω** 'I give to taste'; **γεύομαι**, 'I taste'; **γράφω**, 'I enrol'; **γράφομαι,** 'I indict' (but 'enrol one's self' in Lu. 2:5); **δανείζω**, 'I lend'; **δανείζομαι**, 'I borrow'; **διδάσκω**, 'I teach'; **διδάσκομαι**, 'I get taught'; **ἵστημι** 'I place'; **ἵσταμαι**, 'I stand'; **λανθάνω**, 'I escape notice'; **λανθάνομαι**, 'I forget'; **μισθόω**, 'I let,' **μισθόομαι**, 'I hire'; **παύω**, 'I make to cease'; **παύομαι**, 'I cease'; **πείθω**, 'I persuade'; **πείθομαι**, 'I obey'; **φαίνω**, 'I show'; **φαίνομαι**, 'I appear'; **φοβέω**, 'I frighten'; **φοβέομαι**, 'I fear.' These examples in the N. T. illustrate the difference between the two voices.[4]

(d) THE USE OF THE MIDDLE NOT OBLIGATORY.[5] This remark may sound like a truism, but it is justified when one can read this: "As the active is used in place of the middle, so the middle

[1] Ewald, Heb. Gr., § 243. [2] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 277.

[3] Viteau, Essai sur la Synt. des Voix, p. 17. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 153.

[4] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 360; Clyde Gk. Synt., p. 58 f.; Farrar, Gr. Synt., p. 117 f.; Thompson, Synt., pp. 168 ff.

[5] Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gk., p. 66.

often stands for the active which would naturally be expected."[1] Winer[2] also speaks of the two voices being used "interchangeably." But Winer loses one of his examples, for W. H. have **συγκαλεῖ** in Lu. 15:9, as in verse 6. Winer correctly says that "it depended on the writer" which he would use. Of course, but that is not to say that no distinction existed. In Jas. 4:2 f., **αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε**, the middle seems rather on purpose ('ye ask for yourselves amiss,' Farrar, *Gk. Syntax*, p. 118). Blass[3] calls this "an arbitrary interchange," though he admits in general the N. T. use of **αἰτέω** for ordinary requests (as from God), but **αἰτέομαι** in business transactions (its usual use in he N. T., Mt. 27:20; Lu. 23:23). This may be the very point in Jas. 4:2 f. and 1 Jo. 5:14. Moulton[4] agrees with Mayor (James *in loco*) on the correctness of the distinction. Mayor (*in loco*) says: "When **αἰτεῖτε** is thus opposed to **αἰτεῖσθε**, it implies using the words, without the spirit of prayer." See the same distinction drawn in Mk. 6:22-25; 10:35, 38 (Mt. 20:20, 22); 1 Jo. 5:15. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 186 note) observes that Herod's offer to Salome gave her business relations to him justifying her use of the middle (Mk. 6:24 f.). When the active and the middle occur side by side the attention is drawn to the distinction. It is to be recalled again that the same verb varied in different stages of the language in the voice used. Hence it is hardly pertinent to bring an indictment against the N. T. writers, because the middle is not used with all verbs just as it was in the Attic Greek. As a matter of fact, Homer differs from the Attic. Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 186) succinctly says that "the New Testament writers were perfectly capable of preserving the distinction between the active and the middle." So in Mk. 14:47 note **σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν**, while in Mt. 26:51 we have **ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ**. In Matthew we have the pronoun **αὐτοῦ** and **ἀπό** supplanting the middle in Mark (cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 120 f.). Radermacher (op. cit., p. 119), however, as a result of his researches, finds in the **κοινή** "*Unsicherheit im Gebrauch des Mediums*." The point of the middle is not the same always. So in Ac. 7:24 **ἀμύνεσθαι**= 'assist,' not 'ward off from one's self,' but the force of the middle is present. So in Col. 2:15, **ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχάς**, it is not 'undress,' but 'throw off from one's self.' Cf. also **πληροῦσθαι** in

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 185.
[2] W.-Th., p. 256.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 186.
[4] Prol., p. 160.

Eph. 1:23 and πληροῦν in 4:10. Moulton[1] shows that there is as much freedom in the papyri in the use of active and middle as in the N. T. Thus ἐὰν αἱρῆτε and ἐὰν αἱρῆσθε (G. H. 36, B.C. 95) occur side by side. So γαμεῖσθαι=*nubere* fell out of use. See also it, (f).

(e) EITHER TRANSITIVE OR INTRANSITIVE. Thus ἐὰν μὴ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας (Mk 7:3) and ἥψαντο αὐτοῦ (6:56), but ἐξίσταντο (6:52) and εἰσεπορεύοντο (6:56) are intransitive. The middle is not, therefore, intransitive in itself: That is a matter that belongs to the verb-stem. As to the future middles, like βήσομαι, see discussion a little later. Some verbs, indeed, are transitive in the active, but intransitive in the middle (**ἀπόλλυμι, ἀπόλλυμαι, φαίνω, φαίνομαι**). Cf. Hatzidakis, *Einl*., pp. 201 ff.; Thompson, *Syntax*, p. 161.

(f) DIRECT MIDDLE. It is necessary to discuss the various uses of the middle, but the divisions made by the grammarians are more or less arbitrary and unsatisfactory. They are followed here merely for convenience. The middle voice is very broad in its scope and no one word, not even reflexive, covers all the ground. It is essentially the voice of personal interest somewhat like the dative case. Grosse (*Beitrage zur Syntax des griechischen Mediums and Passivums,* 1891, p. 4) denies that the reflexive is the original use of the middle. But Rutherford (*First Gk. Syntax,* 1890, p. 74), derives both passive and middle out of the reflexive use. For the various uses of the middle in Homer, who is specially fond of this voice, see Monro, *Homeric Gr.*, p. 7. But, curiously, Monro mentions "the Intransitive use" as one of the separate idioms of the middle. Nearly every grammarian[2] has his own division of these "uses" of the middle, none of which the Greeks themselves had. Gildersleeve[3] is justly impatient with this overrefinement and observes that "one must needs fall back on the way of the language," which "is capricious in such matters." It is needless to take up philosophical abstractions like "subjective" and "objective." It is not possible to tell whether the direct middle (reflexive middle) was the original use of the voice or not. The direct middle is comparatively rare in Homer and in the early Greek generally.[4] It began in the **κοινή** to disappear, before the active and the reflexive pronoun (cf. N. T.), but the direct middle

[1] Prol., p. 158 f. He cites also **συνᾶραι λέγον**, B.U. 775 (ii/A.D.). But the pap. use the middle also.

[2] Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 117; Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 459 ff.; K.-G., Bd. I, pp. 100 ff.; Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., pp. 49 ff.

[3] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 278.

[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 7.

revived again as the indirect middle disappeared before the passive because of "its subtle meaning."[1] Hence in Neo-Hellenic "almost every transitive verb, if active, admits of a direct middle."[2] In modern Greek this direct reflexive is nearly the sole use of the middle.[3] The modern Greek has no distinction in forms between middle and passive, but the middle signification survives. Thus λούζομαι means 'I bathe myself' (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 111, 114). Thumb finds the direct reflexive use common. Moulton[4] practically confines this idiom in the N. T. to ἀπήγξατο (Mt. 27:5), 'he hanged himself,' and even here Moulton suggests 'choked' as a truer English translation. This is indeed "a survival from classical Greek," but there seem to be other N. T. examples also. The example cited by Winer[5] from Jo. 8:59 (cf. also 12:36), ἐκρύγβη, is passive, as Moulton[6] points out. But in ὗς λουσαμένη (2 Pet. 2:22) the direct middle is evident, as Moulton admits in the *Appendix* (p. 238). Cf. λούσασθε (Is. 1:16), 'wash you.' Note also ἀπελούσασθε, 'washed yourselves' (1 Cor. 6:11, correct translation in margin of Rev. V.). A good example also is θερμαινόμενος (Mk. 14:54), 'warming himself' (Rev. V.). It is rather gratuitous to doubt the direct middle παρακσκευάσεται, 'prepare himself' (1 Cor. 14:8). But Moulton adds **μὴ σκύλλου** (Lu. 7:6) to Winer's list and illustrates by "the illiterate contemporary papyrus O.P. 295, μὴ σκλύλλε ἑατήν" (active and reflexive pronoun). So also ῥαντίσωται, (W. H., Mk. 7:4) and βαπτίσωνται (marg.) are both direct middles. **Ζῶσαι** (Ac. 12:8), 'gird yourself,' is also direct middle. **Ἅπτομαι** (Col. 2:20) is probably direct middle, subject yourselves to ordinances.' And **ὑποτάσσεσθε** (Col. 3:18) may be also. **Ἅπτομαι** ('fasten myself to,' 'touch') is really the direct middle (Mk. 8 : 22). **Ἐπεκτεινόμενος** (Ph. 3:13) is 'stretching myself forward.' Cf. also **ὑπεστειλάμην** (Ac. 20:27), 'withdraw myself'; ἀντιτασσόμενος (Ro. 13:2), 'line one's self up against.' In the case of περιβάλλομαι it is probable that we have the direct middle 'clothe one's self' (Mt. 6:29). The accusative of the thing is added in Rev. 3:18. It is possible to regard ἀναπαύεσθε (Mt. 26:45) as direct middle. **Ἀπογράψασθαι**, (Lu. 2:5) may be merely the direct middle, 'enrol himself,' though the causative idea is possible. In Lu. 12:15 **Ἀνεχόμενοι** ἀλλήλων ('guard yourselves from') follows the classic idiom. **Ἀπογράψασθαι** (Eph. 4:2) is also the direct middle, 'holding yourselves back from one an-

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 360..
[2] Ib.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 156.
[4] Ib.
[5] W.-Th., p. 253.,
[6] Prol., p. 156.

other.' The same thing is true of ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων (Ac. 15:29). In 1 Pet. 5:5 ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκουβώσασθε, 'gird yourselves with humility,' we may have the same idiom. In Ac. 18: 5, συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ, we may have the direct middle, 'held himself to the word.' There are to be added, besides, some of the causative middles, like βάπτισαι. (Ac. 22:16), 'get yourself baptized' (cf. ἐβαπτίσαντο, 1 Cor. 10:2). It is true that the list is not a large one, but the idiom is clearly not obsolete in the N. T. The causative middle has a wider use also, as will be shown directly.

(g) CAUSATIVE OR PERMISSIVE MIDDLE. Cf. the German *sich*, *lassen*. This occasional use of the middle does not distinguish it from the active and occurs both with the direct and the indirect use of the middle.[1] It is just so in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 114 f.). It is, like transitive and intransitive, more the notion of the word than a phase of the middle voice.[2] In later Greek the causative sense occurs only with the direct middle.[3] It is not to be forgotten that originally there was no passive form at all. The verb-idea and the context then alone decided the voice as between middle and passive. Even in the aorist and future, where the passive later has a distinct form, the line was not always sharply drawn, especially in the future. More about this a little later. But in the aorist in particular one hesitates to find a passive voice in the middle form, though it sometimes happens. Some few of these causative middles could be explained as passives, but by no means all. Certainly ἐκλεξαμένους (Ac. 15: 22) is a true middle. A considerable residuum remains. "In Tb.P. 35 (ii/B.C.) ἑαυτὸν αἰτιάσεται, 'will get himself accused,' is a middle."[4] In Ac. 22:16, βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, we have the causative middle, one a direct, the other an indirect, middle, 'get yourself baptized and get your sins washed away.' So then ἐβαπτίσαντο (W. H. text in 1 Cor. 10:2) is causative, though many MSS. read ἐβαπτίσθησαν. Blass[5] has eccentric notions of textual criticism, for he rejects the middle here and contends for it in Lu. 11:38 on the authority of one minuscule! Blass[6] also argues that the sense of 'let' or ' allow' belongs to the passive rather than to the middle, but this is by no means certain. Thus ἀδικεῖσθε and ἀποστερεῖσθε (1 Cor. 6:7) may be middles (cf. actives in next verse), ' let yourselves be wronged and robbed.'

[1] Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gr., p. 67.
[2] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 162.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 361.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 162.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 187.
[6] Ib., p. 185.

This permissive sense of the middle is closely allied to the causative and approaches the passive.[1] In Lu. 2:5 **ἀπογράψασθαι** may be (see (f) above) causative, 'have himself enrolled,' though **ἀπογράγεσθαι** (2:1) is passive. In Mt. 5:42 **δανίσασθαι** is to have money lent' ('to borrow'). **Μισθώσασθαι** (Mt. 20:1) is to let out for wages' ('to hire'). In 1 Cor. 11:6, **κειράσθω, κείρασθαι ἢ ξυρᾶσθαι**, (or **ξύρασθαι**), we find the permissive middle. Cf. **ξυρήσονται τὴν κεφαλήν** (Ac. 21:24). But **ἀποκόψονται** (Gal. 5:12) is causative, 'have themselves castrated' (cf. Deut. 23:1). So **ἀπελούσασθε**, according to text of Rev. V. (1 Cor. 6:11). In Rev. 3:5 **περιβαλεῖται** comes rather close to the passive sense. See (f) above. In Lu. 14:18, 19, **ἔχε με παρητημένον**, we have a construction more like modern English. The causative idea in **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ** (Eph. 1:10) is not due to the voice, but to the verb itself (**-όω**).

(h) INDIRECT MIDDLE. In the flourishing period of the language this was by far the most frequent use, but it finally faded before the active and the intensive (reflexive) pronoun or the passive.[2] In 1 Cor. 15:28, **ὑποταγήσεται**, the passive may bear the middle force (Findlay, Expos. *Gr. T., in loco*). But in general the indirect middle is abundant and free in the N. T. In the modern Greek Thumb gives no instances of the indirect middle. The precise shade of the resultant meaning varies very greatly. The subject is represented as doing something for, to or by himself. Often the mere pronoun is sufficient translation. Each word and its context must determine the result. Thus in Heb. 9:12, **αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος**, Jesus is represented as having found eternal redemption by himself. He found the way. In Mt. 16:22, **προσλαβόμενος αὐτόν**, 'Peter takes Jesus to himself.' In Mk. 9:8, **περιβλεψάμενοι**, 'the disciples themselves suddenly looking round.' In Lu. 8:27, **οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον**, 'did not put a garment on himself.' In 8:52, **ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν** the word has really changed meaning, 'they beat themselves for grief as to her' ('bewailed her'), actually a direct middle. "We have, in fact, to vary the exact relation of the reflexive perpetually if we are to represent the middle in the form appropriate to the particular example."[3] That is precisely the case. So **προσκαλεσάμενος** (Mt. 10:1) represents Jesus as calling the disciples to himself. Cf. **εἰσκαλοῦμαι** (Ac. 10:23). So **προσλαμβάνεσθε** (Ro. 15:7; cf. also **προσελάβετο**) is 'take to yourselves.' **Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι** (Ac. 25:11) is 'I call upon Caesar in my behalf.' **Αἱρήσο-**

[1] Thompson, Synt., p. 162.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 360, 362.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 157.

μαι (Ph. 1:22) is 'I take for myself' (‘choose’), while κτήσησθε (Mt. 10:9), though only in the middle, means 'provide for yourselves' (‘procure’). In σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν (Mk. 14:47), the possessive is probably sufficient, ‘drawing his own sword’ (cf. ἀπέσπασεν—αὐτοῦ in Mt. 26:51). **Ἐ**κτιναξάμενος τὰ ἱμάτια (Ac. 18:6) is rather ‘shaking out his clothes from himself,’ while ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας (Mt. 27:24) is probably ‘he himself washed his hands.’ In ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτόν (Ac. 13:46; cf. Ro. 11:1) the idea is 'ye push it away from yourselves' (‘reject’). **Ἀ**πέδοσθε (Ac. 5:8) is 'ye gave away for your own interest' (‘sold’). **Ἐ**νοσφίσατο (Ac. 5:2) means ‘kept back for himself.’ In ἐπιδεικνύμεναι χιτῶνας (Ac. 9:39) the women were 'showing garments belonging to themselves.' Note the fulness of meaning in περιεποιήσατο (Ac. 20:28). Cf. παρατηρεῖσθε (Gal. 4:10), ἀπειπάμην, (2 Cor. 4:2), ἐκτρέπομαι (1 Tim. 6:20). In διεζώσατο (Jo. 21:7) we have ‘he girded round himself.' **Π**αραιτήσησθε (Heb. 12:25) is 'beg off from yourselves' (‘reject’). In Col. 4:5, τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι, we have 'buying the opportunity for yourselves out of the open market.' **Ἀ**ποθέμενοι. (Heb. 12:1) is 'laying aside from yourselves every weight.' In ἐξελέξατο (Lu. 10:42) we have 'she selected for herself' (‘chose’). **Ἐ**νεδιδύσκετο (Lu. 16:19) is ‘he put clothes on himself,’ though this may be direct middle with accusative of thing added. **Κ**ατοπτριζόμενοι (2 Cor. 3:18) is probably ‘beholding for ourselves in a mirror.’ In Ro. 3:25, ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεός, note that it was God's own Son whom he set forth. This free indirect reflexive use came to be the typical middle in the flourishing period of the Greek language. No fixed rule can be laid down for the translation of this or any other use of the middle. Even "deponents" like χράομαι may be indirect middles. This word from χρή (‘necessity’) means 'I make for myself what is necessary with something' (Moulton, Prol., p. 158). An interesting group of middles occurs in Ac. 24: 22-25, ἀνεβάλετο, διαγνώσομαι, διαταξάμενος, παραγενόμενος, μετεπέμψατο, διαλεγομένου, πορεύου, μετακαλέσομαι. These are not all "indirect" middles, as is obvious. Cf. also ἐκβαλλόμενοι. (Ac. 27:38) and προσελάβετο (Ro. 14:3). It is interesting to note the difference between παρεῖχε in Ac. 16:16 (the damsel who furnished gain for her masters) and παρείχετο in Ac. 19:24 (Demetrius who furnished gain for his craftsmen and himself). So πείθω is ‘to exercise suasion,’ and πείθομαι ‘to admit suasion to one's self’ (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 158).

(i) RECIPROCAL MIDDLE. Since ἑαυτῶν was used in the reciprocal sense, it was natural for the middle to fall in with this idiom.

Thus **συνεβουλεύσαντο** (Mt. 26:4), 'they counselled with one another,' does not differ radically from **ἐξελέγοντο** (Lu. 14:7), 'they selected the first seats for themselves.'[1] So also **ἐβουλέσαντο** (Jo. 12:10), **συνετέθειντο** (9:22), **συναναμίγνυσθαι** (1 Cor. 5:9), **κρίνεσθαι** (6:1), **ἐμάχοντο** (Jo. 6:52), **διαλεγόμενος** (Ac. 19:8. In Mk. 9:34, **πρὸς ἀλλήλους διελέχθησαν**, we have passive deponent with reciprocal pronoun).[2] The reciprocal middle survives in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 114). For classic examples see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 66.

(j) REDUNDANT MIDDLE. Here the pronoun and the middle both occur. This idiom is found as early as Homer and indicates a dimness in the force of the middle on the part of the speaker. "The effect is artificial" according to Thompson.[3] Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 68) sees in this idiom the effort to bring out more clearly the reflexive force of the middle. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 162) cites from the papyri **ἑαυτὸν αἰτιάσεται**. Tb.P. 35 (ii/B.C.). This redundance probably began very naturally. Thus in Ac. 7:58, **ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν**, the personal pronoun is added, not the reflexive. So in **ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου** and **περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου** (12:8) and **ἄλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλήν** (Mt. 6:17). Cf. **νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας** (Mt. 15:2) without the pronoun. So in Lu. 14:1, **καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι**, the **αὐτοὶ** wavers between mere personal and intensive. Cf. the active in Eph. 5:27, **παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ**. But in Jo. 19:24 the LXX quotation is given as **διεμερίσαντο—ἑαυτοῖς**, while in Mt. 27:35 it is merely **διεμερίσαντο**. Note also **σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος** (Tit. 2:7) and **ποιοῦμαι — ἐμαυτῷ** (Ac. 20:24). See also **ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν**, (Ac. 7:21) and 1 Tim. 3:13 **ἑαυτοῖς περιποιοῦνται**. Most of the examples, however, in the N. T. occur with verbs which are not found in the active. Cf. Lu. 9: 23 **ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν**, Ac. 24:10 **τὰ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ ἀπολογοῦμαι**, 26: 2 **ἥγνμαι ἐμαυτόν**, Ph. 3:12 **ἐμαυτὸν οὔπω λογίζομαι.**

(k) DYNAMIC (DEPONENT) MIDDLE. "I would fain call the drip-pan middle, the **πανδέκτης** middle, the middle that is put at the bottom to catch the drippings of the other uses."[4] And this is the most difficult use of the middle to explain. Some writers distinguish between the dynamic and the deponent. Others, like Thompson,[5] make the dynamic include the deponent. The name "deponent" is very unsatisfactory. It is used to mean the laying

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 157.
[2] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 361.
[3] Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 166.
[4] Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 277.
[5] Synt., p. 161.

aside of the active form in the case of verbs that have no active voice. But these verbs in most cases never had an active voice. Moulton[1] is clearly right in his contention that the term in reality applies as well to active verbs that have no middle as to middle verbs that have no active. The term is usually applied to both middles and passives that have no active (Clyde, *Gk. Syntax*, p. 61). Others[2] use the term for middle verbs that have no longer a reflexive idea. But "deponent" is a very poor definition. Nor is the word "dynamic" much better. Winer's remark[3] is not very lucid: "From Middle verbs are to be carefully distinguished Deponents." They are indeed either transitive or intransitive, but some are in the middle voice, others passive. But the point about all the "dynamic" middles is that it is hard to see the distinctive force of the voice. The question is raised whether these verbs have lost the middle idea or never had it. "Like the rest of us, Stahl has to go into bankruptcy," Gildersleeve[4] remarks on Stahl's attempt to explain this use of the middle. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 158) thinks that in these verbs "it is useless to exercise our ingenuity on interpreting the middle, for the development never progressed beyond the rudimentary stage." But these verbs persist in the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 113). It is possible that the Greeks were more sensitive to the exact force of this middle than we are, just as they used the intensive particles so freely. Where guessing is all that we can do, is it not clear that these "dynamic" middles represent the original verb before the distinction was drawn between active and middle? The French says *je m'apercois*, 'I perceive.' The intensive force of this middle is partially seen in verbs of mental action which are so common in Greek, like **αἰσθάνομαι** (Lu. 9:45), **ἀρνέομαι** (Lu. 12:9), **προαιτιάομαι** (Ro. 3:9), **ἀσπάζομαι** (Ac. 25:13), **διαβεβαιοῦμαι** (Tit. 3:8), **καταλαμβάνομαι** (Ac. 4:13, but note **καταλαμβάνω** in the same sense in Ph. 3:12), **ἐντέλλομαι** (Heb. 11:22), **ἐπιλανθάνομαι** (Mt. 16:5), **εὔχομαι** (Ro. 9:3), **ἡγέομαι** (Ph. 3:8), **λογίζομαι** (Ph. 4:8), **μαίνομαι** (Ac. 26:25), **μέμφομαι** (Ro. 9:19), **φείδομαι** (Ro. 8:32). I imagine that the personal interest of the subject is not so difficult to recognise in such verbs, especially since in a word like **καταλαμβάνομαι** it is not "deponent," but occurs also in the active. The papyri vary,[5] as does the N. T. in the use of **ποιοῦμαι** and **ποιῶ** with nouns. Thus we have **συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες** (Mk. 15:1), but **μνείαν ποιού-**

[1] Prol., p. 153.
[2] Thompson, Synt., p. 161.
[3] W.-Th., p. 258,
[4] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 278.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 159,

μενος (Eph. 1:16). There is the utmost freedom in the matter in the N. T. Not all the "deponents" of mental action are middles in the aorist. Cf. **βούλομαι, ἐνθυμέομαι, ἐπιμελέομαι, εὐλαβέομαι**. These are commonly called passive deponents in the present as well as in the aorist and future, but the matter is not clear by any means. At any rate there are middle verbs which are very hard to explain, like **γίνομαι**. (Mt. 8:26), **ἅλλομαι** (Jo. 4:14), **ἀφικνέομαι** (Ro. 16:19), **διαμαρτύρομαι** (Ac. 2:40), **ἔρχομαι**, (Jo. 1:39), **ἐργάζομαι** (Mt. 25: 16), **καθέζομαι** (Mt. 26:55), **κάθημαι** (Mt. 13:1), **συνέπομαι**. (Ac. 20: 4; cf. *sequor*). **Κεῖμαι** is probably passive. It is not hard to see the reflexive idea in **δέχομαι**. (Mt. 10:14). **Περιβλέπομαι** is always middle in the N. T. (cf. Mk. 3:5), accenting the movement of the eyes or concern expressed in the look. There are also passive deponents that correspond to this list that really do not seem to be passive in idea, like **βούλομαι, δύναμαι, φοβέομαι**. Some of these verbs have both middle and passive forms, like **γίνομαι (ἐγένετο, ἐγενήθην)**, **δέχομαι (ἐδέξατο, ἐδέχθην)**. Not all of these middle "deponents" have middle forms in all tenses. Cf. **γέγονα, ἦλθον, ἐλήλυθα, ἔλαθον**. Then, again, some verbs have the deponent or dynamic middle only in the future, like **ὄψομαι**, though Homer is fond of the middle forms of this verb.[1] But the aorist and future middle call for special treatment.

(l) MIDDLE FUTURE, THOUGH ACTIVE PRESENT. Some verbs, active in the other tenses, have the future only in the middle. No real explanation of this phenomenon is known. For a list see chapter VIII, VI, (d). Some of them are really separate verb-roots, as **ὁράω, ὄψομαι; ἐσθίω, φάγομαι**. Others represent a special variation of the future form, like **ἀποθανοῦμαι, πεσοῦμαι, πίομαι**, but both **κομίσομαι** and **κομιοῦμαι**. Others are regular enough, like **ἀκούσομαι**, —**βήσομαι, γνώσομαι, ἔσομαι, θαυμάσομαι, τέξομαι, φεύξομαι.** In other instances the old classic middle has vanished in the N. T. before the active future, as in **ἁμαρτήσω, ἁπαντήσω, ἁπράσω, γελάσω, κλαύσω, κράξω, παίξω, ῥεύσω**, etc. Some verbs, like **ἀκούω**, **ζάω**, use either voice in the future. Some of these middle futures create no difficulty. Thompson[2] calls them all "strict middles," but most of them are as "deponent" as the verbs in the previous section. Clyde[3] quotes Curtius' explanation that an act in the future lies mainly in the mind of the speaker. But on the whole the matter remains unexplained, though the number has greatly decreased in the N. T. as in the **κοινή** generally.[4] See also Dieterich,

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 7. So the other poets. Thompson, Synt., p. 165.
[2] Synt., p. 165. [3] Gk. Synt., p. 60. [4] Moulton, Prol., p. 154.

Untersuch., p. 205; Radermacher, *N. T. G*r., p. 120. Moulton[1] justly takes "the existence of this large class of futures as additional evidence of a close connection between the middle flexion and the stressing of the agent's interest in the action of the verb." The use of the middle future (and occasionally aorist) as passive comes under the passive voice, for it is really passive. See under IV.

(m) THE MIDDLE RETREATING IN THE N. T. This is happening because of the active (cf. ἁμαρτήσω above) as well as the passive. This is true of the κοινή in general.[2] There was a considerable amount of variation and even of confusion among writers in the later period.[3] Different words had different histories in the matter. But we have just seen from the list of "dynamic-deponent" middles plenty of evidence that from the day of Homer on the function of the middle voice was indistinct in many verbs.[4] "The accuracy with which the middle was used would naturally vary with the writer's Greek culture."[5] And, it may be added, with the author's feelings at the moment. The judgment of Simcox[6] is right, that the middle "is one of the refinements in Greek idiom which is perhaps beginning to be blurred in some of the N. T. writers, but is preserved to a greater or less extent in most." But it is no more "blurred" than in other writers of the κοινή. It is simply that all the distinctions of earlier times did not survive with all the verbs. On the whole, in the N. T., αἰτῶ is used colloquially and αἰτοῦμαι for the more elevated style, but usage varies with different writers as in the LXX. Cf. Abbott, *Johannine Gr.*, p. 389. So ὑστερέω in Heb. 4:1, but ὑστεροῦμαι in Ro. 3:23. But the change in the N. T. is mainly in the disuse of the middle, not in a new use of it. From Homer to modern Greek plenty of middles are hard to define, and the N. T. is no more erratic than the rest of Greek, not to say of the κοινή (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 159). But the delicate distinctions between the active and the dynamic middle are lost in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 112), if indeed they ever really existed.

IV. The Passive Voice (διάθεσις παθητική).

(a) ORIGIN OF THE PASSIVE. See chapter VIII, VI, (e), for a discussion of the rise of the passive voice.[7] In Sanskrit the middle

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 155. Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 42.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 363 f.
[3] Hatz., Einl., pp. 194 ff. Cf. Thumb, Hellen., p. 127.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 158 f.
[5] Ib., p. 159.
[6] Lang. of the N. T., p. 95.
[7] Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, pp. 121 ff.

was liable to be used in the passive sense.[1] As is well known in Homer, the future passive forms do not occur except two, **μιγήσεσθαι** and **δαήσεαι** (Stahl, *Syntax*, p. 66), and the distinction between aorist middle and aorist passive is indistinct. Indeed, strictly speaking, there was no passive voice as to form in Greek, as there was none in the original Indo-Germanic speech.[2] The passive sense was developed in various languages in different" ways. This sense may be due to verbs of state, but Greek fell upon various devices like the active of some verbs (**κακῶς ἔχω, πάσχω**), the mere use of the middle, the development of two special tenses by the use of active endings (aorist) and middle (future) with a special suffix. In Homer[3] **ἐβλήμην, ἐκτάμην, ἐσχόμην** occur as passives just like **ἐσχέθην, ἔχομαι.** "Even in Attic **ἐσχόμην** appears as a passive, **ἐσχέθην** being late."[4] In Homer also the distinctive aorist passive form sometimes has practically the active or middle signification.[5] This much of repetition is necessary to get the position of the passive clearly before us. It is really no voice at all in form as compared with the active and middle. Cf. French *je me trouve* and the use of reflexive pronouns in English.

(b) SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PASSIVE. The subject is represented as the recipient of the action. He is acted upon. The name "passive" comes from *patior* (cf. **πάσχω ὑπό** in Mt. 17:12). **Ἀποκτανθῆναι** (Mk. 9:31) occurs as well as **ἀποθνήσκειν**. The use of **περίκειμαι** as the transitive passive (Ac. 28:20) of **περιτίθημι** is somewhat different. The idea of having an experience is very vague and allows wide liberty. The point to note is that at first this idea had no distinctive form for its expression. Only the context and the force of the verb itself could make it clear. The future passive, being built upon the earlier aorist passive, reflects the *Aktionsart* of the aorist.[6]

(C) WITH INTRANSITIVE OR TRANSITIVE VERBS. "Theoretically the passive ought to be formed from transitive verbs only with an accusative object."[7] But Greek follows no such narrow rule. That is an artificial rule of the Latin which Greek knows nothing about.[8] Cf. **κατηγορεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων** (Ac. 22:30). Other N. T. examples are **διακονηθῆναι** (Mk. 10:45), **ἐγκαλεῖσθαι** (Ac.

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., pp. 201, 275.
[2] Thompson, Synt., p. 162.
[3] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 464.
[4] Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 278.
[5] Sterrett, The Dial. of Hom., N. 27.
[6] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 464.
[7] Gildersleeve, Am. Jour, of Philol., 1908, p. 279.
[8] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 359.

19:40), εὐαρεστεῖσθαι, (Heb. 13:16), κατεγνωσμένος (Gal. 2:11), μαρτυρεῖσθαι (Ac. 6:3), χρηματίζεσθαι (Mt. 2:12). Blass (*Gr. of N. T.* Gk., p. 185) notes that "only in Lu. 2:26 do we have ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον." The passive is used with both active and middle verbs. Thus we have from λογίζομαι both ἐλογισάμην and ἐλογίσθην. Cf. εἰγενόμην and ἐγενήθην from γίνομαι.

(d) THE PASSIVE USUALLY INTRANSITIVE. But it is not necessarily so. Διδάσκω, for instance, is transitive in the passive, as ἐδιδάχθητε (2 Th. 2:15), and note κατηχημένος την ὁδόν (Ac. 18:25). See also 1 Cor. 9:17; Lu. 7:25; 9:25; Gal. 2:7. Transitive passives are usually verbs that in the active have two accusatives or an accusative of the thing with the person in the dative or ablative. This accusative of the thing is retained in the passive. Cf. ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (Ro. 3:2), περιβεβλημένους στολὰς λευκάς (Rev. 7:9). For full list see "Accusative" in chapter XI, Cases. Cf. also τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι (Ac. 28:20). The transitive passive " deponents," like μὴ φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς (Mt. 10:26), call for special discussion a little later. Certainly there is no "passive" sense in πορευθῆναι. The vernacular[1] in later times preferred the active to passive. Cf. αἰτοῦσιν (Lu. 12:20) as a N. T. illustration. In ἁγνίσθητι, (Ac. 21:24) the passive apparently has the force of 'let' or 'get' (cf. the causative middle). Cf. also περιτέμνησθε (Gal. 5:2).[2] It is possible so to regard ἀδικεῖσθε and ἀποστερεῖσθε (1 Cor. 6:6 f.). Sometimes, indeed, it is difficult to tell whether a verb is middle or passive. Cf. πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (Mt. 11:5), προεχόμεθα (Ro. 3:9), ἐνδυναμοῦσθε (Eph. 6:10). Indeed, as already said, in all the Greek tenses save the aorist and the future it is always an open question whether we have middle or passive. "The dividing-line is a fine one at best" (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 162). Only the context and the verb-idea can decide. So with ἐγείρομαι (Mt. 27:63), περιεσπᾶτο (Lu. 10:40) and θορυβάζῃ (10:41), βιάζεται (Mt. 11:12). Cf. perfects in Ac. 13:2; 25:12; Ro. 4:21; 1 Pet. 4:1; Jo. 9:22.

(e) AORIST PASSIVE. This tense calls for special comment. As already stated, in Homer the aorist middle form, like the other middle forms, was sometimes used as passive.[3] In itself there is no reason why this should not be so. The distinctive passive aorist (second and first) grew up side by side with this use of the aorist middle. Ἐφάνην and ἔβην are really the same form at

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 359.
[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 185.
[3] Seymour, The Hom. Dial., p. 74. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 464.

bottom.[1] Out of this intransitive aorist active (cf. ἀπόλωλα) grew the so-called second aorist passive forms (–ην) with active endings. We have ἐκύβην (Jo. 8:59) from the transitive κρύπτω) (cf. ἐστάλην from στέλλω, etc.) and ἐχάρην (Jo. 14:28) from the intransitive χαίρω. It is probable that ἠγέρθη sometimes (as in Mk. 16:6) is merely intransitive, not passive, in idea. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 163) says "often." In 1 Cor. 15:15 f., etc., the true passive "emphasizes the action of God." But ὑπετάγησαν (Ro. 10:3) is more likely passive in sense, like ἐκοιμήθην (1 Th. 4:14), 'was put to sleep' (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 162). Moulton quotes from the papyri "a purely middle use of κοιμηθῆναι, 'fell asleep'," ἡνίκα ἤμελλον κοιμηθῆναι ἔγραψα, Ch.P. 3 (iii/B.C.). He finds a "clear passive" in ἵνα τὰ πρόβατα ἐκεῖ κοιμηθῆι, F.P. 110 (i/A.D.), but ἐκολλήθη (Lu. 15:15) can be explained as passive or middle in sense. In a few verbs (ἔστην ἐστάθην) a distinction was developed.[2] W. F. Moulton thinks (Winer-M., p. 315, n. 5) that "a faint passive force" may be observed in σταθῆναι in the N. T., but hardly in Mk. 3:24. Cf. also intransitive σταθήσομαι in Mt. 12:25, 26. Ἑστάθηκα in modern Greek is aorist passive for στέκω, 'stand,' and ἐστήθηκα for στήνω, 'place' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 145). The correct text (W. H.) in Ac. 21:3 is ἀναφάναντες τὴν Κύπρον (active), not ἀναφανέντες (passive). But still some MSS. do have this transitive second aorist passive participle. If one keeps in mind the origin of this aorist passive form (from the active), he may be the less surprised to find it also transitive like the active. Already in Homer this was true.

The so-called passive "deponents," verbs which had no active, formed the aorist with the passive form. But they were not always intransitive. Some of them were so, like πορεύομαι (Mt. 8:9), μεταμέλομαι, (Mt. 27:3), δύναμαι (Mt. 17:16), but most of them are really transitive. They probably represent a survival of the old active origin of the aorist passive forms.[3] As examples of the transitive passive deponents note ἐβουλήθη (Mt. 1:19), ἐδεήθη (Lu. 5:12), ἐνθυμηθέντος (Mt. 1:20), ἐπεμελήθη (Lu. 10:34), ἐφοβήθη (Mt. 14:5). These passive aorists have precisely the construction that the middle or active would have so far as case is concerned. The distinctive passive sense is absent. Some of the "deponents" have both a middle and a passive aorist with a distinct passive sense. Thus note the middle and passive voices side

[1] Giles, Comp. Philol., p: 410; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 465.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 181.
[3] See ch. VIII, vt, (e), for list of these N. T. passive aorists.

by side in ἀρνησάμενος and ἀπαρνηθήσεται (Lu. 12:9). It so happens that this context is full of passive forms. Some of them in the strict passive sense, like ἐπισυναχθεισῶν (12:1), συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται (12:2), γνωθήσεται (12:2), ἀκουσθήσεται and κηρυχθήσεται (12:3), πωλοῦνται and οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλελησμένον (12:6), ἠρίθμηνται (12:7), ἀφεθήσεται (12:10). But note also the passive deponents φοβηθῆτε (12:4 f.), φοβήθητε (12:5), φοβεῖσθε (12:7). Cf. also ἀποδέξασθαι (Ac. 18:27) and παρεδέχθησαν (15:4), where the voices are distinguished, θεάσασθαι τοὺς ἀνακειμένους (Mt. 22:11) and πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς (Mt. 6:1), λογισάμενος (Heb. 11:19) and ἐλογίσθη (Lu. 22:37), ἴάσατο (Lu. 9:42) and ἰάθη (Mt. 8 : 13), ἐρύσατο (Col. 1:13) and ἐρύσθην (2 Tim. 4:17), ἐχαρίσατο (Lu. 7:21) and χαρισθῆναι (Ac. 3:14). One may note also παρητήσαντο (Heb. 12:19) and ἔχε με παρητημένον (Lu. 14:19, perfect passive); ἐξελέξατο (Mk. 13:20), but ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος (Lu. 9:35); κορεσθέντες τροφῆς (Ac. 27:38) and ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ (1 Cor. 4:8). It is possible to see a difference also between ἐγένετο (Jo. 1:14) and γενηθήτω (Mt. 6:10). Ἀπεκρίθην (Mt. 25:9) steadily drove out ἀπεκρίνατο (Ac. 3:12), though both are used transitively with no difference in sense. The papyri more frequently[1] have ἀπεκρινάμην, though both forms continue in the κοινή. Cf. also ἀπολογηθῆναι (Lu. 21:14), διελέχθησαν (Mk. 9:34), ἐθαυμάσθη (Rev. 13:3), though with passive sense in 2 Th. 1:10. As a result of this inroad of the comparatively new passive forms the aorist middle forms vanished. In modern Greek the passive aorist form is almost invariably used for both the middle and the passive ideas. This tendency seen in the N. T. (and the rest of the κοινή) has triumphed over the aorist middle.[2] In Ro. 10:3, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν, the Rev. V. translates `they did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God.'

(f) FUTURE PASSIVE. As has been mentioned several times already, Homer has only two future passive forms (second futures). The passive voice indeed occurs but rarely in the Boeotian dialect.[3] The future in –θήσομαι is comparatively late. At first, certainly, the distinction between passive and middle (and active also, --ην, –θην) was "a distinction of function, not of form."[4] It is not surprising to find the middle future form in Homer used with the passive sense (cf. all the other tenses save aorist), where the forms

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 161.

[2] Cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 362; Hatz., Einl., pp. 196 ff.; Jebb in V. and D.'s Handb., p. 315.

[3] Claflin, Synt. of the Boeot. p. 67.

[4] Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gk., p. 61.

for the two voices are identical. In later prose the future middle form continued to be used in the passive sense even in the great prose writers (Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes).[1] In the LXX Conybeare and Stock (*Selections*, p. 75 f.) find the same idiom. Cf. Ex. 12:10, **οὐκ ἀπολείψεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἕως πρωί, καὶ ὀστοῦν οὐ συντρίψεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.** It is quite within bounds, therefore, to speak of "medio-passives" in the future as in the aorist.[2] The idiom appears in the papyri.[3] So narrow is the dividing-line between middle and passive. Is **περιβαλεῖται** (Rev. 3:5) middle or passive in sense? The same ambiguity exists as to **ἀποκόψονται** (Gal. 5:12). Considering the rather large list of verbs[4] that once used the middle future as passive in sense the idiom is rare in the N. T. In general, therefore, the future passive form has made its place secure by the time of the **κοινή**. Even verbs that have no active form have the future passive as well as the future middle. Thus **ἀπαρνήσομαι**. (Mk. 14:31), but **ἀπαρνηθήσομαι**. (Lu. 12:9); **ἰάσομαι** (Ac. 28:27), but **ἰαθήσεται** (Mt. 8:8); and in Ro. 2:26 **λογισθήσεται** is passive in sense. But the future passive form was destined, like the other futures, to disappear as a distinct form. Only the compound tense occurs in the modern Greek.[5] But, meanwhile, the future passive form took over the uses of the vanishing future middle forms.[6] It is possible to find a passive sense in **ἐπαναπαήσεται**. (Lu. 10:6), **μεταμεληθήσεται** (Heb. 7:21), **ἀνακλιθήσονται** (Mt. 8:11), **κοιμηθησόμεθα** (1 Cor. 15:51), **κολληθήσεται**. (Mt. 19:5). Cf. also **θαυμασθήσονται** (Rev. 17:8), **πεισθήσονται** (Lu. 16:31), **φανήσεται** (Mt. 24:30), **ὑποταγήσεται** (1 Cor. 15:28).[7] In 1 Cor. 15:28 note also **ὑποταγῇ**, which reinforces the argument for the true passive. But the future passive may also be devoid of the passive idea and even transitive just like the aorist passive. Cf. **ἀποκριθήσομαι** (Mt. 25:37), **ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν** (Mt. 21:37), **φοβηθήσομαι** (Heb. 13:6). The passive **ἀφαιρεθήσεται** (Lu. 10:42) has the usual sense, but one wonders if in **ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι** (Ac. 26:16) the passive voice is transitive and even causative (cf. Is. 1:12). Cf. the examples of reflexive passives in the LXX (Conybeare and Stock, Sel., p. 76), like **ὄφθητι**= 'show thyself' (1

[1] Gildersleeve, ib., p. 73 f. Cf. Hartel, Abriss der Gr. d. hom. and herod. Dial., 1888, p. 40.

[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 463 f. [3] Moulton, Prol., p. 162.

[4] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 61; Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 171.

[5] Cf. Thumb, Handb., pp. 115, 125.

[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 363.

[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 163. Cf., for the LXX, Helbing, Gr., p. 98.

Ki. 18:1). It is possible, of course, for ὧ to be attracted to the case of τούτων from οἷς ('in which,' 'wherein'). Then ὀφθήσομαί σοι would be 'I will appear to thee.' Note the new present ὀπτάνομαι (Ac. 1:3). But the future middle persisted in γενήσομαι, δυνήσομαι, ἐπιμελήσομαι, πορεύσομαι.

(g) THE AGENT WITH THE PASSIVE VOICE. As already noted, the Greek has no difficulty in using a verb in the passive which was not used with the accusative in the active. Thus note ἐγκαλεῖσθαι (Ac. 19:40), κατηγορεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Ac. 22:30), πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Gal. 2:7).[1] A few verbs idiomatically use the dative with the passive. Thus ἐγνώσθη τῷ Σαύλῳ (Ac. 9:24), εὑρέθην (Ro. 10:20), ἐφάνη (Mt. 1:20), ὤφθη (1 Cor. 15:7 f.), θεαθῆναι (Mt. 6:1).[2] The direct agent is most commonly expressed by ὑπό (Mt. 4:1), the intermediate by διά (Mt. 1:22). The agent (see chapter on Prepositions) is also expressed by ἀπό (2 Cor. 3:18), ἐκ (Gal. 4:4), παρά (Jo. 17:7). See also discussion under Instrumental Case (chapter XI, Cases) for discussion of αὐτῷ with ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον (Lu. 23:15), whether dative or instrumental. In the N. T., as in ancient Greek (Gildersleeve, Syntax, p. 72), the instrument is sometimes personified and treated as an agent. Cf. κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμον; (Mt. 11:7).

(h) IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTION. This is the usual idiom in the Coptic in lieu of the absence of the passive. But it is often rather rhetorical than syntactical as Moulton shows.[3] He compares also the French *on*, the German *man*, the English *one*. Wellhausen[4] shows how in the Aramaic this impersonal plural was common. One notes αἰτοῦσιν (Lu. 12:20), where a passive would be possible. Cf. συνάγουσιν καὶ βάλλουσιν καὶ καίεται (Jo. 15:6) where the passive occurs in καίεται. Note in particular ἐξηράνθη καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτά (Jo. 15:6). Cf. also τρέφωσιν αὐτήν (Rev. 12:6). The use of the impersonal passive like πιστεύεται and ὁμολογεῖται (Ro. 10:10) is another matter and calls for no comment. It is rare in Greek as compared with Latin (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 77). Cf. the plural in 10:14 f. See also the personal construction in 1 Cor. 15:12 εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι.

[1] Cf. Gildersleeve, Synt., etc., p. 77.
[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 185.
[3] Prol., p. 58 f.
[4] Einl., p. 25 f.

CHAPTER XVIII

TENSE (**ΧΡΟΝΟΣ**)

I. Complexity of the Subject.

Probably nothing connected with syntax is so imperfectly understood by the average student as tense. This is due to various causes.

1. THE DIFFICULTY OF COMPARING GREEK TENSES WITH GERMANIC TENSES. "The translators of our English version have failed more frequently from their partial knowledge of the force of the tenses than from any other cause."[1] Ignorance, one may add, both of English and Greek still stands in the way of proper rendering of the Greek. The English, like the other Germanic tongues,[2] has only two simple verb-forms. We have a great wealth of tenses in English by means of auxiliary verbs, but they do not correspond with any of the Greek tenses.[3] It is the commonest grammatical vice for one to make a conjectural translation into English and then to discuss the syntactical propriety of the Greek tense on the basis of this translation.[4] Burton[5] indeed justifies this method for the benefit of the English student of Greek. But I submit that the practice brings more confusion than help. "The Aorist for the English Perfect, and the Aorist for the English Pluperfect" Burton urges as "a pertinent illustration." But that method keeps the student at the English standpoint, just the thing to be avoided. The Greek point of view affords the only sure basis of operation. Winer[6] laments that "N. T. grammarians and expositors have been guilty of the greatest mistakes" here, though it cannot be said that Winer himself always lives up to his just ideal. Translation into English or German is the least point to note in judging a tense.

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 123. [2] K.-G., Bd. I, p. 129.
[3] Weymouth, On Rendering into Eng. of the Gk. Aorist and Perf., 1894, p. 11.
[4] Cf. Broadus, Comm. on Matthew, p. 54 note.
[5] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 4 f. [6] W.-Th., p. 264.

2. BAD INFLUENCE OF THE LATIN ON GREEK GRAMMARIANS. Most of the older Greek grammars were made by men who knew Latin better than Greek. Even to-day[1] the study of the Greek tenses is hampered by the standpoint of Latin idioms which developed under very different conditions. This is true of school grammars[2] in particular, whereas Latin has had no influence on the Greek tenses themselves by the time of the **κοινή**. The perfect and the aorist blend in Latin, while that is not true in Greek till a very late date (1000 A.D.).[3] The separate Greek development (cf. the Sanskrit) was due to the genius and spirit of the Greek people and has continued throughout the history of the language,[4] though in modern times the Greek tenses have suffered serious modification. The Latin tenses must be left to one side. The time element is more prominent in the Latin.

3. ABSENCE OF HEBREW INFLUENCE. There is no time element at all in the Hebrew tenses. Hence it is not strange that the LXX translators had much trouble in rendering the two Hebrew tenses (perfect and imperfect) into the Greek with its richness of tense. A similar difficulty exists for the English translators. Curious devices (possibly slips) sometimes occur, like **ἐγώ εἰμι**. **καθίσομαι** (B in Ju. 6:18), **ἔσομαι διδόναι**. (BA in Tob. 5: 15).[5] But such translation Greek left no lasting impress on the Greek of the N. T. save in **προσέθετο πέμψαι** (Lu. 20:12; cf. Ex. 25:21). The problems of the Greek tenses are not to be solved by an appeal to the Semitic influence.

4. GRADUAL GROWTH OF THE GREEK TENSES. There is no future optative in Homer and no future passive. The aorist passive is also rare.[6] The past perfect is rare in Homer,[7] and it does not occur with the idea of relative time. "In the examination of tense usages, we must be careful to observe that tenses, in the sense in which the word is now used, are of comparatively late development."[8] In the beginning the verb-root was used with personal suffixes. At first this was enough. Some verbs developed some tenses, others other tenses, some few all the tenses.

[1] Mutzbauer, Die Grundl. d. griech. Tempusl., 1893, p. i.

[2] K. Roth, Die erzalllenden Zeitformen bei Dion. von Hal., p. 5.

[3] Ernault, Du Parfait en Gree et en Lat., 1886, p. 164. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 440.

[4] Mutzb., Die Grundl. d. griech. Tempusl., 1893, p. vi f.

[5] Cf. Swete, Intr. to 0. T. in Gk., p. 308.

[6] Sterrett, Dial. of Hom., N. 42.

[7] Monro , Hom. Gr., p. 44.

[8] Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 482.

5. "AKTIONSART" OF THE VERB-STEM. *Aktionsart* ("kind of action") must be clearly understood. The verb-root plays a large part in the history of the verb. This essential meaning of the word itself antedates the tense development and continues afterwards. There is thus a double development to keep in mind. There were originally two verb-types, the one denoting durative or linear action, the other momentary or punctiliar action.[1] Hence some verbs have two roots, one linear (durative), like **φέρω** (*fero*), the other punctiliar (momentary), like **ἤνεγκον** (*tuli*). So **ὁράω, εἶδον**; **τολμάω, ἔτλην**. With other verbs the distinction was not drawn sharply, the root could be used either way (cf. **φη-μί, ἔ-φη-ν**; **λέγ-ω, ἔλεγ-ο-ν**). All this was before there was any idea of the later tense. So **ἔ-φαγ-ον**, is punctiliar, while **ἐσθίω** is linear or durative. Moulton[2] rightly observes that this is the explanation of "defective" verbs. Moulton notes **ἔχω** as a word that can be used either for durative, as in Ro. 5:1, or punctiliar, like aorist **ἔσχον** (cf. **ἔσχες** and **ἔχεις** in Jo. 4:18). The regular idiom for a papyrus receipt is **ἔσχον παρὰ σοῦ**. This matter of the kind of action in the verb-root (*Aktionsart*) applies to all verbs.[3] It has long been clear that the "tense" has been overworked and made to mean much that it did not mean. The verb itself is the beginning of all. But scholars are not agreed in the terminology to be used. Instead of "punctiliar" (*punktuelle Aktion*, Brugmann), others use "perfective" (Giles, *Manual*, p. 478). But this brings inevitable confusion with the perfect tense. All verbs may be described as "punctiliar" (*punktuell*) and "non-punctiliar" (*nicht-punktuell*). But the "non-punctiliar" divides into the indefinite linear (durative) and the definite linear (completed or perfect). The notion of perfect action as distinct from point action came later. The three essential[4] kinds of action are thus momentary or punctiliar when the action is regarded as a whole and may be represented by a dot (.), linear or durative action which may be represented by a continuous line ----, the continuance of perfected or completed action which may be represented by this graph *------. The distinction between punctiliar and perfected action is not clearly drawn in the verb-root itself. That is a later refinement of tense. Brugmann[5] credits this "perfected" idea to the perfect stem. "Iterative" action belongs to certain

[1] Giles, Man., etc., p. 477 f.
[2] Prol., p. 110 f. [3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 469.
[4] Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, p. 131; Stahl, brit.-hist. Synt. d. griech. Verbums, p. 86 f.
[5] Griech. Gr., p. 472.

stems (reduplicated, like γίγνομαι), but it is not a fundamental kind of action.

6. THE THREE KINDS OF ACTION EXPRESSED IN TERMS OF TENSE. These ideas (punctiliar, durative, perfected state) lie behind the three tenses (aorist, present, perfect) that run through all the moods. The forms of these tenses are meant to accentuate these ideas.[1] The aorist stem presents action in its simplest form (ἀ-ορισ-τος, 'undefined'). This action is simply presented as a point by this tense. This action is timeless. The present is also timeless in itself as is the perfect.[2] It is confusing to apply the expression "relations of time" to this fundamental aspect of tense, as is done by some grammars.[3] Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 121) uses *Zeitart* and *Zeitstufe*, but why *Zeitart* instead of *Aktionsart*? It is better to keep "time" for its natural use of past, present and future, and to speak of "kind of action" rather than "kind of time."[4] These three tenses (aorist, present, perfect) were first developed irrespective of time. Dionysius Thrax erred in explaining the Greek tenses from the notion of time, and he has been followed by a host of imitators. The study of Homer ought to have prevented this error. The poets generally do not bring the time relations to the fore.[5] Even Paul (*Principles of the History of Language,* p. 300) falls into this error. It is doubtless easier[6] to trace the history of the verb than of the noun, but as many mistakes lie along the way.

7. TIME ELEMENT IN TENSE. But for the indicative the Greek tenses would have had a simple history. There are no past tenses in the subjunctive. The future subjunctive is an anomaly of very late Greek. The future optative occurs only in indirect discourse and is not found in the N. T. The time element in the infinitive is confined to indirect discourse and μέλλω. Time in the participle is only relative to the principal verb. It is thus kind of action, not the time of the action, that is expressed in these forms.[7] But in the indicative the three grades of time had tenses of their own. The Greeks evidently felt that there was no need for time in the other modes except in a relative sense. As a matter of fact, the real time of subjunctive, optative, and imperative is future

[1] K.-G., Bd. I, p. 130. [2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 469.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 433; Gildersleeve, Synt. of Class. Gk., p. 79.
[4] Cf. Benard, Formes Verb. en Grec, 1890, p. 279.
[5] Mutzb., Die Grundl. d. griech. Tempusl., 1890.
[6] Sayce, Intr. to the Sci. of Lang., vol. II, 1880, p. 149.
[7] Cf. Spyridis, Lang. grec. actuelle ou mod., 1894, p. 287.

in relation to speaker or writer.[1] It was evidently with difficulty (cf. absence of time in Hebrew) that time was expressed in a positive (non-relative) sense even in the indicative. It is only by the augment (probably an adverb) that past time is clearly expressed.[2] "Homer and later Greek writers often use the present with an adverb of time instead of a past tense, a construction which has an exact parallel in Sanskrit and which is therefore supposed to be Indo-Germanic."[3] There is no really distinctive form for the present indicative. The future was a later development out of both the present and aorist. See chapter VIII, Conjugation of Verb. The augment was not always used. Homer used it only when it suited him. But past time was objective and the three kinds of action (punctiliar, durative, perfected) were regularly expressed with the tenses (aorist, imperfect, past perfect). There is *Aktionsart* also in the present and future time, but the tense development did not go on to the full extent here. There are only two tense-forms in the present and practically only one in the future. But both punctiliar and linear action are expressed, but not differentiated, in the present time by the same tense, as is true also of the future. The kinds of action exist, but separate tense-forms unfortunately do not occur.[4] There might thus have been nine tenses in the indicative: three punctiliar (past, present, future), three linear (past, present, future), three perfect (past, present, future).[5] Because of this difference between the indicative and the other moods in the matter of time some grammars[6] give a separate treatment to the indicative tenses. It is not an easy matter to handle, but to separate the indicative perhaps accents the element of time unduly. Even in the indicative the time element is subordinate to the kind of action expressed. A double idea thus runs through tense in the indicative (kind of action, time of the action).

8. FAULTY NOMENCLATURE OF THE TENSES. There is no consistency in the names given the tenses, as has already been explained. Cf. chapter VIII, (b). The terms aorist, imperfect and perfect (past, present, future) are properly named from the point of view of the state of the action, but present and future are named from the standpoint of the time element. There is

[1] Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, 1890, pp. 23, 27.
[2] Cf. Seymour, Trans. of the Am. Philol. Asso., 1881, p. 89.
[3] Giles, Man., etc., p. 487.
[4] Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, p. 131.
[5] Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 120 f.
[6] Cf. Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, pp. 8, 22.

no time element in the present subjunctive, for instance. But the names cannot now be changed, though very unsatisfactory.

9. THE ANALYTIC TENDENCY (*Periphrasis*). This is the Common way of expressing tense in the Germanic tongues. It was not unknown to the older Greek and was very frequent in the LXX under the Hebrew influence. See an extended list in Conybeare and Stock, *Selections from the LXX,* pp. 68-71 The tendency is strong in the N. T. See the summary already given (pp. 374-376). In the modern Greek the periphrastic form has displaced the usual inflected forms in all the tenses but the present, imperfect and aorist. These are "simple." The rest are "compound" (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 115).[1] This analytic tendency affected the durative and perfect kinds of action. It did not suit the purely punctiliar idea.

10. THE EFFECT OF PREPOSITIONS ON THE VERB. This is another aspect of *Aktionsart*. This subject has already been briefly discussed from the standpoint of the prepositions.[2] Delbruck[3] has worked the matter out with thoroughness and he is followed by Brugmann.[4] Moulton[5] has applied the principle to N. T. verbs. The point is that often where the simple verb is durative it is rendered "perfective" by the preposition in composition. This peculiarity is common to all the Indo-Germanic tongues and reaches its highest development in the Germanic (cf. English and German) and the Balto-Slavic languages.[6] Thus we in English say *bring* and *bring up, burn* and *burn up, carry* and *carry off*, *come* and *come on, drive* and *drive away (home, in, off, out), drink* and *drink up, eat* and *eat up, follow* and *follow up, go* and *go away, grow* and *grow up, knock* and *knock down, make* and *make over, pluck* and *pluck out, run* and *run away, speak* and *speak out, stand* and *stand up, take* and *take up, wake* and *wake up, work* and *work out*.[7] The "imperfective" simplex becomes "perfective" in the compound. Prof. A. Thumb[8] has a paper " Zur Aktionsart der mit Prapositionen zusammengesetzten Verba im Griechischen," in which he compares some tables of Schlachter for Thucydides with some by Prof. S. Dickey for the N. T. Thucydides shows for the present tense 260 *simplicia* verbs to 83 compound, for the aorist 158 to 199. Dickey has investigated about thirty N. T. verbs

[1] Jebb in V. and D.'s Handb., pp. 323, 326.
[2] Cf. ch. XIII, iv, (i).
[3] Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, pp. 146-170.
[4] Griech. Gr., pp. 482 ff.
[5] Prol., pp. 111-115.
[6] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 482.
[7] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 112.
[8] Indoger. Forsch., XXVII.

like ἀπέχω, etc. He reports for the present tense a proportion of 1160 *simplicia* to 83 compound, for the aorist 885 to 226. It is unfortunate that the term "perfective" is used for this idea, since it inevitably suggests the perfect tense. Some writers[1] use "perfective" also for the aorist or punctiliar action, a means of still further confusion. Brugmann[2] uses "Perfektive Aktion" for the effect of the preposition in composition and "Perfektische Aktion" for the perfect tense, a distinction hard to draw in English. Latin and Greek both show abundant illustrations of this use of prepositions. Cf. *sequor* and *consequor, facio* and *efficio, teneo* and *sustineo*. Moulton[3] thinks that the freedom in the position of the preposition in Homer helped the adverb to retain its force longer than in later Greek and Latin. The point of the preposition here is best seen in the prepositions ἀπο--, δια--, κατα--, συν--.[4] But even in these the actual majority of examples preserve the original local meaning and so are not perfective. But in Lu. 8:29, πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν, the perfective sense of σύν combines with the past perfect tense and the locative (or instrumental) πολλοῖς χρόνοις to denote "not the temporary paroxysm, but the establishment of a permanent hold" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 113). So γινώσκω is durative (‘gaining knowledge,’ as in Mk. 13:28), ἔγνων is effective (‘grasping the point,’ as in Lu. 16:4, ἔγνων τί ποιήσω), ἐπιγινώσκω is perfective (‘knowing my lesson,’ as in 1 Cor. 13:12), and ἐπιγνῶναι also (‘recognising,’ as in Mt. 14:35). Moulton (*ib*., p. 114) calls particular attention to a οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι. (1 Cor. 1:18), ‘the perishing,’ where the destiny is accented by ἀπό, and the process is depicted by the tense. In Heb. 6:18, οἱ καταφυγόντες, the perfective sense of κατά, coincides with the effective aorist. So even when the tense is durative, the notion of completion is expressed in the preposition as contemplated or certain. In τέθνηκεν (Lu. 8:49) the perfect tense of the simplex is sufficient, but not so in ἀπέθανεν, (Lu. 8:53). θνήσκω as simplex became obsolete outside of the perfect, so that ἀπέθνησκεν (Lu. 8:42; cf. 2 Cor. 6:9; Heb. 11:21) occurs for the notion of 'dying.' "The linear perfective expressed its meaning sufficiently, denoting as it does the whole process leading up to an attained goal."[5] Moulton notes also the iterative use of ἀπέθνήσκω in 1 Cor. 15:31, and the frequentative in 1 Cor. 15:22. See also the "perfective" use of ἀποκτείνω, the active of ἀποθνήσκω. In ἀπόλλυμι and ἀπόλλυμαι (ἀπόλωλα) the sim-

[1] So Giles, Man., p. 478; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 187.
[2] Griech. Gr., p. 472.
[3] Prol. p. 112.
[4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 482.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 114.

plex is obsolete. Even in the present tense the force of ἀπο-- is obvious. Cf. τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις (1 Cor. 1:18), ἀπόλλυμαι (Lu. 15:17), ἀπολλύμεθα (Mt. 8:25), where Moulton[1] explains ἀπο- as suggesting "the sense of an inevitable doom." Cf. also ἐκφεύγω (Mt. 2:13), 'to flee,' with διαφεύγω (Ac. 27:42), and ἐκφεύγω (Heb. 2:3), 'to escape,' καταφεύγω (Heb. 6:18), 'to find refuge '; τηρέω (Ac. 24:23), 'to watch,' with διατηρέω, 'to keep continually' (Lu. 2:51), and συντηρέω (Lu. 2:19), 'to keep together (safely)'; σπάω (Mk. 14:47), 'to draw,' with διασπάω (Mk. 5:4), 'to draw in two'; καίω (Jo. 15:6), 'to burn,' with κατακρίνω (Ac. 19:19), 'to burn up'; κρίνω (Jo. 5:30), 'to judge,' with κατακρίνω (Mt. 12:41), 'to condemn'; λύω 3:16), 'to loosen,' with καταλύω (Mt. 24:2), 'to destroy'; ἔχω (Ac. 13:5; Rev. 10:2), 'to have' or 'hold,' with ἐπέχω (Ac. 3:5), 'to hold on to,' and συνέχω (Lu. 8:45), 'to hold together' or 'press,' and ἀπέχω (Mt. 6:5), 'to have in full,' etc. As to ἀπέχω for 'receipt in full,' see Deissmann, *Light*, p. 110 f. The papyri and ostraca, give numerous illustrations. It is not necessary to make an exhaustive list to prove the point. Cf. μενῶ καὶ παραμενῶ (Ph. 1:25), χαίρω καὶ συνχαίρω (2:17), where the point lies in the preposition, though not "perfective" here. So γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη (2 Cor. 3:2), ἀναγινώσκετε ἢ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε (1:13), μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται (Lu. 6:38), ἔχοντες--κατέχοντες (2 Cor. 6:10). Cf. ἔκβαλε (Mt. 22:13). In some verbs[2] the preposition has so far lost its original force that the "perfective" idea is the only one that survives. Dr. Eleanor Purdie (*Indog. Forsch.*, IX, pp. 63-153, 1898) argues that the usage of Polybius as compared with Homer shows that the aorist simplex was increasingly confined to the constative sense, while the ingressive and effective simplex gave way to the "perfective" compounds. Moulton[3] is inclined to agree in the main with her contention as supported by the papyri (and Thumb thinks that modern Greek supports the same view). At any rate there is a decided increase in the number of compound verbs. The ingressive and effective uses of the aorist would naturally blend with the "perfective" compounds. But it remains true that the *Aktionsart* of the verb-root is often modified by the preposition in composition.

11. "AKTIONSART" WITH EACH TENSE. It is not merely true that three separate kinds of action are developed (punctiliar, durative, perfected), that are represented broadly by three tenses in all the modes, though imperfectly in the present and future tenses of the indicative. The individual verb-root modifies greatly the

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 114. [2] Ib., p. 112. [3] Ib., pp. 115-118.

resultant idea in each tense. This matter can only he hinted at here, but must be worked out more carefully in the discussion of each tense. The aorist, for instance, though always in itself merely point-action, "punctiliar," yet may be used with verbs that accent the beginning of the action or the end of the action. Thus three distinctions arise: the unmodified point-action called "constative," the point-action with the accent on the beginning (inceptive) called "ingressive," the point-action with the accent on the conclusion called "effective." The names are not particularly happy, but they will answer. "Constative" is especially awkward.[1] In reality it is just the normal aorist without any specific modification by the verb-meaning. Hirt[2] does not use the term, but divides the aorist into "ingressive" and "effective" when there is this special *Aktionsart*. But the use of these demands another term for the normal aorist.[3] As an example of the "constative" aorist for the whole action take ἐσκήνωσεν (Jo. 1:14), for the earthly life of Jesus. So also ἐξηγήσατο (1:18), while ἐγένετο (1:14) is "ingressive," and accents the entrance of the Logos upon his life on earth (Incarnation). **Ἐ**θεασάμεθα (1:14) is probably "effective " as is ἐλάβομεν (1:16), accenting the result ("resultative," Brugmann, *Griech. Gr*., p. 475). So likewise in the so-called "present" tense various ideas exist as set forth by the various "classes" of verbs or "conjugations." The perfect and the future likewise have many variations in resultant idea, growing out of the varying verb-idea in connection with the tense-idea. These must be borne in mind and will be indicated in the proper place in discussing each tense.

12. INTERCHANGE OF TENSES. The point here is not whether the Greeks used an aorist where we in English would use a perfect, but whether the Greeks themselves drew no distinction between an aorist and a perfect, a present and a future. It is not possible to give a categorical answer to this question when one recalls the slow development of the Greek tenses and the long history of the language. There was a time long after the N. T. period[4] when the line between the aorist and the perfect became very indistinct, as it had been largely obliterated in Latin. It is a question for discussion whether that was true in the N. T. or not. The subject will receive discussion under those tenses. The future grew out of the present and the aorist. The present continued to be used sometimes as vivid future, as is true of all languages. But it is a very crude way of speaking to say that one tense is used

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 109.
[2] Handb. d. Griech etc., p. 392.
[3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 475.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 440.

"for" another in Greek. That would only be true of ignorant men. In general one may say that in normal Greek when a certain tense occurs, that tense was used rather than some other because it best expressed the idea of the speaker or writer. Each tense, therefore, has its specific idea. That idea is normal and can be readily understood. Various modifications arise, due to the verb itself, the context, the imagination of the user of the tense. The result is a complex one, for which the tense is not wholly responsible. The tenses, therefore, are not loosely interchangeable. Each tense has a separate history and presents a distinct idea. That is the starting-point. Winer (Winer-Thayer, p. 264) is entirely correct in saying: "No one of these tenses strictly and properly taken can stand for another." Writers vary greatly in the way that the tenses are used. A vivid writer like Mark, for instance, shows his lively imagination by swift changes in the tenses. The reader must change with him. It is mere commonplace to smooth the tenses into a dead level in translation and miss the writer's point of view. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 124) is doubtful whether in the N. T. we are justified in making "sharp distinctions between the imperfect, aorist or perfect; a subjunctive, imperative, or infinitive of the aorist or present." But for my part I see no more real ground in the papyri and inscriptions for such hesitation than we find in the ancient Attic Greek. Thumb (*Handb.*, p. 116) notes that modern Greek, in spite of heavy losses, has preserved the distinction between linear and punctiliar action even in the imperative and subjunctive. I shall discuss the tenses according to the three ideas designed by them rather than by the names accidentally given.

II. Punctiliar Action.

This is the kind of action to begin with. It is probably not possible always to tell which is the older stem, the punctiliar or the linear. They come into view side by side, though the punctiliar action is logically first. The aorist tense, though at first confined to verbs of punctiliar sense, was gradually made on verbs of durative sense. So also verbs of durative action came to have the tenses of punctiliar action.[1] Thus the tenses came to be used for the expression of the ideas that once belonged only to the root. The Stoic grammarians, who gave us much of our terminology, did not fully appreciate the aorist tense. They grouped the tenses around the present stem, while as a matter of fact in many verbs that is impossible, the root appearing in the aorist,

[1] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, pp. 241, 316.

not in the prsent. Cf. ἔ-στη-ν (ἵ΄-στη-μι), ἔ-λαβ-ο-ν (λαμβάν-ω), etc. This error vitiated the entire theory of the Stoic grammarians.[1] Grammatical forms cannot express the exact concord between the logical and the grammatical categories,[2] but the aorist tense came very near doing it. By Homer's time (and Pindar's) the distinction between the aorist and imperfect tenses is fairly well drawn, though some verbs like ἔ-φη-ν remain in doubt.[3] So we start with th aorist tense. In modern Greek the ancient aorist is the base-form on which a number of new presents are formed (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 143). J. C. Lawson (*Journ. of Th. St.*, Oct., 1912, p. 142) says that Thumb would have smoothed the path of the student if he had "dealt with the aorist before proceeding to the present."

1. THE AORIST (ἀόριστος). The aorist, as will be shown, is not the only way of expressing indefinite (undefined) action, but it is the normal method of doing so. The Greek in truth is "an aorist-loving language" (Broadus).[4] In the **κοινή** the aorist is even more frequent thal in the classic Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 120), especially is this true of the N. T.

Gildersleeve[5] does not like the name and prefers "apobatic," but that term suits only the "effective" aorist. The same thing is true of "culminative." The name aorist does very well on the whole. I doubt if the aorist is a sort of "residuary legatee," taking what is left of the other tenses. The rather, as I see it, the aorist preserved the simple action and the other tenses grew up around it. It is true that in the expression of past time in the indicative and with all the other moods, the aorist is the tense used as a matter of course, unless there was special reason for using some other tense. t gives the action "an and fur sich." The common use of the "imperfect" with verbs of speaking (ἔφη, ἔλεγε) may be aorist in fact.

(a) Aktionsart in the Aorist.

(a) *Constative Aorist*. There is still a good deal of confusion in the use of terms. Gildersleeve (*Syntax of Attic Gr*., p. 105) prefers "complexive" to "constative." Moulton[6] comments on Miss Purdie's use of "perfective" in the sense of "punctiliar."

[1] Steinthal, Gesch. d. Sprach., p. 306 f.

[2] Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 300.

[3] Cf. Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1883, p. 161; Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 32, 45.

[4] Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 137.

[5] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 397 f.

[6] Prol., p. 116.

So Giles[1] uses "perfective or momentary" for the aoristic action, but he also (p. 478 note) uses constative. But Moulton[2] also makes a distinction between "constative" and "punctiliar," using "punctiliar" for real point-action and "constative" for what is merely treated as point-action. That is a true distinction for the verb-root, but the growing number of constative aorists was in harmony with the simple idea of the tense. Brugmann[3] rests constative, ingressive and effective aorists, all three on the *punktuell* idea and draws no sharp distinction between "punctiliar" and "constative." Delbruck[4] divides the *punktuell* or aorist into *Anlangspunkt* or Ingressive, *Mittelpunkt* or Constative and *Schlusspunkt* or Effective. The constative accents the "middle point." The idea of Delbriick and Brugmann is that *punktuell* action is "action focused in a point."' "The aorist describes an event as a single whole, without the time taken in its accomplishment."[6] It seems best, therefore, to regard "constative" as merely the normal aorist which is not "ingressive" nor "effective." The root-difference between the aorist and the imperfect is just this, that the aorist is "constative" while the imperfect "describes."[7] The "constative" aorist just treats the act as a single whole entirely irrespective of the parts or time involved.[8] If the act is a point in itself, well and good. But the aorist can be used also of an act which is not a point.. This is the advance that the tense makes on the verb-root. All aorists are punctiliar in statement (cf. Moulton, *Prol*., p. 109). The "constative" aorist treats an act as punctiliar which is not in itself point-action. That is the only difference. The distinction is not enough to make a separate class like ingressive and effective over against the purely punctiliar action. Thumb (*Handb*., p. 122) passes by "constative" as merely the regular aorist "to portray simply an action or occurrence of the past," whether in reality punctiliar or not. He finds both ingressive and effective aorists in modern Greek. But Thumb uses "terminative" for both "ends" (initial and final), a somewhat confusing word in this connection. The papyri show the same *Aktionsart* of the aorist. So note constative

[1] Man., p. 481 f.
[2] Prol., p. 116, but not on p. 109.
[3] Griech. Gr., pp. 475-477.
[4] Vergi. Synt., Bd. II, p. 230.
[5] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 184. But Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, p. 157, "momentan, effektiv, ingressiv."
[6] Moulton, Intr. to the Stu. of N. T. Gk., 1895, p. 190,
[7] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 302.
[8] Moulton, Prol., p. 109, prefers "summary" to "constative."

ὅτι με ἐπαίδευσας καλῶς, B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). Thus in Jo. 2:20, **Τεσσεράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν οἰκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος**, we have a good example of the constative aorist. The whole period of forty-six years is treated as a point. In Mt. 5:17, **ἦλθον**, we have a very simple constative aorist, just punctiliar and nothing more, describing the purpose of Christ's mission. It is true that the constative aorist in this sense is far more frequent than the ingressive and the effective uses of the tense. This has always been so from the nature of the case. The increasing number of "perfective" compounds, as already shown, increased the proportion of constative aorists.[1] When the action is in itself momentary or instantaneous no difficulty is involved. These examples are very numerous on almost any page of the N. T. Cf. in Ac. 10:22 f., **ἐχρηματίσθη, μεταπέμψασθαι, ἀκοῦσαι, ἐξένισεν, συνῆλθον**. See the aorists in Ac. 10:41 f. Cf. Mt. 8:3; Ac. 5:5. This is the normal aorist in all the moods. But verbs that are naturally durative may have the aorist. In **ἐκαρτέρησεν** (Heb. 11:27) we have a verb naturally "durative" in idea, but with the "constative" aorist. Cf. also **ἐκρύβη τρίμηνον** (Heb. 11:23), where a period of time is summed up by the constative aorist. Cf. **ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι** (Ro. 5:14). A good example is **ἔζησαν καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ χίλια ἔτη** (Rev. 20:4). Here **ἔζησαν** is probably ingressive, though **ζήσωμεν** is constative in 1 Th. 5:10, but **ἐβασίλευσαν** is clearly constative. The period of a thousand years is merely regarded as a point. Cf. also Jo. 7:9 **ἔμεινεν ἐν τῷ Γαλιλαίᾳ**, 10:40 **ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ**. See also Ac. 11:26 **ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ**, 14:3 **ἱκανὸν χρόνον διέτριψαν**, 18:11 **ἐκάθισεν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἓξ** 28:30 **ἐνέμεινεν διετίαν ὅλην.** Cf. Eph. 2: 4. See **ἀεὶ--διετέλεσα** in B.G.U. 287 (A.D. 250). Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 105) calls this "aorist of long duration" (constative).

For a striking example of the constative (summary) use of the aorist, note **ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον** (Rom. 5:12). Note in particular the summary statements in Heb. 11, as **ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες** (13), **οὗτοι πάντες—οὐκ ἐκμίσαντο** (39). Gildersleeve's "aorist of total negation" (*Syntax*, p. 106) is nothing more than this. Repeated or separate[2] actions are thus grouped together, as in Mt. 22:28, **πάντες ἔσχον αὐτήν**. So **τρὶς ἐραβδίσθην, τρὶς ἐναυάγησα** (2 Cor. 11: 20). In Mk. 12:44, **πάντες—ἔβαλον, αὕτη δὲ--ἔβαλεν**, the two actions are contrasted sharply by the aorist. There is no difficulty in **εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν· ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον** (2 Cor. 5:14). The same verb may sometimes be used either as constative (like **ἐβασί-**

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 115. [2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 193.

λευσαν, 'reigned,' Rev. 20:4 above) or ingressive (καὶ ἐβασίλευσας, 'assumed rule,' Rev. 11:17, though true here of God only in a dramatic sense). Thus ἐσίγησεν (Ac. 15:12) is 'kept silence' (constative), but σιγῆσαι (verse 13) is ingressive as is ἐσίγησαν (Lu. 9:36). Cf. Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 21. In Gal. 5:16, **οὐ μὴ τελέσητε**, we have the constative aorist, while πληρῶσαι is effective in Mt. 5:17. In line with what has already been said, βαλεῖν may mean 'throw' (constative), 'let fly' (ingressive) or 'hit' (effective). Cf. Moulton, *Prol*., p. 130. Illustrations occur in the N. T. in **ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακήν** (Mt. 18:30, constative, 'cast' or 'threw'), **βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω** (Lu. 4:9, ingressive, 'hurl.' Note **ἐντεῦθεν**, as well as "perfective" force of **κάτω**. Cf. Mt. 5:29), **ἔβαλεν κατ' αὐτῆς** (effective, 'beat,' Ac. 27:14).

(0) *Ingressive Aorist.* This is the inceptive or inchoative aorist. It is not, however, like the "constative" idea, a tense-notion at all. It is purely a matter with the individual verb.[1] Thus **ἐπτώχευσεν**, 2 Cor. 8:9, is 'became poor'; Ro. 14:9, is 'became alive' (cf. **ἀπέθανεν** just before).[2] Perhaps in Jo. 16:3, **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν**, the meaning is 'did not recognise.'[3] But this could be constative. But it is clear in Jo. 1:10. So in **ὅσοι ἔλαβον αὐτόν** (Jo. 1:12) the ingressive idea occurs, as in **οὐ παρέλαβον** in verse 11. Cf. **ἔκλαυσεν** (Lu. 19:41) = 'burst into tears' and **ἔγνως** (vs. 42) = 'camest to know.' So **ἐδάκρυσεν** (Jo. 11:35). In Mt. 22:7 **ὠργίσθη** = 'became angry.' Cf. also **μὴ δόξητε** (Mt. 3:9), **ἀφύπνωσεν** (Lu. 8:23), **ἐθυμώθη** (Mt. 2:16). In Lu. 15:32 **ἔζησεν** is ingressive, as is **ἐκοιμήθη** (Ac. 7:60), **ἰσχύσαμεν μόλις** (Ac. 27:16), **μισήσωσιν** (Lu. 6:22), **ἠγάπησεν** (Mk. 10:21), **ἐλυπήθητε** (2 Cor. 7:9), **πλουτήσητε** (2 Cor. 8:9). The notion is common with verbs expressing state or condition (Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, p. 16). Moulton quotes βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται, 'having come to his throne he shall rest,' Agraphon, O.P. 654. See also **ἔλαβα** βιάτικον παρὰ **Καίσαρος**, B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 248) cites Jo. 4:52, **κομψότερον ἔσχεν**, 'got better,' and compares it with **ἐὰν κομψῶς σχῶ**, Tb.P. 414 (ii/A.D.). Another instance is **ἤγγισαν** Mt. 21:1.[4] Cf. **ἐκτήσατο** (Ac. 1:18).

(γ) *Effective Aorist*. The name is not particularly good and "resultant aorist" is suggested by some scholars. Gildersleeve[5]

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 193. See Gildersl., Synt., p. 105.
[2] Ib. [3] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 328.
[4] These ingressive aorists are often denominative verbs. Cf. Gildersl., Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 104. [5] Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 104.

suggests "upshot aorist." Giles[1] calls it aorist of the "culminating point," following Monro.[2] But the idea is that emphasis is laid on the end of the action as opposed to the beginning (ingressive). This is done (if done) by the verb itself (*Aktionsart*). The following examples will make the matter clear: ποιήσατε καρπόν (Mt. 3:8), κλείσας (6:6), ἐτέλεσεν (7:28), ὡμοιώθη (13:24), ἐνέπρησεν (22:7), ἐκέρδησα (25:20), ἔπεισαν, (27:20), ἐλύθη (Mk. 7:35), ἐστάθησαν (Lu. 24:17), ἐκρύβη (19:42), ἤγαγεν (Jo. 1:42) ἀπέστησε (Ac. 5:37), πληρώσαντες (12:25), ἔπεσεν (20:9), ἐπαύσαντο (21:32), ἐκώλυσεν (27:43), ἔμαθον (Ph. 4:11), ἐνίκησεν (Rev. 5:5). A good example of the effective aorist in the papyri is ἔσωσε, B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.). So then in the case of each aorist the point to note is whether it is merely punctiliar (constative) or whether the verb-idea has deflected it to the one side or the other (ingressive or effective). It needs to be repeated that there is at bottom only one kind of aorist (punctiliar in fact or statement). The tense of itself always means point-action. The tense, like the mode, has nothing to do with the fact of the action, but only with the way it is stated. Sometimes it will not be clear from the context what the *Aktionsart* is. The "perfective" force of prepositions applies to all the tenses. It must be said also that the *Aktionsart* in the aorist (ingressive, effective) applies to all the modes. Indeed, because of the time-element in the indicative (expressed by the augment and secondary endings) the real character of the aorist tense is best seen in the other modes where we do not have notes of time.[3] It is merely a matter of convenience, therefore, to note the aorist in the different modes, not because of any essential difference (outside of the indicative). One is in constant danger of overrefinement here. Gildersleeve[4] criticises Stahl[5] for " characteristic prolixity" in his treatment of the tenses. A few striking examples are sufficient here.

(b) *Aorist Indicative*. The caution must be once more repeated that in these subdivisions of the aorist indicative we have only one tense and one root-idea (punctiliar action). The variations noted are incidental and do not change at all this fundamental idea.

(a) *The Narrative or Historical Tense*.[6] It is the tense in which

[1] Man., p. 498.
[2] Hom. Gr., p. 48.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 129.
[4] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 400.
[5] Krit.-hist. Synt., pp. 148-220.
[6] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 19. It is the characteristic idiom in the indicative. Cf. Bernhardy, Wiss. Synt., 1829, p. 380.

a verb in ordinary narrative is put unless there is reason for using some other tense. Hence it is enormously frequent, in the Greek historians. Writers vary greatly, of course, in the use of the tenses as of words, but in the large view the point holds. The aorist holds its place in the papyri and in the modern Greek as the usual tense in narrative (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 122). Almost any page in the Gospels and Acts will show an abundance of aorist indicatives that illustrate this point. Cf., for instance, the eight aorists in Ac. 13: 13 f. (no other tense), the eight aorists in 21:1 f. (no other tense), the three aorists in 25:1 f. (no other tense). In these instances the tenses are not all in indicative mood, though predominantly so. See again the fifteen aorists in Ac. 28:11-15 (one perfect). The aorist was used in narrative as a matter of course. Note the many aorists in Heb. 11.

The redundant use of the verb as in λαβὼν ἔσπειρεν (Mt. 13:31) = took and sowed' is not a peculiarity of the aorist tense. Cf. ἀπῆλθεν καὶ εἶπεν (Jo. 5:15) = 'went and told.' Nor is it a peculiarity of Greek. It belongs to the vernacular of most languages. But we no longer find the iterative use of ἄν with the aorist according to the classic idiom (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 167).

(β) *The Gnomic Aorist*. Jannaris[1] calls this also "empiric aorist," while Gildersleeve[2] uses "empirical" for the aorist with a negative or temporal adverb, a rather needless distinction. The real "gnomic" aorist is a universal or timeless aorist and probably represents the original timelessness of the aorist indicative.[3] This aorist is common in Homer[4] in comparisons and general sayings. The difference between the gnomic aorist and the present is that the present may be durative.[5] But general truths may be expressed by the aoristic present. Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 109) compares this use of the aorist to the generic article. Winer[6] denies that this idiom occurs in the N. T., but on insufficient grounds. Abbott[7] rather needlessly appeals to the "Hebrew influence on Johannine tense-construction" to explain ἐβλήθη καὶ ἐξηράνθη (Jo. 15:6) after ἐὰν μή τις μένῃ ἐν ἐμοί. It is a general construction here and is followed by three presents (aoristic). This is a mixed condition certainly, the protasis being future

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 436.
[2] Synt., p. 112.
[3] J. Schmid, Uber den gnomischen Aorist der Griech., 1894, p. 15. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 278.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 48 f.
[5] Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 54.
[6] W.-Th., p. 277.
[7] Joh. Gr., p. 327.

(third class, undetermined with some likelihood of determination). But ἐδοξάσθη (Jo. 15:8) is possibly also gnomic. Cf. πάντες ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται (Ro. 3:23). But in Jo. 15:6, 8, we may have merely the "timeless" aorist, like ὅταν θέλῃς, ἐξῆλθες, in Epictetus, IV, 10, 27. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 124) so thinks and adds, what I do not admit: "The genuine gnomic aorist appears to be foreign to the Hellenistic vernacular." It survives in modern Greek, according to Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 436. Moulton (*Prol.*, pp. 135, 139) admits it in N. T., but (p. 134) considers Jo. 15:6 the "timeless" aorist, like ἀπωλόμην εἴ με λείψεις in Eur., *Alc.*, 386. There are other examples, like ἔκρυψεν (Mt. 13:44) which is followed by presents ὑπάγει, πωλεῖ, ἠγόρασεν (13:46), συνέλεξαν—ἔβαλον (13:48), ὡμοιώθη (18:23), ἐκάθισαν (23:2), εὐδόκησα (Lu. 3:22), ἐδικαιώθη (7:35), ἐδίδαξεν (Jo. 8:28), ἀνέτειλεν and the other aorists in Jas. 1:11, ἐκάλεσε—ἐδόξασε (Ro. 8:30), ἐξηράνθη--ἐξέπεσεν (1 Pet. 1:24; LXX, Is. 40:7). It is true that the timeless Hebrew perfect is much like this gnomic aorist, but it is a common enough Greek idiom also. Cf. further Lu. 1:51-53. It is not certain that εὐδόκησα (Mt. 3:17; 17:5; Mk. 1:11; Lu. 3:22) belongs here. It may be merely an example of the timeless aorist used in the present, but not gnomic. See under (ε). Burton (*N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 29) finds it difficult and thinks it originally "inceptive" (ingressive).

(γ) *Relation to the Imperfect.* The aorist is not used "instead of" the imperfect.[1] But the aorist is often used in the midst of imperfects. The Old Bulgarian does not distinguish between the aorist and the imperfect. In modern Greek, aorists and imperfects have the same endings (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 119), but the two tenses are distinct in meaning. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 122) thinks that in the κοινή he finds the imperfect used as aorist, as in ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐπύει (ἐποίει) τὸν βωμόν (Inscr. de la Syrie 2413[a]), and διεσάφεις for διεσάφησας (P. Lond., XLII, Kenyon 30). But I venture to be sceptical. In both passages the imperfects make perfectly good sense. Radermacher urges the common use of ἐτελεύτα, but that may be merely descriptive imperfect. I grant that it is "willkurlich" in Herodotus (in 1214) to say διεφθάρη καὶ τελευτᾷ, as in Strabo (C 828) to have ἐτελεύτα—διαδέδεκται. It is "rein stilistisch," but each writer exercises his own whim. Winer[2] properly remarks that it "often

[1] Monro, Hom Gr., p. 46; Leo Meyer, Griech. Aoriste, p. 97; Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 243; Moulton, Prol., p. 128. ἦν may be either aorist or imperfect.

[2] W.-Th., p. 276.

depends on the writer" which tense he will use. Why "often"? Why not "always"? The presence of aorist, imperfect and past perfect side by side show how keen the distinction was felt to be.[1] Blass[2] seeks to distinguish sharply between ἔλεγον and εἶπον, but with little success. The trouble, as already stated, is probably that ἔλεγον may be either aorist (like ἔλιπον) or imperfect. He admits that Thucydides introduces his speeches either with ἔλεγε or ἔλεξε. Gildersleeve,[3] like Stahl, denies "an actual interchange of tenses." In any given incident the speaker or writer may have the choice of representing it in narrative by the aorist (punctiliar) or the imperfect (durative). An interesting example is found in Mk. 12:41-44.[4] The general scene is presented by the descriptive durative imperfect ἐθεώρει and the durative present βάλλει. It is visualized by πολλοί--ἔβαλλον. But the figure of the widow woman is singled out by the aorist ἔβαλεν. The closing reference by Jesus to the rest is by the constative aorist πάντες ἔβαλον. Note also the precise distinction between εἶχεν and ἔβαλεν at the end. Where the aorist and the imperfect occur side by side, it is to be assumed that the change is made on purpose and the difference in idea to be sought. In juxtaposition the aorist lifts the curtain and the imperfect continues the play. Cf. ἐνύσταξαν (ingressive, 'fell to nodding') and ἐκάθευδον ('went on sleeping') in Mt. 25:5. So **Τίς μου ἥψατο; καὶ** περιεβλέπετο (Mk. 5:32). 'He began to look around because of the touch.' See also ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς (7:35). A similar distinction appears in ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ (Mt. 4:11); ἔπεσεν καὶ ἐδίδου (13:8); κατέβη λαῖλαψ—καὶ συνεπληροῦντο (Lu. 8:23); ἦρε τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ καὶ περιεπάτει (Jo. 5:9); ἀνέβη—καὶ ἐδίδασκεν (7:14); ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἐκραύγαζον, (12:13). In Lu. 8:53 note κατεγέλων and ἀπέθανεν. Once again note εἴδαμεν--καὶ ἐκωλύομεν in 9:49 and κατενόουν καὶ εἶδον (Ac. 11:6). Cf. further Ac. 14:10; 1 Cor. 3:6; Mt. 21:8; Mk. 11:18; Jo. 20:3 f. In 1 Cor. 10:4 note ἔπιον --ἔπιον; in 11:23, παρέδωκα, παρεδίδετο. The same sort of event will be recorded now with the aorist, as πολὺ πλῆθος ἠκολούθησεν (Mk. 3:7), now with the imperfect, as ἠκολούθει ὄχλος πολύς (5:24). Cf. Lu. 2:18 and 4:22.[5] But the changing mood of the writer does not mean that the tenses are equivalent to each other. A word further is necessary concerning the relative frequency of aorists and imperfects. Statistical syntax is interesting,

[1] Gildersl., Synt., p. 114.
[2] Or. of N. T. Gk., p. 192.
[3] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 398.
[4] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 30.
[5] Ib.

laborious and not always conclusive. Schlachter[1] has applied statistics to Homer. In both Iliad and Odyssey the aorists in the indicative are more numerous than the imperfects. Gildersleeve[2] found a similar result in Pindar. Jacobsthal (*Der Gebrauch der Tempora und Modi in den kretischen Dialektinschriften*) finds the aorist surpassing the imperfect. But Hultsch[3] found the imperfect very abundant in Polybius, and Prof. Miller[4] has added statistics for other writers. "The imperfect divides the crown with the aorist in different proportions at different times and in different spheres."[5] A further extended quotation from Gildersleeve[6] is pertinent: "Not the least interesting is the table in which Schlachter has combined his results with Professor Miller's and from which it appears that the use of the aorist indicative gradually diminishes until it finds its low-water-mark in Xenophon. Then the aorist thrusts itself more and more to the front until it culminates in the N. T. The pseudo-naivete of Xenophon suggests an answer to one problem. The *Hellenica* has the lowest percentage of imperfects, but it mounts up in the novelistic *Kyropaideia*. The other problem, the very low percentage of the imperfect in the N. T. — e.g. Matthew 13 per cent., Apocalypse 7 — Schlachter approaches gingerly, and well he may. It stands in marked contrast to Josephus whose 46 per cent. of imperfects shows the artificiality of his style, somewhat as does his use of the participles (A. J. P., IX 154), which, according to Schlachter, he uses more than thrice as often as St. John's Gospel (41:12). This predominance of the aorist indicative can hardly be dissociated from the predominance of the aorist imperative in the N. T. (Justin Martyr, *Apol*. I, 16. 6), although the predominance of the aorist imperative has a psychological basis which cannot be made out so readily for the aorist indicative. Besides, we have to take into consideration the growth of the perfect and the familiar use of the historical present, which is kept down in St. Luke alone (*A. J. P.*, XX 109, XXVII 328)." The personal equation, style, character of the book, vernacular or literary form, all come into play. It largely depends on what

[1] Stat. Unters. Uber den Gebr. der Temp. und Modi bei einzelnen griech. Schriftst., 1908.

[2] Am. Jour. of. Philol., 1876, pp. 158-165.

[3] Der Gebr. der erzahlenden Zeitf. bei Polyb. (1898).

[4] Am. Jour. of Philol., XVI, pp. 139 ff. Cf. also L. Lange, Andeut. uber Ziel und Meth. der synt. Forsch., 1853.

[5] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 242. [6] Ib., p. 244.

the writer is after. If he is aiming to describe a scene with vividness, the imperfect predominates. Otherwise he uses the aorist, on the whole the narrative tense *par excellence*.[1] "Hence the aorist is the truly *narrative* tense, the imperfect the truly descriptive one; and both may be used of the same transaction."[2]

(δ) *Relation to the Past Perfect.* It is rather shocking, after Winer's protest that the tenses are not interchanged, to find him saying bluntly: "In narration the aorist is used for the pluperfect."[3] Burton[4] helps the matter by inserting the word "English" before "pluperfect." Winer meant "German pluperfect." Gildersleeve[5] does much better by using "translated." "We often translate the aorist by a pluperfect for the sake of clearness." Goodwin[6] adds more exactly that the aorist indicative merely refers the action to the past "without the more exact specification" which the past perfect would give. That is the case. The speaker or writer did not always care to make this more precise specification. He was content with the mere narrative of the events without the precision that we moderns like. We are therefore in constant peril of reading back into the Greek aorist our English or German translation. All that one is entitled to say is that the aorist sometimes occurs where the context "implies completion before the main action,"[7] where in English we prefer the past perfect. This use of the aorist is particularly common in subordinate clauses (relative and temporal and indirect discourse).[8] It must be emphasized that in this construction the antecedence of the action is not stressed in the Greek. "The Greeks neglected to mark the priority of one event to another, leaving that to be gathered from the context."[9] Strictly therefore the aorist is not used for the past perfect. The Greeks cared not for relative time. In Mt. 14:3 it is plain that ἔδησεν and ἀπoέθετο are antecedent in time to ἤκουσεν, verse 1, and εἶπεν in verse 2, but the story of the previous imprisonment and death of John is introduced by γάρ in a reminiscential manner. In Mt. 2:9 ὃν εἶδον points back to verse 2. Cf. also ὅτι ἐγίμωσεν (Mt. 22:34); ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ ἐξέδυσαν αὐτόν (27:31). So in 28:2

[1] Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 158.
[2] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 77.
[3] W.-M., p. 343.
[4] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 22.
[5] Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 109.
[6] Gk. Moods and Tenses, p. 18. Cf. Gildersl., Synt., p. 109.
[7] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 47.
[8] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 437.
[9] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 76. Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, p. 169.

ἐγένετο is antecedent to **ἦλθεν** in verse 1. In 27:18 note in particular **ᾔδει ὅτι παρέδωκαν** and compare with **ἐγίνωσκεν ὅτι παραδεδώκεισαν** in Mk. 15:10 (cf. **οἵτινες πεποιήκεισαν** in verse 7). Here Mark did draw the distinction which Matthew did not care to make. In Lu. 19:15 we have **οἷς δεδώκει**, but **τί διεπραγματεύσαντο**. Other examples where the antecedence is not expressed, though true, and the aorist is used, are **ἐπελάθοντο** (Mk. 8:14), **ἐπειδήπερ ἐπεχείρησαν** (Lu. 1:1), **ὡς ἐτέλεσαν** (2:39), **ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν** (7:1), **ἐνεδύσατο** (8:27), **ἃ ἡτοίμασαν** (Lu. 24:1), **ὡς ἐγεύσατο** (Jo. 2:9), **ὅτι ἤκουσαν** (4:1), **ὃν εἶπεν** (4:50), **ἐξένευσεν**, (5:13), **ὡς ἐγένετο** (6:16), **ὅτι ἀνέβλεψεν** (9:18), **ὅτι ἐξέβαλον** (9:35), **ὅπου ὑπήντησεν** (11:30 and note **ἐληλύθει**), **οὓς προέγνω** (13:12); **ὡς ἀπέβησαν** (21:9), **οὓς ἐξελέξατο** (Ac. 1:2), **ὅτε ἔνιψεν** (Ro. 8:29. Cf. 30 also). In Jo. 18:24, **ἀπέστειλεν οὖν**, the presence of **οὖν** makes the matter less certain. If all is transitional, there would be no antecedence. But if **οὖν**, is inferential, that may be true, though Abbott considers it "impossible."[1] Clyde[2] calls the aorist "an aggressive tense, particularly in the active voice, where it encroached on the domain of the perfect, and all but supplanted the pluperfect." That is true, and yet it must not be forgotten that the aorist was one of the original tenses, much older than the perfects or the future. In wishes about the past (unattainable wishes) the N. T. uses **ὄφολον** (shortened form of **ὤφελον**) with the aorist indicative (1 Cor. 4:8) **ὄφελόν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε**. A similar remark applies to use of the aorist indicative in conditions of the second class (past time), without **ἄν** in apodosis (Gal. 4:15) or with **ἄν** (Jo. 11:21). In both cases in English we translate this aorist by a past perfect.

(e) *Relation to the Present.* The so-called Dramatic Aorist is possibly the oldest use of the tense. In Sanskrit this is the common use of the tense to express what has just taken place.[3] One wonders if the gnomic or timeless aorist indicative is not still older. The absence of a specific tense for punctiliar action in the present made this idiom more natural.[4] This primitive use of the aorist survives also in the Slavonic.[5] Giles suggests that "the Latin perfect meaning, like the Sanskrit, may have developed directly from this usage." The idiom appears in Homer[6] and is

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 336. Cf. Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 23.
[2] Gk. Synt., p. 76.
[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 329. [4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 129.
[5] Giles, Man., etc., p. 498. "The aorist is used not uncommonly of present time." Ib., p. 497. [6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 48.

found chiefly in the dramatic poets where a sudden change comes,[1] or in colloquial speech or passionate questions.[2] It is a regular idiom in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 123) as **πείνασα**, I grew hungry,' 'am hungry still.' This aorist is used of actions which have just happened. The effect reaches into the present. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 247) quotes a traveller in Cos who "had a pleasant shock, on calling for a cup of coffee, to have the waiter cry "**Ἔφθασα**." The Greek can still use a past tense in passionate questions affecting the present.[3] Moulton[4] speaks of "cases where an aorist indicative denotes present time," though he adds: "None of these examples are really in present time, for they only seem to be so through a difference in idiom between Greek and English." This latter statement is the truth. The aorist in Greek, particularly in dialogue, may be used for what has just happened. It seems awkward in English to refer this to past time, but it is perfectly natural in Greek. So we translate it by the present indicative. From the Greek point of view the peculiarity lies in the English, not in the Greek. The examples in the N. T. are numerous enough in spite of Winer[5] to be worth noting. Moulton[6] has made a special study of Matthew concerning the translation of the aorist. "Under the head of 'things just happened' come 9:18 **ἐτελεύτησεν** (with **ἄρτι**), 5:28 **ἐμοίχευσεν**, and 14:15 **παρῆλθεν** and 17:12 **ἦλθε** (with **ἤδη**); 6:12 **ἀφήκαμεν**, 12:28 **ἔφθασεν**, 14:2, etc., **ἠγέρθη**, 16:17 **ἀπεκάλυψε,** 18:15 **ἐκέρδησας**, 20:12 **ἐποίησαν --ας**, 26:10 **ἠρηάσατο**, 26:13 **ἐποίησε**, 26:65 **ἐβλασφήμησεν**, **ἠκούσατε**, 26:25, 64 **εἶπας**, 27:19 **ἔπαθον**, 27:46 **ἐγκατέλιπες**, 28:7 **εἶπον**, 28:18 **ἐδόθη** (unless 11:27 forbids) and perhaps **ἐγενήθη**." Certainly this is a respectable list for Matthew. Add **ἐμερίσθη** (Mt. 12:26). These all can be translated by the English 'have.' **Εὐδόκησα** (Mt. 3:17 and parallels) is a possible example also. Cf. **ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου** (12:18, LXX). It is a "timeless" aorist[7] and may be gnomic, as already pointed out. Cf. 2 Pet. 1:17; Mk. 10:20, **ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ τῆς νεότητος;** **ἐξέστη** in Mk. 3:21; **ἀπέχει, ἦλθεν—παραδίδοται** (14:41). Other examples of the aorist for what has just happened are in **ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε** (Mk. 16:6); **ἠγέρθη---ἐπεσκέψατο** (Lu. 7:16); **ἠγόρασα, ἔγημα** (14:18-20); **ἔζησεν, εὑρέθη** (15:32); **ἔγνων** (16:4); **ἐκρύβη** (19:42); **ὄντως ἠγέρθη** (24:34); **προσεκύνησαν** (Jo.

[1] Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, p. 18.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 437.
[3] Gildersl., Synt., p. 113.
[4] Prol., p. 134.
[5] W.-Th., p. 278.
[6] Prol., p. 140.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 134 1.

4:20); ἤκουσας (11:41); ἀπῆλθεν (12:19); ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην (12:27); ἦλθεν (13:1); νῦν ἐδοξάσθη (13:31), but ἐδόξασα (17:4) points backward, 'I did glorify thee,' while ἐδοξάσθη in 15:8 is possibly gnomic; ἐπιάσατε νῦν (21:10); ἐδούλωσα, ἐγενόμην (1 Cor. 9:19, 20, 22. Cf. ποιῶ in verse 23); ἔπεσεν, ἔπεσεν (Rev. 14:8; 18:2).[1] With this use of the aorist adverbs of time are common to make clear the present relation of time. Cf. τουτο ἤδη τρίτον ἐφανερώθη (Jo. 21:14) where τοῦτο has the effect of bringing the action forward. For a sharp contrast between the aorist and present see ἔσχες, καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις (Jo. 4:18). So ἔθυσα καὶ ἀξι[ῶ], B.G.U. 287 (A.D. 250). Cf. also Lu. 10:24. See in particular ἔγνω, ἔγνων and ἔγνωσαν in Jo. 17:25. The timeless aorist is well illustrated in the participle in Lu. 10:18, ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν πεσόντα.

(ζ) *Relation to Present Perfect.* The problem just here is not whether the present perfect is ever used as an aorist. That will be discussed under the present perfect. If the distinction between the two tenses was finally[2] obliterated, as early happened in Latin,[3] there would be some necessary confusion. But that has not happened in the N. T. period. Jannaris[4] notes it regularly about 1000 A.D. It is undeniable that the early Sanskrit used the aorist chiefly for "something past which is viewed with reference to the present" and it disappeared before the growth of the other more exact tenses.[5] The perfect may be said to be a development from the aorist, a more exact expression of completed action than mere "punctiliar" (aorist), viz. state of completion. But in the Greek the aorist not only held its own with the other tenses, but "has extended its province at the expense of the perfect," particularly in the N. T. period, though different writers vary greatly here.[6] But was the aorist used "for" the perfect? Clyde[7] says: "The aorist was largely used for the perfect." Winer[8] replies: "There is no passage in which it can be certainly proved that the aorist stands for the perfect." Gildersleeve[9] more correctly says: "The aorist is very often used where we should expect the perfect," i.e. in English. But the trans-

[1] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 135.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 440.
[3] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 78. Still, in Lat. the aorist must be noted for sequence of tenses. Cf. Meillet, L'Aoriste en Lat., Revue de Phil., 1897, p. 81 f.
[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 437. Cf. Hatz., Einl., p. 204 f.
[5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., pp. 298, 329.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 199.
[7] Gk. Synt., p. 78.
[8] W.-M., p. 344.
[9] Synt., p. 107,

lation of the aorist into English will call for special discussion a little later. What is true is that the action in such cases "is regarded as subordinate to present time,"[1] in other words, the precise specification of relative time which we draw in our English perfect is not drawn in the Greek. The Greek states the simple undefined punctiliar action in a connection that suggests present time and so we render it in English by our "have."[2] But Farrar[3] is right in insisting that we do not explain the Greek tense by the English rendering. In truth, the examples given under the head of "Relation to the Present" (ε) may often be rendered by the English "have" with tolerable accuracy.[4] Sometimes the use of an adverb or particle helps the English. The examples are rather numerous in the N. T., as in the papyri,[5] where the aorist and the present perfect occur side by side. Thus **χωρὶς ὧν ἀπεγραψάμην καὶ πέπρακα**, 0.P. 482 (ii/A.D.); **τῆς γενομένης καὶ ἀποπεπεμμένης γυναικός**, N.P. 19 (ii/A.D.). Moulton adds: "The distinction is very clearly seen in papyri for some centuries." In most instances in the N. T. the distinction is very sharply drawn in the context, as in **ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται** (1 Cor. 15:4). So **ἐκτίσθη, ἔκτισται** (Col. 1:16). Cf. Ac. 21:28. In most instances where we have trouble from the English standpoint it is the perfect, not the aorist that occasions it, as in **πέπρακεν καὶ ἠγόρασεν** (Mt. 13:46). We shall come back to this point under the present perfect. As a rule all that is needed is a little imagination on the part of the English reader to sympathize with the mental alertness expressed in the changing tenses, a sort of "moving picture" arrangement. Cf. **κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν** (Jas. 1:24). The single point to note concerning the aorist in those examples where we use "have" is that the Greeks did not care to use the perfect. Cf. **οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους** (Lu. 5:32) with **οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους** (Mt. 9:13), just two ways of regarding the same act. That is the whole story and it is a different thing from saying that the aorist is used "for" the present perfect. Here are some of the most interesting examples in the N. T. where "we" in English prefer "have": **ἠκούσατε** (Mt. 5:21); **εὗρον** (8:10); **ἀνέγνωτε** (12:3); **ἐπαχύνθη καὶ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἐκάμμυσαν** (13:15, LXX, Is. 6:10.

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 48.

[2] Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, p. 18; P. Thomson, The Gk. Tenses in the N. T., p. 24.

[3] Gk. Synt., p. 125.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 140,

[5] Ib., p. 142 f.

Likely enough the timelessness of the Hebrew perfect may have caused this translation into the aorist so common in the LXX), **ἠκυρώσατε** (Mt. 15:6); **συνέζευξεν** (19:6); **ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι κατηρτίσω** (21: 16); **ἀφήκατε** (23:23); **κατέστησεν** (24:45); **ἐποίησεν** (27:23)[1]; **ἠγέρθη** (28:6), **ἐξέστη** (Mk. 3:21), **ἀπέθανεν** (5:35; cf. **τί ἔτι σκύλλεις**; 5: 35. Cf. **ἀλλὰ καθεύδει**); **εἴδαμεν** (Lu. 5:26); **παρεδόθη** (10:22); **ἥμαρτον** (15:21); **ἔγνωσαν** (Jo. 7:26); **ἀφῆκεν** (8:29); **ἔλαβον** (10:18); **ἔδειξα** (10:32); **ἐδόξασα** (12:28. Cf. **δοξάσω**); **ἔνιψα** (13:14); **ἐξελεξάμην** (13:18); **ἠγάπησα** (13:34); **ἐγνώρισα** (15:15); **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν** (16:3); **ἦραν—ἔθηκαν** (20:2); **ἐπιάσατε** (21:10).[2] Cf. Mk. 14:8. Abbott remarks, that the Greek perfect does not lay the same stress on what is recently completed as does the English "have." Cf. also **οὐκ ἔγνω** (1 Jo. 4:8. Cf. 1 Cor. 8:3); **ἐφανερώθη** (1 Jo. 4:9. Contrast **ἀπέσταλκεν** in verse 9 and **ἠγαπήκαμεν, ἠγαπήσαμεν** in margin, in verse 10 with **ἠγάπησεν** and **ἀπέστειλεν** in verse 10); **ἔλαβον** (Ph. 3:12); **ἔμαθον** (4:11); **ἐκάθισεν** (Heb. 1:3); **ἐξέστημεν** (2 Cor. 5:13). The same event in Mk. 15:44 is first mentioned by **ἤδη τέθνηκεν** and is then referred to by **ἤδη** (or **πάλαι**) **ἀπέθανεν**. The is not here very great, but each tense is pertinent. However, **τέθνηκεν** means practically 'to be dead,' while **ἀπέθανεν** = 'died,' 'has died.' Cf. Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 108.

(η) *Epistolary Aorist*. This idiom is merely a matter of standpoint. The writer looks at his letter as the recipient will. It is probably due to delicate courtesy and is common in Latin as well as in the older Greek, though less so in the later Greek.[3] The most frequent word so used was **ἔγραψα**, though **ἔπεμψα** was also common. The aorist has its normal meaning. One has merely to change his point of view and look back at the writer. In 1 Jo. 2:12-14 we have the rhetorical repetition of **γράφω**, **ἔγραψα** (note the perfects after **ὅτι**). But in 1 Jo. 2:21 **ἔγραψα** may be the epistolary use, though Winer[4] protests against it. Here as in 2:26, **ταῦτα, ἔγραψα**, the reference may be not to the whole epistle, but to the portion in hand, though even so the standpoint is that of the reader. Cf. also 5:13. In 1 Cor. 9: 15 also the reference is to the verses in hand. In Eph. 3:3, **καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ**, the allusion may be to what Paul has just written or to the whole epistle, as is true of **ἐπέστειλα** (Heb. 13: 22). Certainly **γράφω** is the usual construction in the N. T. (1 Cor. 4:14; 14:37; 2 Cor. 13:10, etc.). **Ἔγραψα** usually refers

[1] Most of these exx. from Mt. come from Moulton, Prol., p. 140.
[2] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 324.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 437. [4] W.-Th., p. 278.

to an epistle just finished (Phil. 19; 1 Pet. 5:12; 1 Jo. 5:13), but even so the standpoint veers naturally to that of the reader. This is particularly so in Gal. 6:11 which probably refers to the concluding verses 11-18 and, if so, a true epistolary aorist. In Ro. 15:15 the reference may be[1] to another portion of the same epistle or to the epistle as a whole. In 1 Cor. 5:9, 11, ἔγραψα refers to a previous letter, as seems to be true also in 2 Cor. 2:3, 4, 9; 3 Jo. 9. But ἔπεμψα is found in undoubted instances as in Ac. 23:30; Eph. 6:22; Ph. 2:28; Col. 4:8. So ἀνέπεμψα in Phil. 12 and ἠβουλήθην in Text. Rec. 2 Jo. 12. Curiously enough Gildersleeve[2] says: "The aorist in the N. T. [Ep. aor.] is clearly due to Roman influence, and is not to be cited." The epistolary aorist is more common in Latin (cf. Cicero's *Letters*), probably because of our having more epistolary material. The idiom occurs often enough in the papyri. Cf. ἔπεμψα, B.G.U. 423 (ii/A.D.), ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἰδότος γράμματα, P.Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). There is therefore no adequate reason for denying its presence in the N. T. examples above.

(θ) *Relation to the Future.* The future was probably (cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 480) a late development in the language, and other devices were at first used, like the present indicative, the perfect indicative, the aorist subjunctive. The aorist indicative was also one of the expedients that never quite disappeared. It is not exactly, like the epistolary aorist, a change of standpoint. It is a vivid transference of the action to the future (like the present ἔρχομαι, Jo. 14:3) by the timeless aorist. The augmented form is still used, but the time is hardly felt to be past. This idiom, survives in the Slavonic also.[3] It is a vivid idiom and is still found in modern Greek.[4] Thumb (*Handb.*, p. 123) cites κι ἂν μέ σουβλίσετε, ἕνας Γραικὸς ἐχάθη, 'even if you impale me only one Greek perishes.' Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 124) cites from Epictetus, ὅταν θέλῃς ἐξῆλθες. Gildersleeve[5] calls it "a vision of the future." Burton[6] considers it "rather a rhetorical figure than a grammatical idiom," but the idiom is not so strange after all. Cf. Eur., *Alc.*, 386, ἀπωλόμην εἴ με λείψεις='I perish if you leave me.' The examples are not numerous in the N. T. and some of them may be gnomic. Cf. ἐάν σου ἀκούσῃ, ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἀδελφόν σου (Mt. 18:15. Cf. παράλαβε as the next apodosis in verse 16 and ἔστω in verse 17); ἐὰν καὶ γαμήσῃς, οὐχ ἥμαρτες (1 Cor. 7:

[1] Blass,. Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 194.
[2] Synt., p. 128.
[3] Giles, Manual, p. 499.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 437.
[5] Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 114.
[6] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 23.

28); ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθη (Rev. 10:7), probably also ἐὰν μή τις μένῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη—καὶ ἐξηράνθη (Jo. 15:6), though this may be merely gnomic, as already stated. Cf. the use of ἐμερίσθη and ἔφθασεν in Mt. 12:26, 28 in a condition of the present time. In Jo. 13:31 ἐδοξάσθη (twice) is explained (verse 32) by δοξάσει καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει. Cf. p. 1020 (standpoint).

(ι) *Aorist in Wishes*. The special use of the aorist indicative in wishes about the past and conditions determined as unfulfilled will be discussed in chapter XIX, Modes.

(κ) *Variations in the Use of Tenses*. Where so much variety is possible, great freedom is to be expected. In modern English we make a point of uniformity of tense in narrative. The Greeks almost made a point of the opposite. It is jejune, to say no more, to plane down into a dead level the Greek spontaneous variety. Cf. ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται (Ro. 3:23). In Matt. 4:11, for instance, we have ἀφίησιν, (historical pres.), προσῆθον (aor.), διηκόνουν (imperfect). In Mt. 13:45 f. note ἐστίν, ζητοῦντι, εὑρών, ἀπελθών, πέπρακεν, εἶχεν, ἠγόρασεν. "When they wished to narrate a fact, or to convey a meaning, there is good ground for holding that they employed the tense appropriate for the purpose, and that they employed it just because of such appropriateness."[1] That is well said. The explanation is chiefly psychological, not mere analogy, which is true of only a few tenses, especially in late Greek (Middleton, *Analogy in Syntax*, 1892, p. 6). Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 437, lays probably too much stress on "the terminal homophony of the two tenses" (aor. and perf.).

(λ) *Translation of the Aorist into English*. The Greek aorist ind., as can be readily seen, is not the exact equivalent of any tense in any other language. It has nuances all its own, many of them difficult or well-nigh impossible to reproduce in English. Here, as everywhere, one needs to keep a sharp line between the Greek idiom and its translation into English. We merely do the best that we can in English to translate in one way or another the total result of word (*Aktionsart*), context and tense.[2] Certainly one cannot say that the English translations have been successful with the Greek aorist.[3] Weymouth in his New Testament in Modern Speech has attempted to carry out a consistent principle with some success. Moulton[4] has thought the matter

[1] P. Thomson, The Gk. Tenses in the N. T., p. 17.

[2] Weymouth, On the Rendering into Eng. of the Gk. Aorist and Perfect, 1894, p. 15,

[3] Thomson, The Gk. Tenses in the N. T., p. 23.

[4] Prol., pp. 135-140.

important enough for an extended discussion. He makes clear that the Greek aorist is true to itself, however it is rendered into English. Take τινὲς ἐκοιμήθησαν (1 Cor. 15:6), for instance, 'fell asleep (at various times),' Moulton explains, "and so have fallen asleep." In Mt. 3:7 ὑπέδειξεν may be translated by 'has warned,' but 'warned' will answer. The English past will translate the Greek aorist in many cases where we prefer "have." Burton[1] puts it clearly thus: "The Greek employs the aorist, leaving the context to suggest the order; the English usually suggests the order by the use of the pluperfect." The Greek aorist takes no note of any interval between itself and the moment of speaking, while the English past takes note of the interval. The Greek aorist and the English past do not exactly correspond, nor do the Greek perfect and the English perfect.[2] The Greek aorist covers much more ground than the English past. Cf. διὸ ἐκλήθη ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκεῖνος Ἀγρὸς Αἵματος ἕως τῆς σήμερον (Mt. 27:8), where the Greek aorist is connected with the present in a way that only the English perfect can render. See also ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ᾐτήσατε (Jo. 16:24). From the Greek point of view the aorist is true to its own genius. The aorist in Greek is so rich in meaning that the English labours and groans to express it. As a matter of fact the Greek aorist is translatable into almost every English tense except the imperfect, but that fact indicates no confusion in the Greek.[3]

(c) *The Aorist Subjunctive and Optative*. The aorist of these two " side-moods"[4] may very well be discussed together. The two moods are not radically different as we shall see.

(a) *No Time Element in the Subjunctive and Optative*.[5] There is only relative time (future), and that is not due to the tense at all.[6] The subjunctive is future in relation to the speaker, as is often true of the optative, though the optative standpoint is then more remote, a sort of future from the standpoint of the past.

(β) *Frequency of Aorist Subjunctive.* As between the aorist and present in subjunctive and optative, the aorist is far more common. For practical purposes the perfect may be almost left out of view; it is so rare. As a rule in these moods the action is either punctiliar (aorist) or durative (present). The contrast between point and linear action comes out simply and clearly here. It is just that

[1] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 27.
[2] Ib., p. 24 f.
[3] Thompson, Gk. Synt., 1883, p. xix.
[4] Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of 1908, p. 401.
[5] K.-G., Bd. Up. 182.
[6] Stahl, Hist.-krit. Synt., p. 171.

seen between the aorist and the imperfect indicative.[1] In the classical Sanskrit the subjunctive exists only in a remnant of the first person, which is treated as an imperative, but it is common enough in the early language.[2] In Homer (both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) the aorist is in great preponderance over the present (65 to 35 for the average between subjunctive and optative, about the same for each).[3] Gildersleeve[4] considers the difference due to the nature of the constructions, not to mere lack of differentiation in the early stage of the language. The subj. is more common in Homer than in the later Greek and the aorist subj. is correspondingly abundant. There is no doubt that the aorist is gaining in the κοινή over the present in the subj., opt., imper. (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 123). The distinction is understood. Cf. μέχρις ἂν ἥλιος δύῃ (aim) and ἄχρις ἂν ἐπίκαιρον δοκῇ (duration), I. G., XII, 5, 647. Radermacher cites also ὅπως λαμβάνωσιν and ὅπως λάβωσιν, ὅπως ὑπάρχῃ and ἵνα δοθῇ from a Pergamum inscr., N.13 (B.C. 300). He fears that this proves confusion between the tenses, and appeals also to the papyrus example ἵνα γράφω καὶ φλυαρήσω (Deissmann, *Light*, p. 204). But there is no necessary confusion here. The modern Greek preserves clearly the distinction between punctiliar and linear action in the subj. and uses the aorist and present side by side to show it (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 124). The situation in the N. T. is even more striking. Mr. H. Scott, Birkenhead, England, writes me that he finds only five present subjs. in Acts and one (13:41) is a quotation. In the Pauline Epistles (13) he notes 258 dependent aorist subjs. and 161 dependent pres. subjs. Gildersleeve[5] complains of Stahl's wearisomeness in proving what "no one will dispute." The point is that the aorist subj. or opt. is used as a matter of course unless durative (linear) action is to be emphasized or (as rarely) the completed state is to be stressed (perfect). But variations occur even here. Thus Abbott[6] notes only two instances of the pres. subj.

[1] Clyde, Gk. Synt., p. 82; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 194.
[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 298.
[3] Schlachter, Statist. Unters., pp. 236-238.
[4] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 245. [5] Ib., p. 400.
[6] Joh. Gr., p. 370 f. But there is little point in these exceptions. Abbott rightly notes the variations in the major uncials between –ίσῃ and –ίζῃ in Mk. 9:43-47. Mr. H. Scott finds ἐάν with pres. subj. also (W. H.) in Mk. 1:40; 9:47 (4 in all). In Lu. he adds 5:12 (=Mk. 1:40); 10:6, 8, 10 (ἐάν to be supplied); 13:3; 20:28 (8 in all). In Mt. he notes 5:23; 6:22, 23; 8:2 (=Mk. 1:40); 10:13 *bis*; 15:14; 17:20; 21:21; 24:49 *bis*; 26:35 (12 in all). But he makes 78 aor. subjs. with ἐάν in the Synoptics.

with ἐάν in Mk. (9:45; 14:31) and two in Lu. (6:33; 19:31), apart from and except clauses with ἔχω and θέλω. The aorist subjunctive with ἐάν occurs in Synoptics 24 times, present 79. But in John there is more diversity between the two tenses. "Most Greek writers observe the distinction between the aorist and present subjunctive, as Englishmen observe that between 'shall' and unconsciously and without any appearance of deliberately emphasizing the difference. But we have seen above (2511) that John employs the two forms with great deliberateness, even in the same sentence, to distinguish between the beginning of 'knowing' and the development of it."[1] Cf. ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε (10:38) and εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά (13:17), where the pres. is again used purposely. Note also John's τί ποιῶμεν (6:28) and Luke's τί ποιήσωμεν (3:10). We need not follow all the details of Abbott,[2] but he has made it perfectly clear that John makes the sharp distinction between the aor. and pres. subj. that is common between the aor. and imperf. ind. Cf. ἐάν τις τηρήσῃ (Jo. 8:51) and ἐὰν τηρῶμεν (1 Jo. 2:3); ὅτι ἂν αἰτήσητε (Jo. 14:13) and ὃ ἂν αἰτῶμεν (1 Jo. 3:22). But Paul also knows the punctiliar force of the aor. subj. Cf. ἁμαρτήσωμεν (Ro. 6:15) with ἐπιμένωμεν (6:1), where the point lies chiefly in the difference of tense. See also 2 Tim. 2:5, ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλῇ τις, οὐ στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ. Cf. ποιῆτε in Gal. 5:17. In deliberative questions the aorist subj. is particularly common, as in δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν (Mk. 12:14). In εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν (Ro. 5:1) the durative present occurs designedly = 'keep on enjoying peace with God,' the peace already made (δικαιωθέντες). Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 186) thinks that the aorist subj. in relative clauses like ὃς ἂν φονεύσῃ (Mt. 5:21), or ὅπου ἐὰν καταλάβῃ (Mk. 9:18), or conditional sentences like ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε (Mt. 5:47) "gets a future-perfect sense." But one doubts if after all this is not reading English or Latin into the Greek. Cf. Mt. 5:31. The special construction of the aorist subj. with (οὐ μή) (Jo. 6:35; 18:11) comes up for discussion elsewhere (pp. 929 f., 1174 f.).

(γ) *Aktionsart*. The three kinds of point-action occur, of course, in the aorist subj. Thus in ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ (Jo. 1:7) the aorist is merely constative, as is ἐὰν μείητε ἐν ἐμοί (Jo. 15:7). Cf. ἐὰν μή τις μένῃ ἐν ἐμοί (15:6). In Jo. 6:30, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι, the ingressive use is evident in πιστεύσωμεν = 'come to believe' (cf. ἵνα πιστεύητε in verse 29). Cf. also ἵνα πιστυέσωμεν καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν (1 Jo. 3:23); περιπατήσωμεν (Ro. 6:4; 13:13). The

[1] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 381. [2] Ib., pp. 369-388.

effective aorist is seen in πῶς πληρωθῶσιν (Mt. 26:54). Cf. ὅταν καταργήσῃ (1 Cor. 15:24) for the "perfective" use of the preposition also. In the modern Greek the aorist subj. preserves *Aktionsart* (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 124).

(δ) *Aorist Subjunctive in Prohibitions.* It seems clear[1] that originally both in Sanskrit and Greek prohibition was expressed only by the subj. Hence the growth of the imperative never finally displaced it. In particular the aorist subj. held its place in prohibitions as against the aorist imper. (a late form anyhow). This distinction has held in the main right on through. In the N. T. examples of the aor. imper. in prohibitions do occur in the third person, but the aor. subj. survives. In the second person the rule is still absolute. Moulton[2] has given a very interesting discussion of the development of the discovery of the distinction between the two constructions. The aor. subj. is of course punctiliar, and the present imper. linear. Inasmuch as the prohibition is future, the aorist subj. would naturally be ingressive. Gottfried Hermann long ago made the distinction, but a few years ago Dr. Henry Jackson tells how one day he got the idea from a friend (quoted by Moulton[2]): "Davidson told me that, when he was learning modern Greek, he had been puzzled about the distinction, until he heard a Greek friend use the present imperative to a dog which was barking. This gave him the clue. He turned to Plato's *Apology*, and immediately stumbled upon the excellent instance, 20 E, **μὴ θορυβήσητε**, 'before clamour begins,' and 21 A, **μὴ θορυβεῖτε**, 'when it has begun.' "This distinction is clearly in harmony with the punctiliar aorist subj. and the durative present imper. It is maintained in ancient Greek and in modern Greek, and Moulton[3] shows how the papyri abundantly illustrate it. Unfortunately the present imperative is rare in the papyri from the nature of the. subject-matter, but the few examples agree to the distinction drawn. The aorist subjunctive is abundant enough. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 123) finds in O.P. (all ii/A.D.) six aorist subjs. with **μή**. Thus **μὴ ἀμελήσῃς** refers to a request in a letter. Cf. also **μὴ ἄλλως ποιήσῃς, ὅρα μηδενὶ--προσκρούσῃς.** But **τοῦτο μὴ λέγε**, 'stop saying this,' is in a letter in reference to what had already been said. So **μὴ ἀγωνία**, ‘don't go on worrying' Another good example is in Hb.P. 56 (iii/B.C.), **σὺ οὖν μὴ ἐνόχλει αὐτόν**. Moulton clinches it by the modern Greek **μὴ γράφῃς** (to one already writing) and **μὴ γράψῃς** (to one who has not begun),

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 240.
[2] Prol., p. 122. [3] Ib., p. 122 f.

The distinction is not admitted by all modern scholars.[1] But the difficulty lies mainly in the use of the present imperative, not in the aorist subj. Examples like **μὴ θαυμάσῃς** (Jo. 3:7) do occur, where the thing prohibited has begun. Here it is the constative aorist rather than the ingressive which is more usual in this construction. Moulton[2] quotes Dr. Henry Jackson again: "**Μὴ** δράσῃς always, I believe, means, 'I warn you against doing this,' 'I beseech you will not'; though this is sometimes used when the thing is being done; notably in certain cases which may be called colloquial or idiomatic, with an effect of impatience, **μή φροντίσῃς**, 'Oh, never mind!' **μὴ δείσῃς**, 'Never fear!' **μὴ θαυμάσῃς**, 'You mustn't be surprised!'" Add also **μὴ φοβηθῇς** (Mt. 1:20). But, as a rule, it is the ingressive aorist subj. used in prohibitions to forbid a thing not yet done or the durative present imper. to forbid the continuance of an act. The N. T. is very rich in examples of both of these idioms because of the hortatory nature of the books.[3] Moulton[4] finds 134 examples of **μή** with the pres. imper. and 84 of **μή** with the aorist subj. In Matthew there are 12 examples of **μή** with the pres. imper. and 29 of **μή** with the aorist subj. But these figures are completely reversed in the Gospel of Luke (27 to 19), in James (7 to 2), in Paul's Epistles (47 to 8) and John's writings (19 to 1). The case in Jo. 3:7 has already been noticed. It may be said at once that the excess of examples of pres. imper. over aorist imper. is the old situation in Homer.[5] In the Attic orators, Miller (*A. J. P.*, xiii, 423) finds the proportion of **μὴ ποίει** type to **μὴ ποιήσῃς** type 56 to 44, about the same as that in the N. T., 134 to 84. In the N. T. this predominance holds except in Matthew, 1 Peter and Rev. (Moulton, *Prol*., p.124). The aorist imper. was an after-growth, and yet is very common in the N. T. (and LXX) as compared with the older Greek.[6] In a the Lord's Prayer, for instance, every tense is aorist (Mt. 6:9-13). Gildersleeve remarks that the aorist suits "instant prayer." But cf. Lu. 11: 2-4. However, the point is

[1] Cf. R. C. Seaton, Cl. Rev., Dec., 1906, p. 438. [2] Prol., p. 126.

[3] Ib., p. 123. Mr. H. Scott properly observes that "the correctness of these figures will depend upon how a repeated **μή** or **μηδέ** *without a verb* is to be counted. E.g. is Mt. 10:9 f. to be counted as one or as seven? The same question arises with a verb without a repeated **ἐάν** or **ἵνα**, etc. It seems to me that these are merely abbreviated or condensed sentences and should be counted as if printed *in extenso* — as separate sentences. In that case Mt. 10:9 f. would count seven instances of **μή** with subj. aor."

[4] Ib. [5] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 244,

[6] Gildersl., Justin Martyr, p. 137.

here that in the N. T., as a rule, the idiom gives little difficulty. Cf. **μὴ νομίσητε** (Mt. 5:17); **μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς** (Mt. 6:13; Lu. 11:4); **μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς ταύτην** (Ac. 7:60). Cf. **μὴ σαλπίσῃς** (Mt. 6:2), 'don't begin to sound,' and **μὴ θησαυρίζετε** (6:19), 'they were already doing it.' Note again **μὴ δῶτε μηδὲ βάλητε** (Mt. 7:6) and **μὴ κρίνετε** (7:1). With Mt. 3:9 **μὴ δόξητε λέγειν** compare Lu. 3:8 **μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν**. But in Lu. 3:14, **μηδένα διασείσητε μηδὲ συκοφαντήσητε**, we have the constative aorist rather than the pres. imper. (the soldiers were present, if John spoke in Greek to them, more restrained at any rate). In Lu. 11:7, **μή μοι κόπους πάρεχε**= 'quit troubling me,' while in Rev. 10:4, **μὴ αὐτὰ γράψῃς**= 'do not begin to write.' (Cf. **ἤμελλον γράφειν** in same verse.) It is not necessary to labour the point. But in Mt. 6:25 we have **μὴ μεριμνᾶτε**, implying that they were anxious in 6:34, **μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε**, a general warning in conclusion. Once more, in Mt. 10:26, note **μὴ οὖν φοβεῖσθε αὐτούς**, the warning against fearing evil men; in 10:31, **μὴ οὖν φοβεῖσθε**= 'quit being afraid.' In Jo. 5:45, **μὴ δοκεῖτε**, it is implied that 'they had been thinking that'; in 2 Cor. 11:16, **μή τίς με δόξῃ**, 'no one did, of course.'[1] In Jo. 6:43 **μὴ γογγύζετε** is interpreted by **ἐγόγγυζον** in verse 41. Cf. **μὴ κλαίετε** (Lu. 8:52), 'they were weeping.' In **μὴ δόξῃ** (2 Cor. 11:16) and **μὴ ἐξουθενήσῃ** (1 Cor. 16:11) the normal use of **μή** with the aorist subj. occurs with the third person. A good double example occurs in Lu. 10:4, **μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον** ('don't keep carrying'), and in **μηδένα ἀσπάσησθε** ('don't stop to salute'). In Col. 2:21 **μὴ ἅψῃ** a warning to the Colossian Christians not to be led astray by the gnostic asceticism. In 2 Cor. 6:17, **ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἅπτεσθε**, the prophet (Is. 52:11) assumes that the people were guilty, if **א**AQ be followed as by Paul, but B has **ἅψησθε**. In Jo. 20:17, **μή μου ἅπτου**, Jesus indicates that Mary must cease clinging to him. Cf. **μήτε ὀμόσῃς** (Mt. 5:36) and **μὴ ὀμνύετε** (Jas. 5:12). As to the present imperative further discussion belongs elsewhere, but a word is necessary here. Moulton[2] thinks that "rather strong external pressure is needed to force the rule upon Paul." John has only one case of **μή** with the aorist subj., and yet Moulton holds that all his uses of the present imper. fit the canon completely. Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 164) says: " **μή** with the present imperative has to do with a course of action and means sometimes 'keep from' (resist), sometimes 'cease to' (desist)." So 'continue not doing,' or 'do not continue doing.' One of the imper. presents is merely exclama-

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 196. [2] Prol., p. 125.

tory (cf. ἄγε, Jas. 5:1). Another, like ὅρα with μηδενὶ εἴπῃς (Mt. 8:4), is almost like a "sort of particle adding emphasis."[1] If "a negative course of action" (Gildersleeve) is enjoined, it is not necessarily implied that one is doing the thing. Moulton's difficulty about Paul is thus obviated. Hence the answer[2] to μὴ ποίει, which usually= 'Stop doing,' may be in a given case= 'Do not from time to time,' 'Do not as you are in danger of doing,' 'Do not attempt to do' or simply 'Continue not doing.' In Eph. 5:18 μὴ μεθύσκεσθε may mean that some of them were getting drunk (cf. even at the Lord's Table, 1 Cor. 11:21), or a course of action (the habit) may be prohibited. In μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε (Eph. 4:26) the imminent peril of sin may be implied (cf. ὀργίζεσθε). So in in μὴ ψεύδεσθε (Col. 3:9) we may have the course of action, though the usual linear notion is pertinent. But cf. μὴ ἀμέλει (1 Tim. 4:14), μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, and μηδὲ κοινώνει (5:22),[3] and μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί (Mt. 6:16), as illustrations of the point in dispute. In the modern Greek "as a prohibitive the *aorist* subj. is on the whole less commonly used than the pres. subj." (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 127). **Μή** with the present imper. survives in a few instances, but the subj. in modern Greek does practically all the work of prohibiting.

(ε) *Aorist Subjunctive with* **οὐ μή**. It is merely the tense that calls for comment here, not the mode nor the negative. The present subj. was sometimes used with **οὐ μή** in the ancient Greek, but no examples occur in the N. T. The aorist is very natural as the action is distinctly punctiliar. Of the 100 examples of **οὐ μή** in the W. H. text, 86 are with the aorist subj., 14 are future inds.[4] Cf. **οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε** (Mt. 5:20); **οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω** (Mk. 14:25). The other aspects of the subject will be discussed elsewhere (chapters on Modes and Particles).

(ζ) *Aorist Optative*. It is more frequent than the present in the N. T. This is partly due to the relative frequency of **μὴ γένοιτο** (cf. Gal. 6:14) and the rarity of the optative itself. The distinction of tense is preserved. Cf. **μηδεὶς φάγοι** (ingressive, Mk. 11:14); πληθυνθείη (effective, 1 Pet. 1:2); **κατευθύναι—πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι** (constative, 1 Th. 3:11 f.). Cf. δῴη (2 Tim. 1:16, 18). Cf. 2 Tim. 4:16. These are wishes. The aorist occurs also with the potential opt. as in **τί ἄν ποιήσαιεν**, (Lu. 6:11). Cf. Ac. 26:29. In the N. T. certainly the optative usually refers to the future (relatively), though Gildersleeve[5] is willing to admit

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 124. [2] Ib., p. 125 f. [3] Ib.
[4] Ib., p. 190. [5] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 403.

that Homer uses the potential opt. with to a few times of the past. The opt. in indirect questions has to be noted.

(d) **The Aorist Imperative**. In Homer the aorist imperative, as already stated, is not so common as the present, while in the N. T. it is remarkably frequent.[1] This frequency of the imper. is characteristic of the **κοινή** generally,[2] though in the end the subj. came to be used in positive commands like the Latin.[3] There is no complication in the positive command, like the ban put upon **μὴ ποίησον** from the beginning of our knowledge of the Greek language.[4] Hence in the positive imperative we are free to consider the significance of the aorist (and present) tense in the essential meaning. Here the distinction between the punctiliar (aorist) and the durative (present) is quite marked.[5] Indeed Moulton (*Prol*., p. 129) holds that to get at "the essential character of aorist action, therefore, we must start with the other moods" than ind. It is easier, for the time element is absent. Cf. **περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου καὶ ἀκολούθει μοι** (Ac. 12:8). It is exactly the distinction between the aorist and imperf. ind. (cf. **ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει** in verse 9). The constative aorist, **περιβαλοῦ**, is like the preceding, **ζῶσαι καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου.** In Jo. 5:8 note **ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει** (the ingressive aorist and the durative, 'walking,' 'went on walking'), and the same tense-distinction is preserved in verse 9, **ἦρε---καὶ περιεπάτει** (cf. further 5:11). In **ὕπαγε νίψαι** (Jo. 9:7) the present **ὕπαγε** is exclamatory (cf. **ἔγειρε ἆρον** in 5:8). Cf. Mk. 2:9, 11. In the midst of the aorists in Jo. 2:5-8 (the effective **ποιήσατε, γεμίσατε, ἀντλήσατε νῦν**) the present **φέρετε** stands out. It is probably a polite conative offer to the master of the feast. In the Lord's Prayer in Mt. (6:9-11) note **ἁγιασθήτω, γενηθήτω, δός, ἄφες** and **εἴσελθε--ῥύσαι** in 6:6. In opposition to **δὸς σήμερον** in Matthew we have **δίδου τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν** in Lu. 11:3, a fine contrast between the punctiliar and the linear action.[6] So **τῷ αἰτοῦντι δός** (Mt. 5:42) and **παντὶ αἰτοῦντι δίδου** (Lu. 6:30); **χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ** (Lu. 6:23) and. **χαίρετε** (Mt. 5:12); **ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε** (Jo. 2:16, a, very fine illustration). In Ro. 6:13 a pointed distinction in. the tenses is drawn, **μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτούς** (one the habit of sin forbidden, the other the instant surrender to God enjoined). Cf. also **νῦν**

[1] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 244 f.; Apr., 1909, p. 235.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 451.
[3] Ib., p. 449.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 173.
[5] Thomson, The Gk. Tenses in the N. T., p. 29.
[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 129.

παραστήσατε in verse 19. In Lu. 7:8, πορεύθητι — πορεύεται, ποίησον—ποιεῖ, the presents are also aoristic. As with the ind. the aorist (constative) may be used with a durative word. So μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ (Jo. 15:9). The action, durative in itself, is treated as punctiliar. Cf. Mt. 26:38, μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε μετ' ἐμοῦ (Mk. 14:34). So with μακροθυμήσατε ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου (Jas. 5:7); τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον (1 Tim. 6:20. Cf. 2 Tim. 1:14; 1 Jo. 5:21); ταῦτα παράθου (2 Tim. 2:2); συνακοπάθησον (2:3); σπούδασον (2:15). Cf. the aorists in Jas. 4:9. Most of them call for little comment. Cf. Jo. 4:16, 35. Abbott[1] notes the avoidance of the aorist imper. of πιστεύω, possibly because mere belief (aorist) had come to be misunderstood. The pres. imper. presses the continuance of faith (cf. Jo. 14:11). The real force of the effective aorist is seen in λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον (Jo. 2:19). In Mk. 15:32, καταβάτω νῦν, the "perfective" force of the preposition is added. Moulton[2] notes that 1 Peter shows a marked liking for the aorist (20 aorists to 5 presents in commands, H. Scott), while Paul's habit, as already noted, is just the opposite. Moulton[3] has an interesting comment on the fact that "in seven instances only do the two evangelists [Mt. 5-7 and Luke's corresponding passage] use different tenses, and in all of them the accompanying variation of phraseology accounts for the differences in a way which shows how delicately the distinction of tenses was observed." There may be variations in the translation of the Aramaic original (if the Sermon on the Mount was spoken in Aramaic?), "but we see no trace of indifference to the force of the tenses." In the imperative also different writers will prefer a different tense. One writer is more fond of the aorist, another of the present. Note the impressive aorists, ἄρατε τὸν λίθον, λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἄφετε αὐτὸν ὑπάγειν (Jo. 11:39, 44). Abbott[4] rightly calls the aorist here more authoritative and solemn than the present would have been. The aorist here accords with the consciousness of Jesus (11:41, ἤκουσας). The aorist imper. occurs in prohibitions of the third person, like μὴ γνώτω (Mt. 6:3); μὴ καταβάτω (24:17); μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω (24:18). This construction occurs in ancient Greek, as μηδέ σε κινησάτω τις, Soph. Ai. 1180. But μή and the aorist subj. was preferred. In the N. T. this is rarely found (1 Cor. 16:11; 2 Th. 2:3; 2 Cor. 11:16).

(e) **The Aorist Infinitive.** In Homer the durative (present) idea is more common than the punctiliar (aorist) with the infini-

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 319 f.
[2] Prol., p. 174.
[3] Ib.
[4] Joh. Gr., p. 318 f.

Live, as with the imperative.[1] There is, of course, no time in the inf. except relative time in indirect discourse. The history of the inf. belongs elsewhere, but here we have only to do with the excellent illustration of punctiliar action afforded by the aorist inf. Radermacher, p. 123, finds the aorist and the pres. inf. together in the Carthaginian inscr. (Audollent, 238, 29, Hi/A.D.), **μηδὲ τρέχειν μηδὲ περιπατεῖν μηδὲ νικῆσαι μηδὲ ἐξελθεῖν**. So in the papyri B.G.U., I, 183, 25. The features of the tenses in the inf., once they are fully established, correspond closely to the use in the moods.[2] As a matter of fact originally the inf., because of its substantival origin, was devoid of real tense-idea (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 204), and it was only by analogy that tense-ideas were associated with the inf. But still the aorist inf. deserves a passing word. Take Ac. 15:37 f., for instance,[3] **Βαρνάβας δὲ ἐβούλετο συνπαραλαβεῖν καὶ τὸν Ἰ. τὸν καλ. Μάρκον**. Here the constative aorist is perfectly natural for the proposed journey. But see the outcome, **Παῦλος δὲ ἠξίου—μὴ συνπαραλαμβάνειν τοῦτον**. Paul was keenly conscious of the discomfort of Mark's previous desertion. He was not going to subject himself again to that continual peril (durative). Cf. also Mt. 14:22, **ἠνάγκασε τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι** (constative aorist), **καὶ προάγειν αὐτόν** (durative, 'go on ahead of him'). An interesting example occurs in Jo. 13:36 f., **οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι** (constative aorist most likely); **διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί σοι ἀκολουθεῖν ἄρτι** (durative, 'keep on following,' is Peter's idea).[4] The aorist inf. is the predominant construction with **δύναμαι, δυνατός, θέλω, κελεύω**, etc.[5] The distinction in tenses is well observed. For **δύναμαι** see further **λαμβάνειν** (Jo. 3:27) and **λαβεῖν** (14:17); **βαστάζειν** (16:12) and **βαστάσαι** (Rev. 2:2); **πιστεῦσαι**, (Jo. 5:44) and **πιστεύειν** (12:39).[6] Abbott notes also that **ποιῆσαι** occurs in John with **δύναμαι**, only in Jo. 11:37, whereas **ἰδεῖν, εἰσελθεῖν, γεννηθῆναι** are natural (3:3 ff.). So with **θέλω** note **λαβεῖν** (Jo. 6:21); **πιάσαι** (7:44), but **ἐρωτᾶν** (16:19). In Mt. 5:17 f. **καταλῦσαι** and **πληρῶσαι** are effective, but **σιγῆσαι** (Ac. 15:13) is ingressive, while **αἰτῆσαι** (Mt. 6 : 8) is constative. Cf. Lu. 7:24 f. The aorist inf. is rare with **μέλλω** (**ἀποκαλυφθῆναι**, Ro. 8:18; Gal. 3:23, though **ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι** in 1 Pet. 5:1). So **ἔμελον ἀποθανεῖν** (Rev. 3:2). Cf. Rev. 3:16; 12:4. A good example of the constative aorist

[1] idea Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., p. 244. In Sans. the inf. has no tenses at all.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 204. Cf. Gildersl., Synt., p. 133 f.; Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 30. Plato, Theat., 155 C, **ἄνευ τοῦ γίγνεσθαι γενέσθαι ἀδύνατον**.

[3] Moulton, ib., p. 130.

[4] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 361.

[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 196 f.

[6] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 360 f.

inf. occurs in Ro. 14:21.[1] The aorist inf. is used with an aorist as the ind., **οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι** (Mt. 5:17), the subj., **εἴπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι** (Lu. 9:54), the imper., **ἄφες θάψαι** (Mt. 8:22). But the aorist inf. is common also with durative tenses like **ἐζήτουν κρατῆσαι** (Mk. 12:12); **οὐκ ἤθελεν--ἐπᾶραι** (Lu. 18:13). There is apparently no instance in the N. T. of an aorist inf. used to represent an aorist ind. in indirect discourse.[2] In Lu. 24:46, **ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν**, we have the usual timeless aorist, the subject of **γέγραπται**. So **μὴ ἰδεῖν** (2:26). In Ac. 3:18 **παθεῖν** is the object of **προκατήγγειλεν**. The aorist and pres. inf. with prepositions vary a good deal. The aorist occurs with **μετά** (Mt. 26:32; Lu. 12:5, etc.), with **πρό** (Lu. 2:21; Jo. 1:48); **πρός** (Mt. 6:1); **εἰς** (Ph. 1:23); and even with **ἐν** sometimes (Lu. 2:27), but only once with **διά**, (Mt. 24:12). Cf. Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 49 f. The following are Mr. H. Scott's figures for the Synoptics:

ARTICULAR INFINITIVE

τό		**τοῦ**		**διὰ τό**		**εἰς τό**		**ἐν τῷ**		**μετὰ τό**		**πρὸ τοῦ**		**πρὸς τό**		Total	
P	A	P	A	P	A	P	A	P	A	P	A	P	A	P	A	P	A
2	4	9	22	12	1	1	6	31	8	--	6	--	3	2	5	57	55
6		31		13		7		39						7		116	
				Perf. 4													
				17													

Perf. 4

There are more articular presents than aorists in N. T.

(f) **The Aorist Participle.** The tenses got started with the participle sooner than with the inf. (cf. Sanskrit), but in neither is there time except indirectly. The Sanskrit had tenses in the participles. The aorist part. is not so frequent in Homer as is the present.[3] But "the fondness of the Greeks for aorist participles in narrative is very remarkable."[4]

(a) *Aktionsart*. That is present here also. Thus we find the ingressive aorist, **μεταμεληθείς** (Mt. 27:3); **φοβηθεῖσα** (Mk. 5:33); **ἀγνοήσαντες** (Ac. 13:27); **ἀγαπήσας** (2 Tim. 4:10). The effective

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 197.
[2] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 53.
[3] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 244.
[4] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gr., p. 213.

aorist appears in πληρώσαντες (Ac. 12:25), the constative in **συν-**παραλαβόντες (ib.). Further examples of the effective aorist are **πείσαντες τοὺς ὄχλους καὶ λιθάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον** (Ac. 14:19); **δικαιω-**θέντες (Ro. 5:1). The constative is seen again in **παραδούς** (Mt. 27:4); **πιστεύσαντες** (Jo. 7:39). The aorist participle in itself is, of course, merely punctiliar action.

(β) **Ὁ** *and the Aorist Participle.* The punctiliar force of the aorist part. is well illustrated in this idiom. It differs from the relative (ὅς + verb) in being a more general expression. In Mt. 23:20 f., **ὁ ὀμόσας ὀμνύει**, we have identical action, not antecedent. The aorist is, strictly speaking, timeless (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, p. 69). **Ὁ ὀμόσας**= 'the swearer,' **ὁ λαβών**= 'the receiver,' etc. Cf. Seymour, "On the Use of the Aorist Part. in Greek," T*ransactions of the Am. Philol. Ass.*, 1881, p. 89. In John the examples, however, are usually definite.[1] Contrast **ὁ λαβών** (Jo. 3:33) probably= 'the Baptist' with **πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας — μαθών** (6: 45) and **οἱ ἀκούαντες, οἱ ποιήσαντες** (5:25, 29). **Ὁ**+ aorist part. may be used with any tense of the ind. Thus **ὁ λαβών** in Jo. 3: 33 occurs with **ἐσφαράγισεν, πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας** (6:45) with **ἔρχεται, οἱ ποιήσαντες** (5:29) with **ἐκπορεύσονται**. Cf. Mt. 26:52, **πάντες οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται**. In simple truth the aorist in each instance is timeless. It is not necessary to take it as= future perf.[2] in an example like **ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται** (Mk. 13:13). So Mt. 10:39. Note the resumptive **οὗτος**. Cf. **ὁ γνούς—καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας δαρήσεται** (Lu. 12: 47). Cf. Jo. 7:39; 16:2; 20:29, in all of which examples the simple punctiliar action is alone presented in a timeless manner. But in Jo. 3:13, **οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐ-ρανοῦ καταβάς**, the content suggests antecedent action. Cf. also 6:41, **ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβάς**[3]; **τὸν ἀποστείλαντα** in Mt. 10: 40; Jo. 5:15, **ὁ ποιήσας**; Heb. 10:29. **Ὁ** and the aorist part. is sometimes used of an act past with reference to the time of writing, though future with reference to the action of the principal verb.[4] This classic idiom occurs in the N. T. also. Cf. **Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν**, (Mt. 10:4; cf. also 27:3); usually the phrase is **ὁ παραδιδούς** (26:25; Jo. 18:2, 5). So in Ac. 1:16 both **γενομένου** and **συλλαβοῦσιν** are future to **προεῖπε**. In Col. 1:8 **ὁ καὶ δηλώσας** is future to **ἐμάθετε**. So Jo. 11:2 (cf. 12:3) **ἦν δὲ Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλέψασα τὸν κύριον μύρῳ καὶ ἐκμάξασα τοὺς**

[1] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 363.

[2] As Abbott does, Joh. Gr., p. 362.

[3] Ib., p. 364 f.

[4] Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, p. 52 f.; Humphreys, Cl. Rev., Feb., '91.

πόδας αὐτοῦ. Cf. Ac. 7:35 τοῦ ὀφθέντος, 9:21 ὁ πορθήσας. This development, though apparently complex, is clue to the very indefiniteness (and timelessness) of the aorist participle and the adjectival force of the attributive participle.

(γ) *Antecedent Action*. This is the usual idiom with the circumstantial participle. This is indeed the most common use of the aorist participle. But it must not be forgotten that the aorist part. does not in itself mean antecedent action, either relative or absolute.[1] That is suggested by the context, the natural sequence of events. As examples of the antecedent aorist part. (antecedent from context, not *per se*) take νηστεύσας—ἐπείνασεν, (Mt. 4:2); ἰδὼν—μεταμεληθεὶς ἔστρεψεν, (27:3); ῥίψας — ἀνεχώρησεν, ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο (27:5). These so-called antecedent aorists do not have to precede the principal verb in position in the sentence. Thus ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός (Mk. 1:31), εὐχαριστοῦμεν—ἀκούσαντες (Col. 1:3, 4), μέλλει κρίνειν—παρασχών (Ac. 17:31), ἐκάθισεν—γενόμενος (Heb. 1:3). This idiom is very common in the N. T. as in the older Greek.[2] Indeed, one participle may precede and one may follow the verb as in Lu. 4:35, ῥίψαν—ἐξῆλθεν—βλάψαν. In Heb. 6:10 the aorist is distinguished from the present, ἐνεδείξασθε—διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες. In Ro. 5:16, δι' ἑνός ἁμαρτήσαντος, there is a reference to Adam (verse 14). The principal verb may itself be future as in ἆρας--ποιήσω (1 Cor. 6:15). In Lu. 23:19 ἦν βληθείς is punctiliar periphrastic (aorist passive), ἦν being aoristic also. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 249) cites ἦν ἀκούσασα from *Pelagia* (inscr. 18). Cf. ἦσαν γενόμενοι in Thuc. 4, 54, 3, and εἶη φανείς in Herod. 3:27. See Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 125.

(δ) *But Simultaneous Action is Common also*. It is so with the circumstantial participle as with the supplementary. Here again it is a matter of suggestion. It is simple enough with the supplementary participle as in ἔλαθον ξενίσαντες (Heb. 13:2), though rare, the present suiting better (cf. Mt. 17:25). The usual idiom is seen in ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν (Lu. 5:4). Indeed this simultaneous action is in exact harmony with the punctiliar meaning of the aorist tense. It is a very common idiom (chiefly circumstantial) in the N. T.[3] as in the older Greek.[4] So πέμψας—εἶπεν (Mt. 2:8); ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (22:1); ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα δίκαιον (27:4);

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 197; Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 70; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 160.

[2] W.-M., p. 433.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 131.

[4] Goodwin, Gk. Moods and Tenses, p. 49 f.

τε καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος (Ac. 10:33); χρησάμενος ἐπέστρεψεν, (27:3). Cf. Ac. 1:24; Ro. 4:20; Heb. 2:10. It is needless to press the point except to observe that the order of the part. is immaterial. Note Ac. 10:33 above. So in σῶσον καταβάς (Mk. 15:30); ἦλθαν σπεύσαντες (Lu. 2:16. Cf. σῶσον καταβάς, Lu. 19:5); ἐμαρτύρησεν δοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα (Ac. 15:8); διέκρινεν καθαρίσας (15:9); ἐποίησαν ἀποστείλαντες (11:30); ἐγκατέλειπεν ἀγαπήσας (2 Tim. 4:10); ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες (Ac. 19:2). This construction of the part. after the verb is very common in the N. T. The coincident use of the aorist tense occurs also with the imperfect, as ἐκπεπλήρωκεν—ἀναστήσας (Ac. 7:26), ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν (Mk. 14:72); the present, as ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει (Mk. 8:29); the perfect, as συνήλλασσεν—εἰπών (Ac. 13:33); and the future, as καλῶς ποιήσεις προπέμψας (3 Jo. 6).[1] In many examples only exegesis can determine whether antecedent or coincident action is intended, as in Heb. 9:12 εἰσῆλθεν—εὑράμενος (Moulton, Prol., p. 132). So Moulton (*ib*., p. 131) notes εἰποῦσα a for antecedent and εἶπασα (BC*) for coincident action in Jo. 11:28. The coincident aorist part. is common enough in the ancient Greek (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 141). The papyri show it also. Cf. εὖ ποιήσεις δούς, F.P. 121 (iii A.D.), a constant formula in the papyri (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 131). Moulton (*ib*.) illustrates the obscure ἐπιβαλών in Mk. 14:72 by ἐπιβαλὼν συνέχωσεν Tb.P. 50 (B.C.), 'he set to and dammed up.' If it is coincident in Mark, it is so "with the first point of the linear ἔκλαιεν."

(ε) *Subsequent Action not Expressed by the Aorist Participle.* Some writers have held this as possible, though no satisfactory examples have been adduced. Gildersleeve[2] denies that Stahl succeeds in his implication. "Coincidence or adverbiality will explain the tense." Burton[3] likewise admits that no certain instance of an aorist part. used to express subsequent action has been found. He claims the idiom in the N. T. to be due to "Aramaic influence." But we can no longer call in the Aramaic or Hebrew, alas, unless the Greek itself will not square with itself. The instances cited by Burton are all in Acts (16:23; 22:24; 23:35; 24:23; 25:13). "In all these cases it is scarcely possible to doubt that the participle (which is without the article and follows the verb) is equivalent to καί with a co-ordinate verb and refers to an action

[1] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 65. Cf. Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 50.

[2] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 408.

[3] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 66.

subsequent in fact and in thought to that of the verb which it follows."[1] This view is held by Prof. Sir W. M. Ramsay[2] to apply to Ac. 16:6, and is in fact essential to his interpretation of that passage. Rackham[3] adds Ac. 12:25 and regards these examples as "decisive." Another instance urged is Ac. 21:14. But are they "decisive" after all? Gildersleeve[4] is still unconvinced. Blass[5] bluntly says that such a notion "is not Greek" and even refuses to follow the uncials in Ac. 25:13 in reading ἀσπασάμενοι rather than ἀσπασόμενοι. Moulton[6] refuses to follow Rackham in his interpretation of Ac. 12:25: "But to take συνπαραλαβόντες in this way involves an unblushing aorist of *subsequent* action, and this I must maintain has not yet been paralleled in the N. T. or outside." And, once more, Schmiedel[7] comments on Ac. 16:6: "It has to be maintained that the participle must contain, if not something antecedent to 'they went' (διῆλθον), at least something synchronous with it, in no case a thing subsequent to it, if all the rules of grammar and all sure understanding of language are not to be given up." The matter might safely be left in the hands of these three great grammarians. But an appeal to the examples will be interesting. As to Ac. 12:25, ὑπέστρεψαν—πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συνπαραλαβόντες Ἰωάνην, there is no problem at all unless εἰς be read rather than ἐξ or ἀπό. It is true that ℵBL read εἰς, but that reading is contradicted by the context. In 11:30 it is plain that Barnabas and Saul were sent from Antioch to Jerusalem, and in 13:3, 5, they are in Antioch with John Mark. The great uncials are not always correct, but if they are right in reading εἰς, the text has been otherwise tampered with. Even granting the genuineness of εἰς and the "subsequent" aorist, we are absolutely in the dark as to the sense of the passage. With εἰς the coincident aorist is good Greek, but still leaves us in the dark. With ἐξ or ἀπό there is no problem at all, πληρώσαντες being antecedent, and συνπαραλαβόντες coincident. In 16:6, διῆλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν

[1] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 66.

[2] St. Paul the Traveller, p. 212. Cf. discussion in The Expositor in 1894 and The Exp. Times, Aug., 1894. In The Exp. Times (1913) Ramsay has sought another interpretation of the passage without the notion of "subsequent" action.

[3] Comm. on Acts, p. 183 f.

[4] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 408. Cf. also his Pindar Pyth., IV, 189.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 197 f.

[6] Prol., p. 133.

[7] Encyc. Bibl., II, p. 1599.

χώραν, κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, the participle is naturally antecedent (or coincident). Paul was headed west for Asia, but, being forestalled by the Spirit, he turned farther north through "the Phrygian and Galatic region." Later he tried to push on into Bithynia, but the Spirit again interposed and he deflected northwest to Troas (16:7 f.). One is not entitled to make κωλυθέντες= καὶ ἐκωλύθησαν because of the exigencies of a theory that demands that "the Phrygian and Galatic region" be Lycaonia (southern part of the Roman province of Galatia), which had already been traversed (16:1 f.). Besides, the narrative in 16:6 seems to be not resumptive, but a new statement of progress. Whatever the fate of the much discussed "South Galatian" theory, the point of grammar here is very clear. Another so-called instance is in 16:23, ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακήν, παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι. This is so obviously a case of coincident action that it would never have been adduced but for need of examples to support a theory elsewhere. Certainly "in 17:26 ὁρίσας is not 'later' than the ἐποίησεν in time (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 133). Still worse is the instance in 21:14, μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡρυχάσαμεν εἰπόντες· Τοῦ κυρίου τὸ θέλημα γινέσθω. The participle is here necessarily antecedent or coincident (this last remark of acquiescence). So in 22:24, ἐκέλευσεν—εἴπας, the participle is coincident like the common ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν. Cf. λέγων in Heb. 2:11 f.; Ac. 7:35. Precisely the same thing is true of ἔφη — κελεύσας in 23:35. In 24:23, ἀνεβάλετο is expanded by three coincident aorist participles, εἰδώς — εἴπας--διαταξάμενος. There remains 25:13, κατήντησαν εἰς Καισαρίαν ἀσπασάμενοι τὸν Φῆστον. Here Blass, as already noted, accepts the future ἀσπασόμενοι, but the aorist is probably correct. But even so, if one simply notes the "perfective" force of the preposition in κατήντησαν, 'went down,' he will have no difficulty at all with the coincident action of the aorist part. Κατήντησαν is the effective aorist and accents the *end* (reinforced by κατ--). They came down saluting' ('by way of salutation'). The salutation took place, of course, when they were "down" (κατ—). Findlay (in loco) connects ἀσπ. with the initial act of κατήντησαν. Thus vanish into air the examples of "subsequent" action with the aorist part. in the N. T., and the construction is not found elsewhere. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 132) cites from the papyri, ἐξ ὧν δώσεις Σ. –λυτρώσασά μου τὰ ἱμάτια δρ. ἑκατόν O.P. 530 (ii/A.D.), a clear case of coincident action. The redemption of the clothes is obtained by paying the hundred drachma.

(ζ) *Aorist Participle in Indirect Discourse (Complementary Participle)*. It is a rare construction on the whole,[1] though more frequent with ὁράω than with ἀκούω.[2] This aorist part. is absolutely timeless, not even relatively past. It is another instance of the coincident aorist part. So ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα (Lu. 4:23), ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα (10:18). In πεσόντα we have the constative aorist.[3] Contrast the perfect in Rev. 9:1, εἶδον ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεπτωκότα εἰς τὴν γῆν, and the present in Rev. 7:2, εἶδον ἄλλον ἀναβαίνοντα (linear), and εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια (Lu. 9:49). Cf. εἶδεν ἄνδρα--εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα (Ac. 9:12. So in 10:3; 26:13); ἠκούσαμεν—ἐνεχθεῖσαν (2 Pet. 1:18).

2. PUNCTILIAR (AORISTIC) PRESENT (ὁ ἐνεστὼς χρόνος). The present tense is named entirely from point of time which only applies to the indicative. But a greater difficulty is due to the absence of distinction in the tense between punctiliar and linear action. This defect is chiefly found in the indicative, since in the subj., opt., imper., inf. and part., as already shown, the aorist is always punctiliar and the so-called present practically always linear, unless the *Aktionsart* of the verb itself is strongly punctiliar. Cf. discussion of the imper. But in the ind. present the sharp line drawn between the imperf. and aorist ind. (past time) does not exist. There is nothing left to do but to divide the so-called Pres. Ind. into Aoristic Present and Durative Present (or Punctiliar Present and Linear Present). The one Greek form covers both ideas in the ind.[4] The present was only gradually developed as a distinct tense (cf. the confusion about ἔ-φη-ν, whether aorist or imperf.). The present is formed on punctiliar as well as linear roots. It is not wise therefore to define the pres. ind. as denoting "action in progress" like the imperf. as Burton[5] does, for he has to take it back on p. 9 in the discussion of the "Aoristic Present," which he calls a "distinct departure from the prevailing use of the present tense to denote action in progress." In sooth, it is no "departure" at all. The idiom is as old as the tense itself and is due to the failure in the development of separate tenses for punctiliar and linear action in the ind. of present time. "The forms εἰμί, εἶμι, φημί, ἄγω, γράφω, etc., in which the stem has the form generally found only in aorists (§ 11, § 31) may be

[1] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 408.
[2] Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 51. [3] Moulton, Prol., p. 134.
[4] Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 120 f.; Sayce, Intr. to the Science of L., vol. II, p. 152 f. [5] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 6.

regarded as surviving instances of the 'Present Aorist,' i.e. of a present not conveying the notion of progress. We may compare the English use of *I am, I go* (now archaic in the sense of *I am going), I say, (says she)*, etc."[1] Hear Monro again: "The present is not a space of time, but a point," and, I may add, yields itself naturally to aoristic (punctiliar) action. Some presents are also "perfective" in sense like **ἥκω**. The so-called "present" tense may be used, therefore, to express an action simply (punctiliar), a process (durative or linear), a state (perfective or perfect).[2] Some of the root-presents (like **φη-μί**) are aoristic. The perfect came originally out of the root-meaning also (cf. **ἥκω, οἶδα**) and grew out of the present as a sort of intensive present.[3] The notion of state in **νικῶ, κρατῶ, ἡττῶμαι** is really that of the perfect. So the momentary action in βη (**ἔ-βη-ν**) becomes linear in the iterative (**βι-βά-ω**, 'patter, patter.' Moulton[4] clearly recognises that "the punctiliar force is obvious in certain presents." The original present was probably therefore aoristic, or at least some roots were used either as punctiliar or linear, and the distinctively durative notions grew up around specially formed stems and so were applied to the form with most verbs, though never with all. In the modern Greek we find "the creation of a separate *aorist present* (**πάγω**)," while **παγαίνω** is linear. So **παγαίνω** is 'I keep going,' while **πάγω** is 'I go' (single act). Cf. Thumb, *Handb*., p. 119. "As a rule the present combines cursive (durative, continuous, etc.) and aorist action" (*ib*., p. 120). The aoristic present= undefined action in the present, as aoristic past (ind.) =undefined action in the past. In the case of **ἄγω** we see a root used occasionally for punctiliar, linear and even perfected action. There are, besides the naturally aoristic roots, three special uses of the aoristic present (the universal present, the historical present, the futuristic present).[5]

(a) **The Specific Present**. Gildersleeve[6] thus describes this simplest form of the aoristic present in contrast with the universal present. It is not an entirely happy description, nor is "effective present," suggested by Jannaris,[7] since there may be ingressive and constative uses also. The common **εἰμί** (Jo. 10:11) is often aoristic. A fine example of the constative aorist present occurs in Lu. 7:8, **πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται—ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται--ποίησον, καὶ ποιεῖ**. Cf. **ἐξορκίζω σε** (Mt. 26:63); **ὁρῶ** (Ac. 8:23);

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 45. [2] Giles, Man., p. 484. [3] Ib., p. 491 f.
[4] Prol., p. 119 f. [5] Giles, Man., p. 485. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 120.
[6] Synt. of Cl. Gk., p. 81, [7] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 433,

ἄρτι βλέπω (Jo. 9:25). The frequent ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω (Mt. 5:22, 28, etc.) is example of the specific aoristic present (constative). So ἀληθῶς λέγω (Lu. 12:44). Cf. σοὶ λέγω (Mk. 5:41); φησίν (Mt. 14:8); οὐ λαμβάνω—ἀλλὰ λέγω (Jo. 5:34), etc. In Mk. 2:5 ἀφίενται is effective aorist present as in ἰᾶται. (Ac. 9:34). Cf. ὅσοι οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔγνωσαν (Rev. 2:24); πόθεν ἦλθον and πόθεν ἔρχομαι (Jo. 8:14); ἔχει--ἦλθεν (Jo. 16:21). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 247) notes how in Mt. 6:2, 5, 16, ἀπέχουσι, the combination of the aoristic pres. and the perfective use of ἀπό makes it very vivid. "The hypocrites have as it were their money down, as soon as their trumpet has sounded." The "perfective" ἀπέχω (Mk. 14:41) is copiously illustrated in the papyri and ostraca (Deissmann, *Light*, etc., p. 111).

(b) *The Gnomic Present.* This is the aorist present that is timeless in reality, true of all time. It is really a gnomic present (cf. the Gnomic Aorist) and differs very little from the "Specific Present." In Mt. 23:2 ἐκάθισαν is gnomic, and in verse 3 we have the aoristic presents (gnomic also), λέγουσιν γὰρ καὶ οὐ ποιοῦσιν. Note Jo. 9:8. Cf. also ὡς λέγουσιν (Rev. 2:24). Good instances are found in 1 Cor. 15:42 ff., σπείρεται. So ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ποιοῦσι (Mt. 6:2). Abbott[1] has great difficulty with ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας προφήτης οὐκ ἐγείρεται (Jo. 7:52). It is this gnomic present. It is not true, to be sure, but this was not the only error of the Sanhedrin. Cf. Mt. 7:8.

(c) *The Historical Present.* This vivid idiom is popular in all languages,[2] particularly in the vernacular. "We have only to overhear a servant girl's 'so she says to me' if we desiderate proof that the usage is at home among us."[3] Cf. Uncle Remus. Curiously the historic present is absent in Homer.[4] But Gildersleeve[5] applauds Stahl for agreeing with his position "that it was tabooed as vulgar by the epos and the higher lyric" (A. J. P., xxiii, 245). It is absent from Pindar and the Nibelungenlied. Gildersleeve[6] also observes that it is much more frequent in Greek than in English and is a survival of "the original stock of our languages." "It antedates the differentiation into imperfect and aorist." The "Annalistic or Note-Book Present" (like γίγνονται παῖδες δύο) is practically the same use of the aorist present. Moulto[7] excludes γεννᾶται in Mt. 2:4, for that is more like the

[1] Joh. Gr.,358.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 434.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 120 f.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 47.
[5] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 393.
[6] Syntax of Cl. Gk., p. 86.
[7] Prol., p. 120.

futuristic (prophetic) use of the present. Brugmann[1] divides the hist. pres. into "dramatic" and "registering" or annalistic presents (cf. Gildersleeve). This vivid idiom is preserved in the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 120). It is common enough in the LXX, since Thackeray (Gr., p. xx) notes 151 examples in 1 Samuel, though it is rare in 2 Samuel and 2 Kings ("absent," Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 24). But Hawkins (*Horae Synopticae*, p. 213) finds it 32 times in 2 Samuel and twice in 2 Kings. Hawkins (*ib*.) finds the hist. pres. in the LXX 337 times. Josephus uses it also. The N. T. examples are thus "dramatic." The hist. pres. is not always aoristic. It may be durative like the imperfect.[2] This point has to be watched. Blass[3] considers that the historical present "habitually takes an aoristic meaning," but room has to be left for the durative meaning also. It is common in the Attic orators and in the N. T., except in Luke where it is rare.[4] Luke's Gospel has it only 9 times (possibly 11) and the Acts 13 times. Hawkins, from whose *Horae Synopticae* (2d ed., pp. 143 ff.) these figures are taken, finds 93 historic presents in Matthew (15 of them in Parables), but 162 in John and 151 in Mark. It is rare in the rest of the N. T. It is most frequent in Mark, John, Matthew and in this order. Mark indeed uses it as often as 1 Samuel, though a much shorter book. John's Gospel is much longer than Mark's, but when the discourses and dialogues are eliminated, the difference between John and Mark is not great.[5] Moulton[6] adds that the idiom is common in the papyri. Cf. Par. P. 51 (ii/B.C.) ἀνύγω—ὁρῶ—κλάγω — ἐπορευόμην—καὶ ἔρχομαι--ἔλεγον, etc. Moulton illustrates λέγει **Ἰησοῦ** in the Oxyrhynchus Logia by **Καῖσαρ** λέγει, Syll. 376. See also ἀφήρπασεν καὶ βούλεται, P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49). Luke's manifest reluctance to use it (changing Mark's historical presents except in 8:49) is due to the fact that in Luke's time the construction was regarded as "too familiar for his liking." He is the scientific historian, while Mark and John are the dramatists. Different writers would feel differently about it. "Josephus would use the tense as an imitator of the classics, Mark as a man of the people who heard it in daily use around him; while Luke

[1] Gk. Gr., p. 484 f. The hist. present demands merely that the reader take his stand with the writer in the midst of the moving panorama. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 261.

[2] Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 11.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 188. 4 Ib.

[5] Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 143 f. [6] Prol., p. 121.

would have Greek education enough to know that it was not common in the cultured speech of his time, but not enough to recall the encouragement of classical writers whom he probably never read and would not have imitated if he had read them."[1] But what about John? Jannaris[2] remarks that the idiom was common in the late Greek as in the early. The personal equation may have to explain the variations in the Gospels. Blass[3] undertakes to give a philosophy of the matter on the theory that the "circumstances," "incidentals" and "final results" are expressed in the past tenses of the ind., while the "principal actions" are found in the historical present. He cites Jo. 1:29-42 in illustration (βλέπει—λέγει—ἐμαρύρησεν—ἵστήκει—λέγει—ἤκουσαν—λέγει—εἶπαν—λέγει—ἦλθαν καὶ εἶδαν –ἦν –ἦν –εὑρίσκει—λέγει—ἤγαγεν--εἶπεν). One doubts if the phenomena can be brought under any rule. Matthew and Luke use **ἰδού**, to enliven the narrative, while Mark and John avoid it.[4] Mark has a habit of using **καί** before the historical present, while John often employs asyndeton.[5] But there is no doubt of the vividness of the narrative in Mark and John which is largely due to the historical presents. Modern literary English abhors this idiom, but it ought to be preserved in translating the Gospels in order to give the same element of vividness to the narrative. The historical present may begin[6] a paragraph (often so), occur in the midst of aorists and imperfects, or alternate with aorists. In Mt. 3:1 **παραγίνεται Ἰωάνης** is preceded by a note of past time. In Mk. 5:15 **ἔρχονται καὶ θεωροῦσιν** occur between aorists. In Mk. 4:37 the realistic **γίνεται λαῖλαψ** is followed by the imperfect. As specimens of this present in parables see Mt. 13:44. Sometimes the MSS. vary as between **φαίνεται** and **ἐφάνη** (Mt. 2:13). The variation in parables may be partly due to obscuration of the gnomic nature of the narrative. In such a wealth of material for illustration it is hard to select, but note John 20. In verse 1 f. note **ἔρχεται--βλέπει--τρέχει--ἔρχεται**, all indicating the excitement of Mary. Then the narrative goes on with aorists and imperfects till Peter and John draw near the tomb, when we have βλέπει—**ἔρχεται--θεώρει** (5-7) with two parenthetic aorists interjected (**οὐκ εἰσῆλθεν, εἰσῆλθεν**). In verse 8 the narrative is resumed by aorists. In verse 12 again **θεωρεῖ** shows the surprise of Mary at seeing the angels (**λέγουσιν**—**λέγει**, verse 13), as in verse 14

[1] Prol., p. 12k
[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 434.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 18.S.
[4] Hawkins, Hor. Synop., p. 144.
[5] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 350.
[6] W.-Th., p. 267.

the present is used when she sees Jesus. Historical presents run through the dialogue with Jesus (15-18). Then the resumptive **ταῦτα εἶπεν**. That is enough to say on the subject.

(d) *The Futuristic Present.* This futuris)ic present is generally punctiliar or aoristic.[1] The construction certainly had its origin in the punctiliar roots,[2] but some of the N. T. examples (cf. English "I am going," as well as "I go") are durative, as Moulton[3] shows. Thus in 1 Cor. 16:5 **διέρχομαι**, (in contrast with **διέλθω**) means 'I am going through' (Macedonia). **Γίνομαι** leans to the aoristic[4] and so **γίνεται** (Mt. 26:2) may be punctiliar. "In **αὔριον ἀποθνήσκομεν** (1 Cor. 15:32) we have a verb in which the perfective prefix has neutralized the inceptive force of the suffix **–ίσκω**: it is only the obsoleteness of the simplex which allows it ever to borrow a durative action."[5] The aoristic origin of many present-stems has already been shown (and some perfectives like **ἥκω**. Thus all three kinds of action are found in the present (punctiliar, durative, perfect). All three kinds of time are also found in the present ind. (historical present= past, futuristic present= future, the common use for present time). Some of these "momentary presents" are always future. So **εἶμι** in old Greek prose,[6] but Homer uses **εἶμι** also as a present.[7] The N. T. uses **ἔρχομαι** and **πορεύομαι** in this futuristic sense (Jo. 14:2 f.), not **εἶμι**. Indeed "the future of Greek was originally a present" (Jebb in Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook*, p. 323). That is too strong, for the future ind. often comes from the aorist subj. In the N. T. such so-called futures as **πίεσαι** and **φάγεσαι**, (Lu. 17:8) are really old aorist subjs. Cf. Mt. 24:40 f. The futuristic pres. occurs in the inscriptions and papyri, as in Petersen-Luschan, p. 160, N. 190, **ἂν δέ τις ἀδικήσῃ, ὑπόκειται**. See **ἂμ μὴ παύσεται, ἔρχεται**, B. M. II, 417 (iv/A.D.), **ἀντίγραψον κἀγὼ ἀναβαίνω**, 0. P. 1157, 25 f. (A.D./iii), **γράψον μοι καὶ πέμπω αὐτῷ ἐπιθήκην**, 0. P. 1158, 23 f. (A.D./iii). Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 124. In South Italian Greek the futuristic present is the only means of expressing the future incl.[8] The other use of the futuristic present is the dramatic or prophetic.[9] "This present — a sort of counterpart to the historic present — is very frequent in

[1] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 309; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 484.
[2] Giles, Man., p. 485. [3] Prol., p. 120. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 189.
[4] Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 393.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 120. [6] Gildersl., Synt., p. 84.
[7] Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 10.
[8] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 434. [9] Giles, Man., p. 485.

the predictions of the N. T."[1] It is not merely prophecy, but certainty of expectation that is involved. As examples note Mt. 17:11 **Ἠλείας ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα**, 24:43 **ποίᾳ φυλακῇ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται,** 26:2 **γίνεται καὶ --παραδίδοται**, 26:18 **ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα**, 27:63 **ἐγείρομαι** Lu. 3:9 **ἐκκόπτεται καὶ βάλλεται**, 19:8 **δίδωμι καὶ ἀποδίδωμι**, Jo. 4:35 **ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται**, 8:14 **ποῦ ὑπάγω,** 8:21 **ὑπάγω καὶ ζητήσετε**, 10:15 **τὴν ψυχήν μου τίθημι**, 12:26 **ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ** 20:17 **ἀναβαίνω**, 21:23 **οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει**, 1 Cor. 15:26 **καταργεῖται**. In Jo. 10:15 ff. **τίθημι** really covers the whole of Christ's life viewed as a unit (constative aorist).[2] In Mk. 9: 31 we have **παραδίδοται**, in Mt. 17:22 **μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι**. This use of **μέλλω** and inf. is a sort of half-way station between the futuristic present and the punctiliar future. Cf. Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 443. The futuristic pres. startles and arrests attention. It affirms and not merely predicts. It gives a sense of certainty. Cf. in Mt. 18:12, **ἀφήσει καὶ πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ** together, and **φεύγει** (Rev. 9:6).

3. THE PUNCTILIAR (AORISTIC) FUTURE (**ὁ μέλλων χρόνος**).

(a) **Punctiliar or Durative**. The future is a "mixed tense" both in origin and meaning.[3] The mixed origin was discussed in ch. VIII, (g). It was a late tense, little used in the early Vedic Sanskrit, and as a distinct form gradually disappeared from the modern Greek, where the periphrastic forms like **θὰ λύω** (**λύσω**) alone occur. But the modern Greek has developed thus two futures, **θὰ λύσω** punctiliar, **θὰ λύω** durative (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 116, 125). The Germanic languages (cf. English *shall* and *will*) have only the periphrastic future. For the history of the future ind. see Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., pp. 552 ff. In Sanskrit the fut. had no modes, i.e. it was confined practically to the ind. (Whitney, *Sans. Gr*., p. 201). The oldest roots are derived either from punctiliar presents (ind.) or aorist (punctiliar) subjunctives.[4] Cf. **πίομαι, βήσομαι**. Gradually the future was formed on durative roots also. Thus **μενῶ** 'I shall remain.' Some verbs formed two futures,[5] one punctiliar, like **σχήσω** from **ἔσχον**= 'I shall obtain,' the other durative, like **ἕξω** 'I shall have.' The **κοινή** has dropped **σχήσω,** as it has "generally got rid of alternative forms."[6] So also **θρέξομαι** (**τρέχω**) was durative and **δραμοῦμαι** (**ἔδραμον**) punctiliar,[7] though both are absent in the N. T. It is probable

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 189.
[2] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 352.
[3] Brug., Griech Gr., p. 479.
[4] Giles, Man., p. 447.
[5] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 480.
[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 150.
[7] Thompson, Synt., p. 219.

that in the future passive we have with most verbs a purely punctiliar future formed on the aorist stem. The middle future was usually durative, the future passive punctiliar.[1] Very few of the list of examples given by Jannaris can be illustrated in the N. T. owing to the disappearance of the future middle before the future passive. In 1 Pet. 4:18 **φανεῖται** (LXX, Prov. 11:31) is durative and certainly **φανήσεται** (Mt. 24:30) is punctiliar. So in Lu. 16:31 **πεισθήσονται** is punctilian, (effective), but **πείσομαι** does not occur in the N. T. So **κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν** (Lu. 21:19) seems to be durative, though no fut. passive of this verb appears in the N. T. So also **συναχθήσονται** (Mt. 24:28) is punctiliar (effective). But the very disappearance of the future middle (as with the Attic **φοβήσομαι**) threw the burden of the durative future[2] on the future passive. So **φοβηθήσομαι** in Heb. 13:6 is durative. Cf. the durative **ἀρκεσθησόμεθα** (1 Tim. 6:8). So also **ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι** (Ph. 1:18) is durative. Cf. also Jo. 16:20, 22, though **χαρήσονται** in Lu. 1:14 is ingressive punctiliar, as **πλησθήσεται** (1:15) is effective punctiliar. But in Jo. 16:20 both **λυπηθήσεσθε** and **γενήσεται** seem ingressive. In Heb. 9:28 **ὀφθήσεται** (cf. Ac. 26:16) is ingressive, but **ὄψομαι** may be either durative (Mt. 5: 8; Jo. 1:50; 19:37; Rev. 22:4) or punctiliar (Jo. 1:39; Heb. 12:14, etc.). An excellent example of the effective future is found in **ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος σωθήσεται** (Mt. 10:22). So the same form in the future may be either punctiliar or durative, as **προάξω ὑμᾶς** (Mk. 14:28) is durative, while **ἄξει** is punctiliar (effective= 'bring').[3] **Πείσομεν**, is punctiliar (effective) in Mt. 28:14 and durative in 1 Jo. 3:19. So **γνώσομαι** is punctiliar or durative (Rev. 2:23). As punctiliar this verb may be either ingressive (1 Cor. 14:7, 9), effective (1 Cor. 4:19) or merely constative (Jo. 8:28, 32). From the nature of the action as future this *Aktionsart* of the verb will not be as prominent[4] in the future aorist as in the other punctiliar constructions. Blass[5] even goes so far as to say that the future "is the one tense which does not express action [kind of action, he means], but simply a time relation, so that completed and continuous action are not differentiated." But it must be borne in mind that the future tense in itself makes as much distinction between punctiliar and dura-

[1] Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, pp. 114 ff., 170 ff.; Giles, Man., p. 483; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 441.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 150.

[3] Ib., p. 149.

[4] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 33.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201.

tive action as the present tense does. The difference is that the future is usually punctiliar, while the present is more often durative. The point need not be pressed. Other examples of the punctiliar aorist are καλέσεις (Mt. 1:21) ingressive; παρακληθήσονται (Mt. 5:4) effective, and so χορτασθήσονται, but ἐλεηθήσονται is ingressive while κληθήσονται is effective. In 1 Cor. 15:22, 28 note ζωοποιηθήσονται, and ὑποταγήσεται (effective). In Jo. 8:32 note ἐλευθεώσει effective= 'set free' (cf. ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε, verse 33).[1] So then both in origin and use the future is chiefly punctiliar.

(b) **The Modal Aspect of the Future.** The future indicative is not merely a tense in the true sense of that term, expressing the state of the action. It is almost a mode on a par with the subjunctive and imperative. Gildersleeve[2] puts the matter plainly when he says: "The future was originally a mood." In both Greek and Latin the forms of the future come for the most part from the subj. and it must be treated as a mode as well as a tense. Indeed Delbruck[3] and Giles[4] put it wholly under moods. It partakes, as a matter of fact, of the qualities of both mood and tense, and both need to be considered. The modal aspect of the fut. ind. is seen in its expression of *will* and *feeling*. Like the subj. the fut. ind. may be merely *futuristic, volitional* or *deliberative*. We have a reflection of the same thing in our *shall* and *will*. The fut. ind. has had a precarious history in Greek. Its place was always challenged by the present and even by the aorist ind., by the subj. and imper. modes, by periphrastic forms. It finally gave up the fight as a distinct form in Greek.[5] See under 3, (a). In the modern Greek the distinction between the periphrastic fut. and the subj. is practically lost.[6] The modal aspects of the fut. ind. appear clearly in subordinate clauses where the tense is common. In indirect discourse the future ind. merely represents the direct discourse (cf. Ro. 6: 8). The future with the descriptive or identifying relative[7] (Jo. 6:51) shows no modal features. But it is found in other relative clauses where purpose (Lu. 7:27) or result (Lu. 7:4) is expressed. The future has also a modal value in temporal clauses (Rev. 4:9; 17:17), in final clauses (Lu. 20:10; Heb. 3:12), in

[1] Moulton, p. 149.
[2] Synt., p. 115.
[3] Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 320 f.
[4] Man., pp. 500, 505; Thompson, Synt., p. 218.
[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 552.
[6] Blass, Hermeneutik and Krit., 1892, p. 199.
[7] Gildersl., Synt., p. 115.

conditional sentences (Lu. 19:40), in wish (Gal. 5:12). In Rev. 3:9 the fut. ind. and the aorist subj. occur side by side with ἵνα. But in independent sentences also the modal aspects of the future appear.

(a) *Merely Futuristic.* This is the most common use of the future and in itself would not be modal. It is the prospective, what lies before the speaker.[1] The predictive[2] (or prophetic) future has to be classed as aoristic (usually constative), though the question as to whether the action is durative or punctiliar may not have crossed the speaker's mind. Cf. Mt. 21:37 **ἐντραπήσονται,** 41 **ἀπολέσει,** 43 **ἀρθήσεται—δοθήσεται**, 24:31 **ἀποστελεῖ**, etc. Cf. Mk. 13:24-27. Further good examples of the predictive future are in Mt. 11:28 f.; 12:31. Unfortunately in English we have no established principle for the translation of the predictive future. In the first person it is done by "shall," and naturally by "will" in the second and third persons. It is not always easy to distinguish the merely futuristic from the volitive future, "but we have to reckon with an archaic use of the auxiliaries which is traditional in Bible translations."[3] The use of "shall" in the second and third persons is almost constant in the R. V. both for the volitive and the futuristic uses. If "shall" could be confined in these persons to the volitive and "will" to the futuristic, even "the solemnly predictive,"[4] it would be a gain.[5] Thus in Mk. 14:13 **ἀπαντήσει** would be 'will meet.' In Mt. 11:28 f. **ἀναπαύσω** would be 'shall give you rest' (R. V. will'), **εὑρήσετε** will find' (R. V. 'shall'). But **ἀναπαύσω** here may be volitive. If so, 'will' is correct. So in Mt. 12:31 **ἀφεθήσεται** would be 'will be forgiven' (R. V. 'shall'). Cf. also Mt. 26:13, **λαληθήσεται**= 'will be preached.' Moulton[6] notes that **ἀπαρνήσῃ** (Mt. 26:34; Mk. 14:30; Lu. 22:61) is often misunderstood because of the rendering 'shalt deny me.' "It could not therefore be Peter's fault if Jesus commanded him." Here "will" is free from that peril. Cf. Mt. 25:29, 32; Lu. 19:43. With the negative the English "shall" becomes volitive when the Greek is not. Cf. Mk. 13:31, **οὐ παραλεύσονται**, (cf. **οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ** in 13:30). Sometimes (very rarely) **οὐ μή** occurs with the predictive fut. (cf. the usual aorist subj.) as in **οὐ μὴ παραελεύσονται** (Lu. 21:33); **οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσιν** (Rev. 9:6); **οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσιν** (18:14; cf. **ἀπῆλθεν**,

[1] Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 309.
[2] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 34 f.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 150.
[4] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 34.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 151.
[6] Ib., p. 150.

ἀπώλετο). The construction of **οὐ μή** with the fut. ind. is "moribund" in the N. T.,[1] only 14 and some of these doubtful (MSS. vary greatly between aorist subj. and fut. ind.). Some of the 14 are examples of the volitive future. In Mt. 15:5 **οὐ μὴ τιμήσει** is probably volitive,[2] though some hold it predictive.

(β) *The Volitive Future.* The three divisions (futuristic, volitive, deliberative) glide into one another both in the subjunctive and the future incl.[3] The volitive future is practically an imperative in sense, for the will is exercised. The futuristic glides imperceptibly into the volitive "as in the colloquial **σὺ ὄψῃ**, 'you will see to that,' Mt. 27:4."[4] Cf. **ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε** (Mt. 27:24), **ἐκκόψεις** (Lu. 13:9). In Heb. 8:5 the imperative and the fut. ind. occur together, **ὅρα ποιήσεις**. The impatient **οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων** (Ac. 13:10) is almost imperatival, certainly volitive. "The future ind. is exceedingly common in this sense (volitive)."[5] In legal precepts the fut. ind. is unclassical.[6] But the idiom itself is classical and "is not a milder or gentler imperative. A prediction may imply resistless power or cold indifference, compulsion or concession."[7] It is exceedingly frequent in the LXX. It is chiefly found in the N. T. in quotations from the 0. T. Cf. **καλέσεις** (Mt. 1:21), **οὐκ ἔσεσθε** (6:5); **ἐρεῖτε** (21:3) = **εἴπατε** (Mk. 11:3). Cf. Jas. 2:8; Ro. 13:9; Gal. 5:14. The volitive future really includes purpose (will) in the first person, as well as in the second and (rarely) in the third. Thus **προσεύξομαι,** ψαλῶ (1 Cor. 14:15) = 'I will pray,' 'I will sing,' not mere futurity. So in **ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι** (Lu. 15: 18) we seem to find 'will,' not mere declaration. Most of the examples are in the second person, like **οὐκ ἔσεσθε** (Mt. 6:5), and are chiefly negative (4:7; Ac. 23:5; Ro. 7:7). But some examples occur in the third person also; though Burton[8] is sceptical. Cf. **ἔσται** in Mt. 20:26 f. (note **θέλῃ**). So Mk. 9:35. In Lu. 10:6 we have **ἐπαναπαήσεται ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη**, while in Mt. 10:13 **ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ᾽ αὐτήν**.[9] In the volitive future 'will' is the English translation for the first person, 'shall' for the second and third. The rare use of **μή** with the fut. ind. shows a volitive use. Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 117) is sceptical, but Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 177) cites from Demosthenes **μὴ βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι** and from B. U. 197 (i/A.D.) **μὴ ἐξέσται**, B. U. 814 (iii/A.D.)

[1] Prol., p. 190.
[2] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 35.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 18J
[4] Ib., p. 177.
[5] Ib., p. 176.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 209.
[7] Glidersl, Synt., p. 116.
[8] N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 35.
[9] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 209.

μὴ ἀφήσις, B. M. 42 μὴ — κρατήσεις (ii/B.C.). Blass[1] quotes μηδένα μιμήσετε from Clem., *Hom*., III, 69, and Moulton (*Prol*., p. 240) adds μὴ θησαυρίσεται, D in Mt. 6:19, and λέξεις δὲ μηδέν, Eurip., *Med*. 822, and observes (p. 248) that MS. evidence should be watched on the point. Sometimes **οὐ μή** occurs with the volitive future as in **οὐ μὴ τιμήσει**. (Mt. 15:5); **οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο** (16:22). In Mt. 26:35 **οὐ μὴ ἀπαρνήσομαι** is also volitive (cf. Mk. 14:31). The volitive future seems to be found in Lu. 10:19, **οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ ὑμᾶς ἀδικήσει** (W. H. text), but it is durative. But ou alone is the usual negative in the volitive future, as in **οὐχ ἁπράσει τις ἐκ τῆς χειρός μου** (Jo. 10:28. Cf. **οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται**). Cf. pres. imper. and fut. ind. side by side in Jo. 1:39 (cf. 1:46). On **οὐ μή** see Modes and Particles. It is possible that **οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς** (Mt. 16:18) is volitive.

(γ) *Deliberative Future*. Burton[2] has pointed out that questions are of two kinds (questions of fact or questions of doubt). Questions of fact make an inquiry for information about the past, present or future. These questions employ the moods and tenses as other simple declarative sentences in both direct and indirect discourse. But deliberative questions ask not for the facts, but about the "possibility, desirability or necessity" of a proposed course of action. The subj. as the mood of doubtful assertion is perfectly natural here. The future is also doubtful from the nature of the case. So deliberative questions use either the subj. or the fut. ind. Deliberative questions (like questions of fact) may be merely interrogative or they may be rhetorical. The deliberative questions in the N. T. with the fut. ind. are all direct questions except Ph. 1: 22, **τί αἱρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω**, where the punctuation is doubtful. (W. H. marg. have **τί αἱρήσομαι**.)[3] In **σχῶ τί γράψω** (Ac. 25:26) it is not certain whether γράψω is fut. ind. or aorist subj. In Lu. 11:5, **τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἕξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται— καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ**, the fut. ind. (rhetorical) and aorist subj. occur side by side if we can trust the reading. Cf. Mt. 7: 6, with **μήποτε**; Eph. 6:3, with ἵνα (0. T.). The examples of the fut. ind. in deliberative questions are all disputed by some MSS. which have the aorist subj., so that Blass[4] remarks that "the N. T. in this case practically uses only the conjunctive"; but that is an overstatement, since the best MSS. (see W. H. and Nestle texts) support the fut. ind. in some instances. As an example of merely interroga-

[1] Ib. [2] N. T. Moods and Tenses, pp. 36, 76 f.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 211.
[4] Ib., p. 210. Cf. W.-Th., p. 279.

tive deliberative questions with fut. ind. take εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ (Lu. 22:49). In Jo. 18:39, βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω, we may have the fut. ind. or the aorist subj., but note βούλεσθε. The N. T. examples are nearly all rhetorical. So Mt. 12:26 πῶς σταθήσεται, Mk. 4:13 πῶς—γνώσεσθε, Jo. 6:68 πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα. Cf. further Ro. 3:5; 6:1 (the common τί ἐροῦμεν); 9:14; 1 Cor. 14:7, 9, 16; 15:29, 51; 1 Tim. 3:5. Cf. Lu. 20:15. Cf. ἀγοράσωμεν καὶ δώσομεν (Mk. 6:37).

(c) **The Future in the Moods.** The future differs from the other tenses in this respect, that in the moods where it occurs it has always the element of time. This is not true of any other Greek tense.

(a) *The Indicative.* It is far more common here than in the other moods. In direct discourse the fut. ind. expresses absolute time. Cf. τότε ὄψονται (Lu. 21:27). In the gnomic future the act is true of any time (cf. gnomic aorist and present). So μόλις ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται (Ro. 5:7); χρηματίσει (7:3), etc. In indirect discourse the time is relatively future to that of the principal verb, though it may be absolutely past. So with ἐνόμισαν ὅτι λήμψονται (Mt. 20:10); εἶπεν σημείνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν (Jo. 21:19).[2]

(β) *The Subjunctive and Optative*. There never was a fut. imperative. The so-called fut. subjs. in the N. T. have already been discussed. W. H. admit ὄψσηθε to the text in Lu. 13:28, but claim it to be a late aorist subj.[3] The same thing may be true of δώσῃ, read by MSS. in Jo. 17:2; Rev. 8:3, but not of καυθήσωμαι in 1 Cor. 13:3. This may be a *lapsus calami*[4] for καυχήσωμαι. Harnack (*The Expositor*, May, 1912, p. 401) quotes Von Soden as saying: " **Κ**αυθήσωμαι — not καυθήσομαι — is to be recognised as the traditional form in families of MSS. which do not give καυχήσωμαι." But Harnack refuses to "saddle" Paul with this Byzantine "deformity." Jannaris[5] thinks that these sporadic examples in late Greek are the fut. ind. "spelt with the thematic vowel (η and ω) of the subjunctive." One naturally thinks of the Latin subj. future. The fut. opt. never had a place save in indirect discourse, and that is lost in the N. T.

(γ) *The Infinitive.* The future inf. was never a common construction and was almost confined to indirect discourse.[6] The six

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201.
[2] Ib.
[3] Appendix, p. 172.
[4] Ib.; Moulton, Prol., p. 151.
[5] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 556.
[6] See the list in Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 486.

examples in the N. T. seem to be punctiliar save two (Ac. 11: 28; Jo. 21:25). **Μέλλω** has the fut. inf. three times, but only in the case of **ἔσεσθαι** (Ac. 11:28; 24:15; 27:10). The three other instances of the fut. inf. in the N. T. belong to ind. discourse. One (**χωρήσειν**) occurs with or **οἶμαι** (Jo. 2:25), one (**ἔσεσθαι**) with **μηνύω**, or more exactly after **ἐπιβουλή** (Ac. 23:30, genitive absolute, **μηνυθείσης μοι ἐπιβουλῆς ἔσεσθαι**),[1] one (**εἰσελεύσεσθαι**) with **ὀμηύω** (Heb. 3:18). So that the fut. inf. "was already moribund for practical purposes."[2] In the papyri Moulton found the fut. inf. often a mere blunder for an aorist. In Ac. 26:7, B has the fut. inf. after **ἐλπίζω**. In the fut. inf. the time relation is only relative, as with all infinitives, not absolute as in the incl.[3] Elsewhere with such verbs the aorist occurs as with **ἐλπίζω** (1 Cor. 16:7); **μέλλω** (Ro. 8:18); **ὀμύω** (Ac. 2:30); **ὁμολογέω** (Mt. 14:7); **προσδοκάω** (Ac. 27:33); **προκαταγγέλλω** (Ac. 3:18); or the present inf. as with **μέλλω** (Ac. 3:3); or the perfect inf. as with **ἐλπίζω** (2 Cor. 5:11).

(5) *The Participle.* The future part. was later in its development[4] than the other tenses of this very ancient, even prehistoric,[5] verbal adjective. The fut. part. was never developed in the Boeotian Dialect.[6] It is by no means dead in the papyri. Moulton[7] notes "the string of final fut. participles in 0. P. 727 (ii/A.D.); B. U. 98 (iii/A.D., etc." See also **κοινολογησόμενον** P. Goodspeed 4 (ii/B.c.) **τὰ — (σ) ταθησόμενα** P. Tb. 33 (B.C. 112), and the list in 0. P. 1118, 10 f (i/A.DB.). It seems to me to be more common in the papyri than in the N. T. Simcox[8] suggests that its rarity in the N. T. is due to the use of other phrases. Cf. **μέλλω** in Ac. 18: 14; 20:3, 7 and **ἐρχόμενος** in Rev. 1:4, etc. The time is, of course, only relative to that of the principal verb, as in **ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων** (Ac. 8:27). The anarthrous examples are volitive[9] and are the most frequent.[10] They are used for purpose or aim. Cf. Mt. 27: 49 **ἔρχεται σώσων**, Ac. 8:27 **ἐληλύθει προσκυνήσων**, 22:5 **ἐπορευόμην ἄξων**, 24:11 **ἀνέβην προσκυνήσων**, 24:17 **ποιήσων παρεγενόμην**, Heb. 13:17 **ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὡς ἀποδώσοντες**. Cf. also v. 1. **ὡς εὑρήσων** in Mk. 11:13. These all seem to be punctiliar. Some MSS. also read **ἀσπασόμενοι** in Ac. 25:13. This is surely a slim showing corn-

[1] Simcox, Lang. of the N. T., p. 120, suggests omission of **μέλλω**.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 151. Cf. Hatz., Einl., pp. 190 ff.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 202.
[4] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 71.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 151.
[6] Claflin, Synt. of the B. Inscr., p. 73.
[7] Prol., p. 230.
[8] Lang. of the N. T., p. 126.
[9] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 496.
[10] Moulton, Prol., p. 151. That is, in the old Gk. Both volitive and futuristic are rare in the N. T.

pared with the classic idiom.[1] Some MSS. read **κομιούμενοι** in 2 Pet. 2:13, rather than **ἀδικούμενοι.** The future participle with the article is futuristic, not volitive. So with **τὸ ἐσόμενον** (Lu. 22:49); **ὁ παραδώσων** (Jo. 6:64); **τὰ συναντήσοντα** (Ac. 20:22); **ὁ κακὼσωμ** (1 Pet. 3:13); **τὸ γενησόμενον** (1 Cor. 15:37); **ὁ κατακρινῶν**, (Ro. 8:34); **τῶν λαληθησομένων** (Heb. 3:5).

(d) **The Periphrastic Substitutes for the Future.** The periphrastic future is as old as the Sanskrit and has survived the inflected form in Greek. Some of these forms are durative, probably most of them, but a few are punctiliar. Tannaris notes in Sophocles, 0. C. 816, **λυπηθεὶς ἔσει**, and 0. T. 1146, **οὐ σιωπήσας ἔσει,** but no examples of the aorist participle and **ἔσομαι** occur in the N. T. They are all present parts. (like **ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι**, Lu. 21: 17) and so durative. In the LXX we actually have the inf. with **ἔσομαι** (Num. 10:2; 2 Sam. 10:11; Tob. 5:15). The use of **μέλλω** with the aorist inf. approaches the punctiliar future.[2] Cf. **ἤμελλεν προσαγαγεῖν** (Ac. 12:6); **μέλλουσαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι** (Ro. 8: 18. Cf. Gal. 3:23), with which compare the pros. inf. in 1 Pet. 5:1. The aorist inf. occurs also in Rev. 3:2, 16; 12:4. The volitive future was sometimes expressed by **θέλω** and in the later Greek helped drive out the future form. It is disputed whether in the N. T. **θέλω** is ever a mere future. But in a case like **θέλεις εἴπωμεν** (Lu. 9:54) we note the deliberative subj.[3] Cf. Mt. 13: 28. So **βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω** (Jo. 18:39). **Βούλομαι** is less frequent in the N. T. than **θέλω** and can hardly be resolved into a mere future. It is purpose. Cf. examples with the aorist inf. in Mt. 11:27; Ac. 5:28; 17:20. With **θέλω** the aorist inf. is the usual construction, and it is nearly always easy to see the element of will as dominant. In a few cases **θέλω** seems to shade off towards the volitive fut. ind. Cf. Jo. 5:40, **οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με,** Ac. 25:9, **θέλεις—κριθῆναι**; Here we have an approach to the later usage, but the auxiliary has not yet lost its force. Cf. also Jo. 6:67; 9:27; Jas. 2:20, where the formula is polite. But in Jo. 7:17 the R. V. rightly preserves "willeth." So in Mt. 16:24. Herodotus shows a fondness for **ἐθέλω** as a quasi-auxiliary, and the connection between him and the modern Greek usage is doubtless through the vernacular. Cf. Jebb in Vine. and Dickson, p. 326. Even

[1] Cf. Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 335.

[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 443. Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 253. "The difference between pres. and aor. furnishes the explan. of **μέλλω** with aor. ind." Giles, Man., p. 479.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 185.

δύναμαι may contain an "inceptive future."[1] In Lu. 20:36 the MSS. vary between δύνανται, and μέλλουσιν. But in the N. T. δύναμαι retains its real force even in examples like Mk. 2:19; 3:24; 10:38; 14:7; Jo. 13:37; Ac. 17:19. In Ac. 25:26 note γράψαι οὐκ ἔχω (cf. σχῶ τί γράψω).

III. Durative (Linear) Action.

The principles underlying the use of the tenses have now been set forth with sufficient clearness to justify brevity.

1. INDICATIVE.

(a) **The Present** (ὁ ἐνεστώς) **for Present Time.** It has already been seen that the durative sense does not monopolize the "present" tense, though, it more frequently denotes linear action." The verb and the context must decide.

(a) *The Descriptive Present*. Its graph is (---). As with the imperfect, so with the present this is the most frequent use. Cf. ἀπολλύμεθα (Mt. 8:25. Contrast aorist σῶσον. So Mk. 4:38; Lu. 8:24); σβέννυνται (Mt. 25:8); ἐν ᾧ ἔχομαι (Jo. 5:7); φαίνει (1 Jo. 2:8) ; συνχύννεται (Ac. 21:31); τελεῖται (2 Cor. 12:9); θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτως ταχέως μετατίθεσθε (Gal. 1:6); ἐπιστρέφετε (4:9); ἔχουσιν, (Mk. 2:19). Cf. 1 Th. 3:8. In these examples the durative action is very obvious and has to be translated by the progressive (periphrastic) form in English, 'We are perishing,' 'Our lamps are going out,' etc. But in the case of θαυμάζω (Gal. 1:6) 'I wonder' brings out the durative idea, though 'ye are changing' is necessary for μετατίθεσθε. Cf. ἔχει (Jo. 3:36) where 'has' is durative. Cf. ζητοῦμεν (Lu. 2:48), οὐ θέλομεν (Lu. 19:14).

(β) *The Progressive Present.* This is a poor name in lieu of a better one for the present of past action still in progress. Usually an adverb of time (or adjunct) accompanies the verb. Gildersleeve[3] calls it "Present of Unity of Time." Cf. ἐστὶν ἕως ἄρτι (1 Jo. 2:9). Often it has. to be translated into English by a sort of "progressive perfect" ('have been'), though, of course, that is the fault of the English. "So in modern Greek, ἐξῆντα μῆνας σ' ἀγαπῶ (Abbott, *Joh. Gr*., p. 222). The durative present in such cases gathers up past and present time into one phrase" (Moulton, Prol., p. 119). Cf. **Ἰδοὺ** τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι (Lu. 13:7); τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι (15:29); πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ἔχει (Jo. 5:6); τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί (14:9); ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε (15:27); πάλαι δοκεῖτε (2 Cor. 12:19). Cf. ἀπὸ βρέφους οἶδας (2 Tim.

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Cr., p. 443. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 119.

[3] Synt., p. 86. Cf. Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 189; Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 10.

3:15). It is a common idiom in the N. T. Cf. 2 Pet. 3:4; 1 Jo. 3:8. In Jo. 8:58 **εἰμί** is really absolute.

(γ) *The Iterative or Customary Present.* Its graph is (. . . .) Cf. **ἐγκρατεύεται** (1 Cor. 9:25); **πυκτεύω** and **ὑπωπιάζω καὶ δουλαγωγῶ** (9:26 f.). So **νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδεκατεύω πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι** (Lu. 18:12); **δίδωμι καὶ ἀποδίδωμι**, (19:8, more likely it is a new purpose in Zaccheus, when it would be aoristic); **ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν** (1 Cor. 10:16); **ὃν κλῶμεν** (10:16); **προλαμβάνει** (11:21); **καταγγέλλετε** (11:26); **ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει** (11:29); **κοιμῶνται** (11:30); **οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει** (1 Jo. 3:6); **ἁμαρτάνει** (3:8). Cf. Mt. 9:17. Probably also **αφίομεν** (Lu. 11:4).

(δ) *The Inchoative or Conative Present.* Either an act just beginning, like **γίνεται**. (Mk. 11:23), **εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται** (4:17), **λιθάζετε** (Jo. 10:32), **νίπτεις** (13:6), **ποιεῖς** (13:27), **ἄγει** (Ro. 2:4), or an act begun but interrupted like **πείθεις** (Ac. 26:28; cf. 2 Cor. 5:11), **ἀναγκάζεις** (Gal. 2:14), **δικαιοῦσθε** (5:4), **ἀναγκάζουσιν** (6:12). Indeed **λιθάζετε** (Jo. 10:32) and **νίπτεις** (13:6) may be regarded as conative also. This idiom is more common in the imperfect. Cf. Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 82. In English we have to use "begin" or "try."

(ε) *The Historical Present*. These examples are usually aoristic, but sometimes durative.[1] In Mk. 1:12 we have **ἐκβάλλει** which is durative. Cf. **ἤγετο** in Lu. 4:1 (but Mt. 4:1, **ἀνήχθη**). So in Mk. 1:21 **εἰσπορεύονται** is durative. The same thing seems to be true of **ἀκολουθοῦσιν** in 6 : 1.

(ζ) *The Deliberative Present*. Rhetorical deliberative questions may be put by the present ind., but it is rather a rhetorical way of putting a negation than a question of doubt. Cf. **τί ποιοῦμεν;** (Jo. 11:47), 'What are we doing?' Cf. **τί ποιήσει** (Mt. 21:40) with **τί ποιῶμων** (Jo. 6:28) and **τί ποιήσωμεν** (Ac. 4:16). The implication of the question in Jo. 11:47 is that nothing was being done. In Mt. 12:34, **πῶς δυνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν ;** a durative deliberative question is expressed by means of **δύνασθε** and the pres. inf. Cf. a similar construction with **δεῖ** in Ac. 16:30.[2] Cf. the same idiom in an indirect question (Col. 4:6; 2 Th. 3:7; 1 Tim. 3:15). The use of the pres. ind. in a deliberative question is a rare idiom. Blass[3] finds parallels in colloquial Latin and an example in Herm., *Sim*., IX, 9, 1.

(η) *The Periphrastic Present*. The examples are not numerous in the LXX.[4] Cf. Num. 14:8; 1 Ki. 18:12, etc. It is rare in

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 11.
[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 210.
[3] Ib.
[4] C. and S., Sel., p. 68.

the N. T. Moulton[1] warns us that "**ἔχων ἐστί** and **δέον ἐστί** (with other impersonal verbs) are both classical and vernacular." In the present tense the idiom is on purely Greek lines, not Semitic. For classical examples see Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 81). So the impersonal verbs (and **ἔχω**) stand to themselves[2] in support from ancient Greek and the **κοινή**. Cf. **ἔστιν ἔχοντα** (Col 2:23); **πρέπον ἐστίν** (Mt. 3:15); **ἐξόν** (sc. **ἐστί**) in Ac. 2:29 and 2 Cor. 12:4; **δέον ἐστίν** (Ac. 19:36. Cf. 1 Pet. 1:6). Other examples are **ἑστώς εἰμί** (Act 25:10), **ἔστιν κατερχομένη** (Jas. 3:15), **ἐστὶν προσαναπληροῦσα — ἀλλὰ καὶ περισσεύουσα** (2 Cor. 9:12), **ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα** (Gal. 4:24) and, in particular, explanatory phrases with **ὅ ἐστιν** (Mt. 1:23; 27:33; Mk. 5:41; Jo. 1:41). Cf. further Ac. 5:25; Col. 1:6; 3:1; 2 Cor. 2:17.

(**θ**) *Presents as Perfects.* Here the form is that of the present, but the root has the sense of completion. The action is durative only in the sense of state, not of linear action. This is an old use of these roots.[3] Cf. Lu. 15:27, **ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἥκει** ('has come,' 'is here'). Cf. **ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω** (Jo. 8:42). See ch. VIII. So with **κεῖται** (Mt. 3:10), 'the axe lies at the root of the trees' (has been placed there); **ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν**, (Jo. 11:28) = 'the Teacher is come.' Sometimes **νικάω** is so used (cf. Ro. 12:21; Rev. 15:2). So **ἡττῶνται** (2 Pet. 2:20). Cf. **ἀκούω** in 1 Cor. 11:18. See also **ἀκούεται** (1 Cor. 5:1) which is rather iterative. **Ἀδικῶ** in Mt. 20:13 is durative, but approaches a perfect in Ac. 25:11 (cf. **πέπραχα**).

(**ι**) *Perfects as Presents.* Some perfect forms have come to be used as practical durative presents, though not of the same word. Thus **οἶδα** from **εἶδον**= 'I have seen,' 'I know' (cf. Mt. 6:8). So **ἕστηκα** (Lu. 8:20), **μέμνημαι** (1 Cor. 11:2). As to **ἀπόλωλα** that occurs in the N. T. in the participle (Mt. 10:6) and the same thing is true **εἴωθα** (Lu. 4:16), which occurs in past perfect. So **βέβηκα, γέγονα, δέδοικα, ἠμφίεσμαι, ἐγρήγορα, ἔοικα, κέκλημαι, κέκτημαι, πέποιθα, πέφυκα, τέθνηκα**. Cf. Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 438.

(**κ**) *Futuristic Presents.* These are usually punctiliar, but some are durative.[4] Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 83) calls this "Praesens Propheticum." The absence of **εἶμι** in the N. T. is noticeable. The papyri illustrate abundantly this futuristic present (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 120). Since the pres. ind. occurs for past, pres-

[1] Prol., p. 226. Cf. also Schmid, Atticismus, III, p. 114; K.-G., Bd. I, pp. 38 ff.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 204.

[3] Goodwin, M.1 and T., p. 9; Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 10; Gildersl., Synt., p. 87.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 120.

ent and future time it is clear that "time" is secondary even in the ind. In the other moods it has, of course, no time at all. As examples of the durative present in this sense take παραδίδοται (Mt. 26:45), ἀναβαίνομεν (Mk. 10:33), ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν and ἐρχόμεθα (Jo. 21:3), δείρχομαι (1 Cor. 16:5), ἔχομεν (2 Cor. 5:1). **Μέλλω** and the pres. inf. is, of course, a prospective present. This idiom is very common in the N. T., 84 examples with the pres. (6 aor., 3 fut.) inf., though, of course, **μέλλω** is not always in the pres. ind. Cf. Mt. 2:13; 16:27, etc.

(b) **The Imperfect for Past Time** (ὁ παρατατικός). Here we have the time-element proper, the augment probably being an old adverb for "then," and the action being always durative. "The augment throws linear action into the past."[1] The absence of a true imperfect in English makes it hard to translate this Greek tense.

(a) *Doubtful Imperfects*. They are sometimes called "aoristic" imperfects. This term is not a happy one, as Gildersleeve[2] shows in his criticism of Stahl for his "synonym-mongering" and "multiplication of categories." The only justification for the term is that, as already shown in the discussion of the aorist, it is not possible always to tell whether some forms are aorist ind. or imperf. ind. The same root was used for both forms, as only one form existed and it is hard to tell which tense the form is. A certain amount of obscurity and so of overlapping existed from the beginning.[3] We see this difficulty in **ἦν, ἔφην, ἔλεγον**, etc., particularly in verbs of saying, commanding, etc.[4] Modern Greek conceives of **ὑπῆγα, ἐπῆγα** and **ἔφερα** as aorists (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 143). Thumb (*Th. L.-Z*., xxviii, 423) thinks that in the N. T. **ἔφερον** had begun to be treated as aorist, but Moulton (*Prol*., p. 129) demurs, though he admits the possibility of punctiliar action in **πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρον** in Mt. 5:24 (ib., p. 247). See also **φέρε καὶ ἴδε, φέρε καὶ βάλε** in Jo. 20:27. But one must not think that the Greeks did not know how to distinguish between the aorist and the imperfect. They "did not care to use their finest tools on every occasion,"[5] but the line between aorist and imperf. was usually very sharply drawn.[6] The distinction is as old as the Sanskrit.[7] In modern Greek it still survives, though the differ-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 128.
[2] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 394.
[3] Giles, Man., p. 488; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 487; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 46.
[4] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., XXIV, p. 180; XXIX, p. 4.
[5] Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 17.
[6] Gildersl., Synt., pp. 91, 94.
[7] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201 f.

ence between ἔλεγεν and εἶπεν, is well-nigh gone,[1] if it ever existed. The same thing is true of the usage of Achilles Tatius.[2] Hence we need not insist that ἦν (Jo. 1:1) is strictly durative always (imperfect). It may be sometimes actually aorist also. So as to ἔφη (Mt. 4:7); ἔλεγεν (Mk. 4:21, 24, 26, 30, etc.), etc. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 192, fails to make a clean distinction. Note ἐκέλευον (Ac 16:22).

(β) *The Descriptive Tense in Narrative*. But the linear action may be insisted on in the true imperfect. It is properly "nicht-punktuell." Though less frequent in Homer than the aorist it often "divides the crown with the aorist."[3] The imperfect is here a sort of moving panorama, a "moving-picture show." The modern Greek preserves this idiom (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 121). In 1 Cor. 10:3 f. ἔφαγον and ἔπιον give the summary (constative) record, while ἔπινον, presents an explanatory description. See further προσῆλθον καὶ διηκόνουν (Mt. 4:11); ἔπεσεν καὶ ἐδίδου (13:8); ἐνύσταξαν καὶ ἐκάθευδον (25:5). Sometimes the change from aorist to imperf. or vice versa in narrative may be due to the desire to avoid monotony. In Mt. 26:60 we have οὐχ εὗρον, in Mk. 14:55 οὐχ εὕρισκον. The aorist tells the simple story. The imperfect draws the picture. It helps you to see the course of the act. It passes before the eye the flowing stream of history. It is the tense of *Schilderung*.[4] Cf. εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ (Mt. 3:4), ἐξεπορεύετο **(**3:5**),** ἐβαπτίζοντο **(**3:6**).** The whole vivid schen at the Jordan is thus sketched. Then Matthew reverts to the aorist (3:7). Cf. ἤρχοντο in Jo. 19 :2. So ὃς ὤφειλεν αὐτῷ (Mt. 18:28) aptly describes a debtor as ἔπνιγεν, 'the choking in his rage.' See the picture of Jesus in ἐθεώρει (Mk. 12 :41). Cf. ἐθεώρουν (Lu. 10 :18), ἐξελέγοντο (14 :7), περιεβλέπετο (Mk. 5 :32), ἐξίσταντο (Ln. 2:47; cf. Ac. 2:12). Cf. Lu. 9:43-45; 16:19; Mt. 8:24. A good example is ἐκυλίετο ἀφρίζων (Mk. 9:20). Cf. further, ἔπιπτεν καὶ προσηύχετο (Mk. 14:35), the realistic scene in Gethsemane (Peter's description probably); ἐπεθύμει καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου (Lu. 15:16); ὡμίλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους (24:14); ἐξεπλήσσουντο (Mt. 7:28); ἐτίθει, (2 Cor. 3:13); ἠκολούθει καὶ ἐκάθητο (Mt. 26: 58). A splendid example of the descriptive durative is ἐσιώπα (Mt. 26:63)= 'kept silent.' So ἐπλέομεν (Ac. 21:3). Note ἐνόμιζον (Ac. 21:29) between past perfect and aorist. Cf. ἐφίλει

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 128. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 436.
[2] Sexauer, Der Sprachgebr. d. rom. Schriftst. Achilles Tatius, 1899, p. 29.
[3] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 242.
[4] Hultsch, per Gebr. d. erzahlenden Zeitf. bei Polyb.

(Jo. 11:36), διετήρει (Lu. 2:51. Cf. 2:19). See the picture of Noah's time in Lu. 17:27. Cf. ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες (Ac. 5:41). Quite striking is ἠλπίζομεν, in Lu. 24:21. See further for the "imperfect and aorist interwoven" in narrative Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 91. An artist could describe his work by ἐποίησα or ἐποίουν. Gildersleeve notes (*ib*., p. 93) that in the inscriptions of the fourth cent. B.C. the imperfect is absent. It becomes common again in the imperial time.

(γ) *The Iterative (Customary) Imperfect*. Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether an act is merely descriptive or is a series. Cf. πολλοὶ πλούσιοι ἔβαλλον (Mk. 12:41); ἐπνίγοντο (5:13), where the separate details are well described by the vivid imperfect. The notion of repetition is clearly present in ἠρώτα ἐλεημοσύνην (Ac. 3:3); ἠρώτα αὐτόν (Mk. 7:26). Cf. Jo. 4:31. The modern Greek keeps this usage (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 122). It is not necessary to see any "aoristic" notion here.[1] Cf. παρεκάλουν σπουδαίως (Lu. 7:4, W. H.); παρῄνει (Ac. 27:9). It is well shown in **Β**αρνάβας ἐβούλετο, **Π**αῦλος ἠξίου (15:37 f.), the one opposing the other. In Ac. 24:26 repetition is shown in ὡμίλει by πυκνότερον μεταπεμπόμενος. Cf. ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο τι ἐπεφώνουν (21:34); ἐπυνθάνετο in verse 33; καθ' ἡμέραν ἐκαθεζόμην (Mt. 26:55); ἔτυπτον (27:30); ὅπου ἤκουον (Mk. 6:55), κατηρόρουν πολλά (15:3); ἀπέλυεν ὅν παρῃτοῦντο (15:6. Cf. εἰώθει ἀπολύειν ὃν ἤθελον, Mt. 27:15); ἐνένευον (Lu. 1:62); ἐβάπτιζεν (Jo. 3:22); ἔλυε (5:18); ἐδίδοσαν (19:3); ἐζώννυες (21:18); ἐτίθουν (Ac. 3:2); ἐπίπρασκον καὶ διεμέριζον (2:45. Cf. 4 : 34). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 128) represents the iterative imperfect by the graph (. . . . .) Cf. Ac. 16:18; 18:8; Mk. 3:11; 4:33 f. A good example is in Lu. 2:41, ἐπορεύοντο κατ' ἔτος.

(δ) *The Progressive Imperfect*. Sometimes the imperfect looks backward or forward, as the case may be.[2] Thus **Τ**ί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με (Lu. 2:49); ἣν εἴχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (1 Jo. 2:7); ἐνεκοπτόμην (Ro. 15:22); ἔμελλον (Rev. 3:2). This idea is, however, often expressed by μέλλω,[3] but without the backward look also. Cf. Lu. 9:31; 10:1; Jo. 4:47; 6:71, etc. In ἐκινδύνευον (Lu. 8:23) the verb itself expresses peril or danger. Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 97) calls this idiom "Imperfect of Unity of Time." Cf. the "progressive" present in (α), (β). The Text. Recept. gives a good example in ἦν πάλαι τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης (Mk. 6:47). See also ἦν γὰρ ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἰδεῖν αὐτόν (Lu. 23:8).

[1] Blass, Gr. 7 N. T. Gk., p. 191.
[2] Burton, N. C. Moods and Tenses, p. 13 f. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 13.
[3] Gildersl., Synt., p. 94 f.

(ε) *The Inchoative or Conative Imperfect*. Here the accent is on the beginning of the action either in contrast to preceding aorists (just begun) or because the action was interrupted (begun, but not completed). The two sorts of inchoative action may be represented by two graphs, thus (- —) for the first, (–) for the second.[1] In English we have to say "began" for the one, "tried" for the other. The modern Greek maintains this idiom (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 121). As examples of the first sort where "began" brings out the idea, note ἐδίδασκε (Mt. 5:2. Cf. Jo. 7: 14); ἐλάλει (Mk. 7:35. Cf. Lu. 1:64); ἔκλαιεν (14:72); διερήσσετο (Lu. 5:6); διελάλουν (6:11); συνεπληροῦντο (8:23); ἐπεσκίαζεν (9: 34. Note ingressive aorist ἐφοβήθησαν); ἐπέφωσκεν (23:54); ἐπεγίνωσκον (Ac. 3:10); ἐκήρυσσεν (9:20); διεκρίνοντο (11:2); κατήγγελλον (13:5); ἐθορύβουν (17:5); παρωξύνετο (17:16); ἀπελογεῖτο (26:1); ἐποιοῦντο (27:18); ἐλύετο (27:41). Cf. Lu. 13:13, 17. In ἐκάλουν (Lu. 1:59) we see both ideas combined. The action was begun, but was sharply interrupted by **οὐχί,** ἀλλά, from Elizabeth. Cf. νῦν ἐζήτουν, (Jo. 11:8). A good instance of the interrupted imperf. is προσέφερεν in Heb. 11:17. Examples of the conative imperfect (action begun, but interrupted) are διεκώλυεν (Mt. 3:14); ἐδίδουν, (Mk. 15:23, in contrast with **οὐκ** ἔλαβεν); ἐκωλύομεν (Lu. 9:49); ἐζήτουν (Jo. 10:39; cf. 19:11); ἐνόμιζεν (Ac. 7:25. Note **οὐ** συνῆκαν); συνήλλασσεν (7:26. Note ἀπώσατο); ἔπειθεν (Ac. 18:4); ἠνάγκαζον (26:11); but not Gal. 1:13. Moulton (*Prol*., pi 247) cites the conative pres. ἀναγκάζουσιν (Gal. 6:12).

(ζ) *The "Negative" Imperfect.* This is not a very happy piece of nomenclature, to use Gildersleeve's remark about Stahl's over-refinement, and yet it is the best one can do. "The negative imperfect commonly denotes resistance to pressure or disappointment."[2] As examples note **ὁ** δὲ **οὐκ** ἤθελεν, (followed by ἔβαλεν, Mt. 18:30) and preceded by παρεκάλει (iterative), **οὐδεὶς** ἐδίδου (Lu. 15:16), **οὐκ** ἤθελεν (15:28. Note ὠργίσθη), **οὐκ** ἐπίστευεν (Jo. 2:24), **οὐ** γὰρ ἤθελεν (Jo. 7:1), **οὐδεὶς** ἐτόλμα (21:12), **οὐκ** εἴων (Ac. 19:30). Cf. Mt. 22:3.

(η) The "Potential" Imperfect. This is a peculiar use of the tense for pres nt time, where the present ind. fails to meet the requirement o the situation. Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 97) calls it "modal" use, ἔδει, etc. The unfulfilled duty comes as a surprise. This “modal” force of the imperfect ind. appears still in the

[1] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 128.
[2] Gild sl., Synt., p. 95. Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 339.

modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 128). There are several varieties of it. Verbs of wishing form one class of passages. In a case like ἐβουλόμην (Ac. 25:22), βούλομαι would be too blunt (cf. 1 Tim. 2:8). The exact idea is 'I was just on the point of wishing.' It is freely rendered 'I could wish' or 'I should wish.' I In 2 Cor. 1:15 ἐβουλόμην πρότερον has its usual signification. In Phil. 13 f. ἐβουλόμην (a past preference) is set over against οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα (a past decision).[1] Another example is ἤθελον παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι (Gal. 4:20). Note ἄρτι. For the force of the present see 1 Cor. 10:20; Col. 2:1; and especially Lu. 19:14, of θέλομεν. In Jo. 6:21, ἤθελον, the usual notion occurs. An example is found in Ro. 9:3, ηὐχόμην, where Paul almost expresses a moral wrong. He holds himself back from the abyss by the tense. He does not say εὔχομαι (cf. 2 Cor. 13:7), nor εὐξαίμην ἄν (Ac. 26:29). Note οὐ ψεύδομαι in Ro. 9:1. In Ac. 27:29 ηὔχοντο has its usual force.

Wishes about the present are naturally unattainable. In the ancient idiom εἴθε or εἰ γάρ was used with the imperf. ind. or ὤφελον and the inf. Callimachus, B.C. 260, uses ὤφελον with the ind. The augmentless form ὄφελον appears in Herodotus (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 201). In the N. T. only ὄφελον is used with the perf. for wishes about the present. Cf. ὄφελον ἀνείχεσθε (2 Cor. 1:1); ὄφελον ἦς (Rev. 3:15).

Verbs of propriety, possibility, obligation or necessity are also used in the imperfect when the obligation, etc., is not lived up to, has not been met. Winer[2] has stated the matter well. The Greeks (and the Latins) start from the past and state the real possibility or obligation, and the reader, by comparing that with facts, notes that the obligation was not met. The English and the Germans start from the present and find trouble with this past statement of a present duty (an unfulfilled duty). A distinction is usually drawn between the present and the aorist infinitives when they occur with these verbs (ἐδύνατο, ὤφειλον, ἔδει, καλὸν ἦν, κρεῖττον ἦν, ἀνῆκεν, καθῆκεν). The present inf. refers more directly to the present, the aorist to an action in the past. This is, however, only by suggestion. Thus in Mt. 18:33, οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλεῆσαι, note ὡς κἀγὼ σὲ ἠλέησα. Cf. also Mt. 23:23 ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφεῖναι, (25:27) ἔδει σε βαλεῖν, (26:9) ἐδύνατο πραθῆναι καὶ δοθῆναι, (26:24) καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ (no inf. here), (Ac. 22: 22) οὐ γὰρ καθήκεν αὐτὸν ζῆν, (24:19) οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι, (26: 32) ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο (note perf. inf.), (27:21) ἔδει μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι

[1] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 15.

[2] W.-Th., p. 282.

κερδῆσαί τε, (2 Pet. 2:21) κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι (perf. inf.), (2 Cor. 2:3) ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν, (Col. 3:18) ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ (Cf. Eph. 5:4.) But it must not be supposed that these imperfects cannot be used in the normal expression of a past obligation or possibility that was met. The context makes the matter clear. Cf. Lu. 13:16; 22:7; 24:26; Jo. 4:4, etc. In Lu. 15:32 ἔδει applies to both the past and present, probably with an implication against the attitude of the elder brother. In Heb. 2:10 ἔπρεπεν and 2:17 ὤφειλεν have their natural past meaning.

Another instance where the imperfect refers to present time is in the second-class conditional sentences (see chapter XIX, Mode). When a condition is assumed as unreal and refers to present time, the imperfect tense is used both in the protasis and the apodosis in normal constructions. See apodosis in Mt. 26:24 and in Ac. 26:32 (both quoted above). It is only the tense that calls for discussion here. Cf. ἁμαρτίαν οὐχ εἴχοσαν (Jo. 15:22, 24), where νῦν δέ is used to explain the point. So οὐκ εἶχες (Jo. 19: 11). In 1 Cor. 5:10, ὠφείλετε ἄρα--ἐξελθεῖν, and Heb. 9:26, ἐπεὶ ἔδει--παθεῖν, we only have the apodosis. Cf. εἰ ἦν –ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν. (Lu. 7:39) as a type of the more usual construction with ἄν. Cf. Lu. 17:6. In Heb. 11:15 the imperfects describe past time.

(θ) *In Indirect Discourse.* In general the imperfect in indir. discourse represents an imperfect of the direct discourse. But sometimes with verbs of perception it is relative time and refers to a time previous to the perception.[1] Thus εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάνην ὅτι προφήτης ἦν (Mk. 11:32); εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ἦν (Jo. 6:22. Cf οὐκ ἔστιν in verse 24); ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν (9:8); ἐπεγίνωσκον ὅ τι ἦν ὁ καθήμενος (Ac. 3:10) while in 4:13 ἦσαν is rightly antecedent to ἐπεγίνωσκον, ἤδεισαν ὅτι—ὑπῆρχεν (16:3). In Ac. 3:10 the idiom approaches that in Jo. 1:15, οὗτος ἦν ὁ εἰπών (a parenthesis), where the verb is thrown back to past time. Our idiom more naturally calls for ἐστίν, here. Gildersleeve[2] calls this the "imperfect of sudden appreciation of real state of things."

(c) *The Periphrastic Imperfect.* It is easy to see how in the present, and especially in the future, periphrastic forms were felt to be needed to emphasize durative action. But that was the real function of the imperfect tense. The demand for this stressing of the durative idea by ἦν and the present participle was cer-

[1] Blass, Gr.lof N. T. Gk., p. 192; Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 339. This imperfect is particularly common in John.

[2] Synt., p. 96 f.

tainly not so great. And yet it is just in the imperfect in the N. T. that this idiom is most frequent. It is not unknown in the ancient Greek.[1] Schmid[2] finds it rare in the κοινή, especially in the imperfect, where the N. T. is so rich in the idiom. He suggests the Aramaic influence, particularly as that language is fond of this periphrasis. Periphrasis is thoroughly Greek, and yet in the N. T. we have unusual frequency of a usage that the κοινή has not greatly developed except "where Aramaic sources underlie the Greek" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 226). Gildersleeve (*Syntax*, p. 124) gives classical examples from Pindar, Thuc., Isocrates, etc. It is true that in the N. T. the pres. participle with ἦν occurs chiefly in Mark (19 times), Luke (31), Acts (28, but 17 of them in chapters 1-12), and just in those portions most subject to Aramaic influence (possible Aramaic sources). Only 7 occur in Acts 13-28, and these mainly in the speech in 22 delivered in Aramaic.[3] The LXX[4] gives abundant illustration of this analytic tendency in the imperfect. Cf. Gen. 37:2; Deut. 9:24; Judg. 1:7. Cf. Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 24. From Pelagia (p. 18) Moulton (*Prol*., p. 249) cites ἤμην ἀπερχόμενος. For a papyrus illustration see ὅσα ἦν καθήκοντα, P. Oxy. 115 (ii/A.D.). The idiom itself is therefore Greek, but the frequency of it in the N. T. is due to the Hebrew and Aramaic. Matthew has it 10 times, John 11, Paul 5.[5] The Pauline examples (Gal. 1:22 f.; Ph. 2:26) are more like the classic independence of the participle. It is usually the descriptive imperfect that uses the periphrastic form. So ἦν διδάσκων (Mt. 7:29); ἦν ἔχων (Mk. 10:22); ἦσαν ἀναβαίνοντες (10:32); ἦν προσευχόμενον (Lu. 1:10); καιομένη ἦν (Lu. 24:32). But sometimes it is the iterative imperfect as in ἦν διανεύων (Lu. 1:22); ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν (19:47).[6] In Lu. 5:17 the periphrastic imperfect and past perfect occur in the same sentence. In Lu. 23:12 note προϋπῆρχον ὄντες (cf. Ac. 8:9).

(κ) *Past Perfects as Imperfects.* The present perfects of these verbs are merely presents in sense when compared with other verbs. So the past perfects have only an imperfect force. Thus ᾔδει (Mt. 27:18); εἰώθει (27:15); ἵστηκει. (Jo. 18:5).

(c) **The Future for Future Time**. The future is mainly aoristic (punctiliar), as has already been shown, but sometimes durative.[7] The broad lines of the problem have already been

[1] Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, p. 38 f.
[2] Atticismus, III, p. 113 f.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 227.
[4] C. and S., Sel., p. 69.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 227.
[6] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 16.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 149.

drawn. As already shown, the modern Greek has a special durative future by means of **θὰ λύω** (pres. subj.). See Thumb, *Handb*., p. 160. A summary statement of the durative future is given.

(a) *The Three Kinds of Action in the Future (futuristic, volitive, deliberative)*. These occur here also. Thus merely futuristic are **σώσει** (Mt. 1:21); **βαπτίσει** (Mt. 3:11); **ἐλπιοῦσιν** (12:21); **ἔσται** (Lu. 1:14 f.); **ἐπιστρέψει** and **προελεύσεται** (1:16 f.); **ἑλκύσω** (Jo. 12:32); **ζήσομεν** (Ro. 6:2); **κυριεύσει** (6:14); **βαστάσει** (Gal. 6:5); **ἐπιτελέσει** (Ph. 1:6); **χαρήσομαι** (1:18); **ζητήσουσιν** (Rev. 9:6). Burton[1] calls this "the progressive future." Cf. Ac. 7:6. Durative also is **ἀδικήσει** with **οὐ μή** (Lu. 10:19). So **οὐ μὴ διψήσει** (Jo. 4:14; cf. 6:35); **οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν** (Jo. 10:5). Examples of the volitive durative future are the legal precepts (common in the LXX) so often quoted in the N. T. Cf. **οὐ φονεύσεις** (Mt. 5:21); **οὐ μοιχεύσεις** (5:27); **οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις** (5:33); **ἀγαπήσεις** (5:43; cf. **ἀγαπᾶτε**, verse 44); **ἔσεσθε** (5:48), etc. Perhaps **οἰκοδομήσω** (Mt. 16:18)= 'I will' rather than 'I shall.' In 1 Tim. 6:8, **τούτοις ἀρκεσθησόμεθα**, the resolution is volitive. It is possible that we have the volitive use in Mt. 4:4, **οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος**. The deliberative future may also be durative. Cf. Mt. 18:21, **ποσάκις ἁμαρτήσει**; (merely interrogative) and Lu. 14:34, **ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται**; (rhetorical). Cf. aor., pres. and fut. ind. in Mt. 28:7.

(β) *The Periphrastic Future.* The very failure of the future to express durative action clearly[2] led to the use of the present participle **ἔσομαι**. In Lysias (2), 13, note **ἔσονται γενόμενοι** more like a future punctiliar (or perfect). Cf. Mt. 10:22 and 24:9, **ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι** (Mk. 13:13; Lu. 21:17); (Mk. 13:25) **ἔσονται πίπτοντες** (Lu. 1:20) **ἔσῃ σιωπῶν**, (5:10) **ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν**, (17:35) **ἔσονται ἀλήθουσαι**, (21:24) **ἔσται πατουμένη**, (1 Cor. 14:9) **ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες**. Cf. Gen. 4:12, 14; Deut. 28:29; Mal. 3:3, etc. The frequent use of **μέλλω** and the pres. inf. (durative) has already been mentioned. The fut. of **μέλλω** itself occurs (Mt. 24:6) with the pres. inf.

2. SUBJUNCTIVE AND OPTATIVE. The rarity of the press subj. (and opt., of course) has already been commented upon. The aorist is used as a matter of course here unless durative action is to be expressd. A few examples will suffice. Thus **τί ποιῶμεν**; (Jo. 6:28); **ἐὰν ἔχητε** (Mt. 17:20); **ἔχωμεν** (Ro. 5:1). The subjunctive is very common indeed, but not in the present tense. There is in the N. T. no instance of a periphrastic present subj.

[1] N. T. M. and T., p. 32. [2] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 444.

or optative. John's free use of the pres. subj. has already been noted (Abbott, *Joh. Gr.*, pp. 369 ff.). Cf. ἐὰν ποιῆτε (13:17); ἐὰν μαρτυρῶ (5:31). In Col. 1:18 note γένηται πρωτεύων like ἐγένετο στίλβοντα (Mk. 9:3). The present opt. survives in δυναίμην (Ac. 8:31); ἔχοι, (Ac. 17:11); βούλοιτο (Ac. 25:20); θέλοι (Ac. 17:18; Lu. 1:62); εἴη (9:46; 15:26; 18:36; 22:23; Ac. 10:17).

3. IMPERATIVE. The contrast between the present imperative and the aorist subj. in prohibitions had to be set forth in connection with the punctiliar-aorist subj. The present imper. was found to be regularly durative. In Paul's frequent use of the pres. imper. with μὴ the inchoative or conative or customary (prohibiting a course of conduct) use of the present is noticeable, as in μὴ ἀμέλει (1 Tim. 4:14); μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει (5:22); μηδὲ κοινώνει (*ib.*); μὴ μεθύσκεσθε (Eph. 5:18); μὴ ψεύδεσθε (Col. 3:9).[1] Cf. μὴ ἀπαίτει (Lu. 6:30). In general μή is used with the present imper. to forbid what one is already doing. Cf. μὴ φοβεῖσθε (Jo. 6:20); μὴ κρίνετε (Mt. 7:1); μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε (Jo. 5:14); μὴ θαυμάζετε (5:28); μὴ δοκεῖτε (5:45); μηκέτει σκύλε (Lu. 8:49). The durative force of the pres. imper. is well seen in καθεύδετε καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε (Mt. 26:45). Cf. also πάντοτε χαίρετε, ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε, ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τε (1 Th. 5:16-22). A good example is seen in Ac. 18:9, **Μὴ φοβοῦ**, ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς, 'He had been afraid, he was to go on speaking, he was not to become silent.' Cf. 2 Tim. 2:16, 22 f. The contrast between aorist and pres. imper. is often drawn in the N. T., as in Jo. 5:8; Mt. 16:24. We note the periphrastic pres. imper. in ἴσθι εὐνοῶν (Mt. 5:25); ἴσθι ἔχων (Lu. 19:17); ἴστε γινώσκοντες (Eph. 5:5)[2]; ἔστωσαν καιόμενοι (Lu. 12:35). Cf. Judg. 11:10; Prov. 3:5; γίνου γρηγορῶν (Rev. 3:2); 2 Cor. 6:14. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 249) cites from *Pelagia* (p. 26) ἔσο γινώσκων.

4. INFINITIVE. The present inf. can be assumed to be durative. The matter has had some discussion in connection with the aorist inf. (punctiliar), but a few further examples will illustrate the usage. Cf. τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν (Ph. 3:1) and τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτόν (Mk. 12:33) where the linear action is obvious.[3] Indeed the force of the pres. inf. is so normal as to call for little cornment.[4] Cf. οὐ δύναμαι ποιεῖν (Jo. 5:30. Cf. Mt. 6:24); τὸ θέλειν Ro. 7:18); ἁμαρτάνειν (1 Jo. 3:9); προσεύχεσθαι (1 Cor. 11:13); τοῦ πατεῖν (Lu. 10:19), etc. For the distinction between the

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 125 f. Cf. Naylor, Cl. Rev., 1906, p. 348.
[2] Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 204.
[3] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 46. [4] Moulton, Prol., p. 204.

aorist and pres. inf. see ἐμβῆναι— καὶ προάγειν (Mt. 14:22). Cf. αἰτεῖν in Ac. 3:2. The frequent use of μέλλω and the pres. inf. has already been twice mentioned. In indirect discourse the pres. inf. merely represents the pres. ind. of the direct discourse. Cf. εἶναι (Mt. 22:23; Ro. 1:22); ἐκβάλλειν (Lu. 11:18), etc. There is one instance in the N. T. of a pres. inf. in indir. discourse representing an imperfect incl.[1] Luke has a periphrastic pres. inf., ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον, which occurs twice (9:18; 11:1). Cf. 2 Chron. 15:16. Only two fut. infs. in the N. T. seem to be durative (Ac. 11:28; Jo. 21:25). The pres. inf. is most natural with ἐν (cf. Lu. 8:40), and is common with διά (cf. Mt. 13:f.); εἰς (Ro. 12:2); but not (pres. 3, aor. 9) with πρός (Mk. 13:22). It is used only once with πρό (Jo. 17:5) and is not used with μετά. Cf. Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 49 f.

5. PARTICIPLE. The present participle, like the present inf., is timeless and urative.

(a) *The Time of the Present Participle Relative*. The time comes from the principal verb. Thus in πωλοῦντες ἔφερον (Ac. 4:34. Cf. πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν in verse 37) the time is past; in μεριμνῶν δύναται (Mt. 6:27) the time is present; in ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι (Mt. 10:22), ὁ βλέπων ἀποδώσει (Mt. 6:18), ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον, (24:30) it is future. Cf. Mt. 24:46; Lu. 5:4; 12:43. Further examples of the pres. part. of coincident action are seen in Mt. 27:41; Mk. 16:20; Jo. 6:6; 21:19; Ac. 9:22; 10:44; 19:9.

(b) *Futuristic*. Just as the pres. ind. sometimes has a futuristic sense, so the pres. part. may be used of the future in the sense of purpose (by implication only, however). Cf. εὐλογοῦντα (Ac. 3: 26); ἀπαγγέλλοντας (15:27); διακονῶν (Ro. 15:25). In Ac. 18:23, ἐξῆλθεν διερχόμενος τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, the pres. part. is coincident with the verb. In 21:2 f. the pres. parts. διαπερῶν and ἀποφορτιζόμεον are futuristic (cf. 3:26; 15:27). Blass, page 189, notes ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Jo. 11:27) and ἐρχόμενον (1:9). This use of the pres. part. is common in Thuc. (Gildersleeve, *A. J. P.*, 1908, p. 408).

(c) *Descriptive*. But usually the pres. part. is merely descriptive. Cf. Mk. 1:4; Ac. 20:9; 2 Cor. 3:18; 4:18. There is no notion of purpbse in ἄγοντες (Ac. 21:16). In τοὺς σωζομένους (Ac. 2:47) the idea is probably iterative, but the descriptive durative is certainly all that is true of τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους in Heb. 10:14 (cf. 10:10).

[1] Lu. 20:6, contrary to Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 52.

(d) *Conative*. It may be conative like the pres. or imperf. ind. as in πείθων (Ac. 28:23) or τοὺς εἰσερχομένους (Mt. 23:14).

(e) *Antecedent Time.* By implication also the pres. part. may be used to suggest antecedent time (a sort of "imperfect" part.). So τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω (Jo. 9:25). See further Mt. 2:20; Jo. 12:17; Ac. 4:34; 10:7; Gal. 1:23. Cf. ὁ βαπτίζων (Mk. 1:4).

(f) *Indirect Discourse.* Cf. p. 864. An example of the pres. part. with the object of a verb (a sort of indir. disc. with verbs of sensation) is found in εἴδαμέν τινα ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια (Lu. 9:49). The pres. part. is common after εἶδον in Rev. (10:1; 13:1, 11; 114:6; 18:1; 20:1, etc.). Cf. Ac. 19:35, γινώσκει τὴν πόλιν οὖσαν.

(g) *With the Article*. The present participle has often the iterative (cf. pres. ind.) sense. So ὁ κλέπτων (Eph. 4:28)='the rogue.' Cf. ὁ καταλύων (Mt. 27:40); οἱ ζητοῦντες (2:20). The part. with the article sometimes loses much of its verbal force (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 127; Kuhner-Gerth, I, p. 266). He cites from the papyri, τοῖς γαμοῦσι, C. P. R. 24 (ii/A.D.). Cf. τοὺς σωζομένους (Ac. 2:47). So in Gal. 4:27, ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα, ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα.

(h) *Past Action Still in Progress.* This may be represented by the pres. part. So Mk. 5:25; Jo. 5:5; Ac. 24:10. Cf. Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 59.

(i) *"Subsequent" Action*. Blass[1] finds "subsequent" action in the pres. parts. in Ac. 14:22 and 18:23. But in 14:22 note ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Λύστραν—ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν the aorist ind. is "effective" and accents the completion of the action. The pres. part. is merely coincident with the "effective" stage. It is a point, not a process in the aorist.

(j) *No Durative Future Participles.* The few fut. parts. in the N. T. seem to be punctiliar, not durative, unless τὸ γενησόμενον (I Cor. 15:37) be durative, but this example is pretty clearly ingressive punctiliar.

IV. **Perfected State of the Action** (ὁ τέλειος ἢ συντελικός).

1. THE IDEA OF THE PERFECT.

(a) *The Present Perfect.* The oldest of the perfects. "The perfect is a present perfect."[2] Such it was in the beginning undoubtedly . The past perfect and future perfect are both built upon the present perfect stem. Both are comparatively rare, especially the future perfect. The use was at first also confined to the indicative. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 140) calls it the most important exegetically of the Greek tenses.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 198. Cf. K.-G., Bd. II, p. 121 f.

[2] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., p. 395.

(b) *The Intensive Perfect.* This use (or the iterative) was probably the origin of the tense. So **ὄλλυμαι**='I perish,' **ὄλωλα**= 'I perish utterly.'[1] Cf. also **θνήσκω, τέθνηκα ; μιμνήσκω, μέμνημαι**. The iterative process is seen in **ἀπέσταλκα** (2 Cor. 12:17), **ἑώρακεν** (Jo. 1:18). The "effective" aoristic present is close kin to the perfect, as we have already seen, in (Lu. 15:27); **ἀκούω** (1 Cor. 11:18); **ἀδικῶ** (Ac. 25:11). Reduplication, though not always used, was an effort to express this intensive or iterative idea. So likewise the aorist of an action just accomplished, like **ἔγνων τί ποιήσω**, (Lu. 16:4), is near in idea to the present perfect, though there is a difference. More about the intensive perfect a little later.

(c) *The Extensive Perfect.* This comes to be the usual force of the tense, Gildersleeve[2] has put the thing finely: "The perfect looks at both ends of an action." It "unites in itself as it were present and aorist, since it expresses the continuance of completed action."[3] That is to say, the perfect is both punctiliar and durative. The aorist (punctiliar) represents an action as finished, the linear present as durative, but the perfect presents a completed state or condition. When the action was completed the perfect tense does not say. It is still complete at the time of the use of the tense by speaker or writer. In Jo. 1:32 **τεθέαμαι** in the mouth of John the Baptist refers to the baptism of Jesus some week before, but he still has the vision. Cf. 1:34, **ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα,** where there is a difference of time between the two words. When Andrew said to Peter **εὑρήκαμεν** (1:41) his discovery is recent and vivid. No single graph for the perfect can therefore be made. In some cases the line of connection from the act (punctiliar) to the time of speaking would be very short, in others very long. This line of connection is just the contribution of the perfect tense as distinct from aorist and present. As a matter of fact, in the combination of punctiliar and durative in the perfect it begins with the punctiliar and goes on with the durative thus (•-----), but the emphasis may be now on the punctiliar, now on the durative. In others the two are drawn almost to a point, but not quite. In still others there is a broken continuity thus (A • • • • > • • • • B).[4] It is the perfect of repeated action. Cf. Jo. 1:18; 5:37; 2 Cor. 12:17.

[1] Jebb in V. and D.'s Handb., p. 327. Cf. Giles, Man., pp. 449, 491 f.
[2] Synt., p. 99. Cf. also Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 395 f.
[3] Blass, Cu of N. T. Gk., p. 198.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 144.

(d) *Idea of Time in the Tense.* In the ind. it appears in three forms with the notion of time (past perfect, present perfect, future perfect). In the other modes only the present perfect occurs, but it has no time in itself and in the imper. and subj. is naturally future. Often in the N. T., as in the Attic writers,[1] a sharp distinction is drawn between the perfect and the aorist or the present. Cf. **μαρτυρεῖ** with **ἀπέσταλκεν** and **μεμαρτύρηκεν** in Jo. 5:36 f.; **εἰσήγαγεν—καὶ κεκοίνωκεν**, (Ac. 21:28); **ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται** (1 Cor. 15:4); **ἐκτίσθη-ἔκτισται** (Col. 1:16); **ἦσαν, ἔδωκας, τετήρηκας** (Jo. 17:6). The perfect active is frequently intransitive,[2] as has been already shown under Voice. Cf. **ἵστημι, ἕστηκα, ἀπόλλυμι, ἀπόλωλα**, etc.

2. THE INDICATIVE.

(a) **The Present Perfect** (**ὁ ἐνεσὼς συντελικὸς ἢ παρακείμενος**). It is not clear how the notion of present time is conveyed by this tense in the ind. since it is absent in the subj. and imper., not to say inf. and part. Gildersleeve suggests that it "comes from the absence of the augment and from the fact that a completed phenomenon cannot complete itself in the future." But that explanation is not very satisfactory. The tense does occur sometimes in the future, and the present perfect is older than the past perfect which rests on it. Perhaps at first it was just the perfect tense (cf. aoristic presents and timeless aorists) and was timeless. By degrees it came to be used only for present time. The rise of the past perfect made it clear. The pres. perf. is much more common in the **κοινή** than in the earlier Greek. "The perfect was increasingly used, as the language grew older, for what would formerly have been a narrative aorist" (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 141). In particular is this true of the vernacular as the papyri show.

(a) *The Intensive Present Perfect.* Moulton[3] calls these "Perfects with Present Force." They are *Perfecta Praesentia*. In reality they are perfects where the punctiliar force is dropped and only the durative remains (cf. past perfect). Gildersleeve[4] distinguishes sharply between the intensive use of emotional verbs and what he calls the "Perfect of Maintenance of Result." But it is questionable if the difference does not lie in the nature of the verb rather than in a special modification of the tense. A real distinction exists in 1 Jo. 4:14 between **τεθεάμεθα** and **μαρτυροῦμεν**. Burton[5] follows Gildersleeve, but he admits the doubt on

[1] Giles, Man., p. 493.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 23.
[3] Prol., p. 147.
[4] Synt., p. 99 f.
[5] N. T. M. and T., p. 37 f.

the subject.[1] In these verbs when the perfect has lost the punctiliar notion it is due to the change in meaning of the verbs.[2] The list is rather large in Homer, particularly where attitude of mind is expressed.[3] Giles (*Man*., p. 481) thinks that originally the perf. was either intensive or iterative like ἕστηκα, and that the notion of recently completed action (extensive) is a development. These almost purely durative perfects in the N. T. may be illustrated by ἔοικα (Jas. 1:6); ἀνέῳγα (2 Cor. 6:11); οἶδα (Mt. 6:8); ἕστηκα (Rev. 3:20); ἐνέστηκα (2 Th. 2:2); πέποιθα (Ph. 2:24); κέκραγεν (Jo 1:15) which is an example of Gildersleeve's emotional intensives and due according to Blass[4] to the "literary language," μέμνημαι (1 Cor. 11:2); τέθνηκα (Lu. 8:49). Most of these verbs have an inchoative or conative or iterative sense in the present. Moulton[5] has shown from the LXX and the papyri that κέκραγα, is vernacular κοινή and not merely literary. He thinks that, while κράζω in the LXX is durative, κέκραγα is merely punctiliar. See (θ) The Aoristic Perfect. It is possible also that πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν (Jo. 6:69) belong here. It is less open to dispute that καταβέβηκα (Jo. 6:38) is a present state. Cf. κεκοίμηται (Jo. 11:11). But more doubtful are ἤλπικα (Jo. 5:45); ἧγημαι (Ac. 26:2); πέπεισμαι. (Ro. 8:38).[6] But τεάρακται (Jo. 12:27) seems to fall under the intensive perfect. Cf. ἑστὼς εἰμί (Ac. 25:10).

(β) *The extensive Present Perfect = a completed state*. This act may be durative-punctiliar like ἤγγικεν (Mt. 3:2) with a backward look (-----•). Cf. thus ἠγώνισμαι, τετέλεκα, τετήρηκα (2 Tim. 4:7). This consummative effect is seen in τετήρηκαν (Jo. 17:6), ἐλήλυθεν (12:23) and πεπληρώκατε (Ac. 5:28). Cf. Heb. 8:13; 10:4. In Jo. 20:29, ὅτι ἑώρακάς με πεπίστευκας the culmination is just reached a few moments before. But more frequently it is the punctiliar-durative perfect where the completed act is followed by a state of greater or less duration (•-----). In Jo. 19:22, ὃ γέγραφα γέγραφα, we have an example of each. Cf. the common γέγραπται (Mt. 4:7). 'It was written (punctiliar) and still is on record' (durative). Thus is to be explained instances like εἴρηκεν in Heb. 10:9 (cf. εἶπον in 10:7). 'The statement is on record.' It is only in appearance that προσενήνοχεν and πεποίηκεν (Heb. 11:17, 28) seem different. This common usage in Hebrews has been compared to that in Thuc. vol. I, pp. 2, 6, etc.

[1] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Bd. II, p. 269 f.
[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 15. [3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 22.
[4] Gr. of N. IT. Gk., p. 198. Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 347 f.
[5] Prol., p. 147. [6] Ib.; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 199.

Cf. further Heb. 7:6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 20, 23, where the permanence of the Jewish institutions is discussed. Jo. 6:25 γέγονας has punctiliar and durative ideas ('earnest and art here'). Cf. Abbott, *Joh. Gr.*, p. 347. In Col. 1:16 ἐκτίσθη is merely punctiliar, while in same verse ἔκτισται adds the durative idea, whereas in verse 17 again συνέστηκεν has lost the punctiliar and is only durative. In 1 Cor. 15:4 ἐγήγερται stands between two aorists because Paul wishes to emphasize the idea that Jesus is still risen. Usually ἠγέρθη was sufficient, but not here. Cf. ἐστήρικται (Lu. 16:26). Cf. ἀφέωνται (Lu. 5:23); ἐκκέχυται (Ro. 5:5). John is especially fond of this use of the present perfect. Cf. 1:32, 34, 41; 5:33, 36 ff. In chapter 17 the present perfects call for special attention. Cf. 1 Jo. 1:1 for contrast between the present perfect and the aorist.

(γ) *The Present Perfect of Broken Continuity*.[1] As already explained, we here have a series of links rather than a line, a broken graph (• • • • > • • • •). Perhaps πέπραχά τι in Ac. 25:11 is to be so understood. But certainly it is true of ἀπέσταλκα (2 Cor. 12:17) where Paul refers to various missions to the Corinthians. In particular Moulton[2] notes the examples with πώποτε, as οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε (Jo. 1:18). Cf. further μεμαρτύρηκεν (5:37); δεδουλεύκαμεν (8:33).

(δ) *The Dramatic Historical Present Perfect*. Here an action completed in the past is conceived in terms of the present time for the sake of vividness. Burton[3] doubts if any genuine examples of the vivid historical perfect occur in the N. T. Certainly κέκραγεν (Jo. 1:15) is a vivid historical tense even if only intensive in sense. Cf. μαρτυρεῖ just before. But by the term "historical" it is not meant that this use of the perfect is common in all narrative. But the Vedic Sanskrit has it often in narrative. It is a matter of personal equation after all. Thus Xenophon, who "affects naivete," uses the present perfect much more frequently than Herodotus and Thucydides.[4] It is rather the tense of the orator or the dramatist and is often rhetorical.[5] Hence Isocrates and Demosthenes surpass Plato in the use of the present perfect. "The nearness of any department of literature to practical life may readily be measured by the perfect."[6] Moulton[7] notes how in the papyri there is an increasing use of the present perfect just

[1] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 144.
[2] Ib.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 38.
[4] Gildersl., Am. Jour. Philol., XXIX, p. 396.
[5] Thompson, Synt., p. 216.
[6] Gildersl., Am. Jour. Philol., 1908, p. 396.
[7] Prol., p. 141.

because it is so largely the language of life. He notes also how Socrates in Plato's Crito uses this vivid present perfect: "τεκμαίρομαι ἔκ τινος ἐνυπνίου, ὃ ἑώρακα ὀλίγον πρότερον ταύτης τῆς νυκτός, where point of time in the past would have εἶδον, as inevitable as the aorist is in English, had not Socrates meant to emphasize the present vividness of the vision." This vivid perfect is found in John's Gospel in particular. One only needs to have some imagination himself. Cf. τεθέαμαι. (1:32). John still has that vision. So εὑρήκαμεν (1:41). The aorist would have been prosaic. Cf. also ἀπεστάλκατε (5:33), a realistic change. (Cf. 1:19 ff.). So also ἀπέσταλκεν, in Ac. 7:35; κεκοίνωκεν in 21:28 and πεποίηκα in 2 Cor. 11:25. A striking instance of it is seen in Rev. 5:7, εἴληφεν, where John sees Jesus with the book in his hand. It is dull to make an εἴληφεν here= ἔλαβεν. Another example of this vivid perfect is ἐσχήκαμεν (2 Cor. 1:9), a dreadful memory to Paul. So with ἔσχηκεν in 7:5. A particularly good instance is γέγονεν (Mt. 25: 6), where the present perfect notes the sudden cry (cf. aorist and imperf. just before). Cf. εἴρηκεν in 2 Cor. 12:9. Blass[1] has observed that it occurs sometimes in parables or illustrations, and quite naturally so, for the imagination is at play. Thus is to be explained ἀπελήλυθεν, (Jas. 1:24) between two aorists. James sees the man. 'He has gone off.' Cf. Mt. 13:46, ἀπελθὼν πέπρακεν πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν καὶ ἠγόρασεν αὐτόν. In Lu. 9:36 ἑώρακαν is "virtually reported speech."2 Cf. ἀκηκόαμεν (Ac. 6:11, but ἠκούσαμεν in 15:24).

(ε) *The Gnomic Present Perfect*. A few examples of this idiom seem to appear in the N. T. The present was always the more usual tense for customary truths,[3] though the aorist and the perfect both occur. Cf. τετελείωται (1 Jo. 2:5); δέδεται (1 Cor. 7: 39)[4]; κέκριται and πεπίστευκεν (Jo. 3:18); κατακέκριται (Ro. 14:23); πεπλήρωκεν (13:8). Cf. Jo. 5:24; Jas. 2:10.

(ζ) *The Perfect in Indirect Discourse.* It is misleading to say, as Blass[5] does, that "the perfect is used relatively instead of the pluperfect" in such instances. This is explaining Greek from the German. Blass does not call this construction "indirect discourse," but merely "after verbs of perception"; but see my discussion of Indirect Discourse in ch. XIX. Cf. Lu. 9:36 οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν οὐδὲν ὧν ἑώρακαν, Ac. 10:45 ἐξέστησαν ὅτι ἐκκέχυται. In Mk. 5:33, εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῇ ἦλθεν, the perfect preserves the

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 144.
[3] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 53 f.
[4] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 39
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200,

vividness of the woman's consciousness. Here the past perfect or the aorist could have been used (cf. Mk. 15:10; Mt. 27:18; Ac. 19:32). It is akin to the reportorial vividness of the historical perfect. It is not the perfects here that call for explanation from the Greek point of view. It is rather the occasional aorists, imperfects or past perfects. Cf. MS. differences in Mk. 3:8.

(η) *Futuristic Present Perfect.* Since the present so often occurs in a futuristic sense, it is not strange if we find the present perfect so used also future perfect. This proleptical use of the perfect may be illustrated by δεδόξασμαι (Jo. 17:10), δέδωκα (17: 22), τετέλεσται (19:28), σέσηπεν and γέγονεν and κατίωται in Jas. 5:2 f. (cf. ἔσται καὶ φάγεται). This use is sometimes called "prophetico-perfect." Indeed some of the examples classed as gnomic are really proleptical also. Cf. Jo. 3:18; 5:24; Jas. 2:10; Ro. 13:8; 14:23.[1]

(θ) *The "Aoristic" Present Perfect.* The Present Perfect is here conceived as a mere punctiliar preterit like the aorist ind. We have seen how in some verbs the punctiliar idea drops out and only the durative remains in some present perfect forms (like οἶδα). It is not *per se* unreasonable to suppose that with some other verbs the durative idea should disappear and the form be merely punctiliar. We seem to have this situation in κέκραγα in the LXX (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 147). The action itself took place in the past though the state following its completion is present. "By centering attention on the former, while forgetting the latter, \the perfect becomes aoristic. We must distinguish between the aoristic (punctiliar) and the preterit notions. We have seen that originally the tense was probably timeless. Nothing, then, but an appeal to the facts can decide whether in the N. T. the present perf. ind. ever= the aor. ind. (i.e. is *preterit punctiliar*). The Sanskrit[2] shows a deal of confusion and freedom in the use of the pres. perf. ind. The blending of the perfect and aorist firms in Latin is also a point to note in spite of the independence of the Greek tense development. E. J. Goodspeed (*Am. J. Theol*., X, 102 f.) regards Latin as having some influence on the ultimate confusion in the Greek. There is no doubt of the ultimate confusion in the late Greek[3] (from A.D. 300 on) between the perfect and the aorist (see later). The use of --θηκα and —ηκα in the aorist pass. ind. in modern Greek illustrates one way confusion could

[1] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 15; Gildersleeve, Synt., p. 101.
[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 296.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 440; Moulton, Prol., p. 142.

arise (Thumb *Handb*., p. 144). Cf. ἔδωκα, δέδωκα. In the modern Greek all other remnants of the old perfect form are gone save in the participle, which has lost its reduplication, like δεμένος. But had it begun in the older Greek? Jannaris[1] answers Yes and cites Thuc. 1, 21, **οὔτε ὡς ποιηταὶ ὑμνήκασι—οὐτε ωπς λογογράφοι ξυνέθεσαν**. But this may be the dramatic historical perfect. Jebb[2] answers Yes and quotes Demosthenes and Lucian; but these again may be merely the rhetorical dramatic perfect. The grammarians and scholiasts, under the influence of the Latin, did come to lose all consciousness of any distinction and explained one tense by the other.[3] The present perfect was always more common in every-day life, as we have noted. The papyri prove this abundantly.[4] Moreover, the present perfect grew in popular use at the expense of the aorist, where the aorist might have been employed. There is thus no strong presumption against the possibility of such confusion in the N. T. Besides, "the line between aorist and perfect is not always easy to draw."[5] This is especially true of an event just past which may be described by either tense. Moulton[6] admits that "the LXX and inscriptions show a few example of a semi-aoristic perfect in the pre-Roman age, which, as Thumb remarks (*Hellenismus*, p. 153), disposes of the idea that Latin influence was working" thus early. But Moulton rightly rejects **ἰδὼν ὁ λαὸς ὅτι κεχρόνικε Μωϋσῆς** (Ex. 32:1) as an instance (merely *oratio obliqua*). Simcox[7] says that "no one but a doctrinaire special pleader is likely to deny that in Rev. 5:7; 8:5, εἴληφεν, and in 7:14, εἴρηκα are mere preterits in sense." Well, I do deny it as to εἴληφεν in Rev. 5:7 and 8:5, where we have the vivid dramatic colloquial historical perfect. The same thing is possible with εἴρηκα in 7:14, but I waive that for the moment. Burton[8] is more cautious. He claims that the N. T. writers "had perfect command of the distinction between the aorist and the perfect," but admits that "there is clear evidence that the perfect tense was in the N. T. sometimes an aorist in force," though the idiom is confined within narrow limits." Some of the examples claimed by him for this usage I have explained otherwise already. Moulton[9] sees that this confusion may exist in one writer, though not in another, but he admits a

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 439.
[2] V. and D., Handb., p. 328.
[3] Ib.; Jann., Gk. Gr., p. 339 f.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 141.
[5] Ib.
[6] Ib., p. 142.
[7] Lang. of the N. T., p. 104.
[8] N. T. M. and T., p. 44.
[9] Prol., pp. 143 ff.

"residuum of genuinely aoristic perfects." He admits γέγονα to be "perplexing," though in the 45 examples in the ind. in the N. T. "it has obviously present time" and "the aoristic sense is not really *proved* for any of them." That is certainly true. There are instances in the N. T., as in the later Greek generally,[1] where γέγονα approaches a present in sense, as in 1 Cor. 13:11, but its use as a mere preterit is not shown, not even by the examples quoted by Moulton[2] from the papyri (0. P. 478 and B. U. 136). The first has προσβεβηκέναι—γεγονέναι — τετελευκέναι, all three apparently vivid historical perfects. The example in Josephus (Apion, 4:21) may be the same. We have left εἴληφα, εἴρηκα, ἔσχηκα, πέπρακα. The last Moulton[3] refuses to admit as an aorist in sense, since "the distinction is very clearly seen in papyri for some centuries" between πεπρακα and ἠγόρασα. He cites 0. P. 482 (ii/A.D.), χωρὶς ὧν ἀπεγραψάμην καὶ πέπρακα. Besides in Mt. 13:46 πέπρακεν is in a vivid parable (dramatic historical perfect). Moulton notes the confusion as worse in illiterate papyri, like οὐκ ἐλουσάμην οὐκ ἤλιμε (=ἤλειμμαι), 0. P. 528 (ii/A.D.). As to ἔσχηκα the matter is more plausible in one example (2 Cor. 2:13). Blass[4] affirms the true present perfect sense for ἔσχηκα elsewhere in the N. T. (Mk. 5:15; 2 Cor. 1:9; 7:5; Ro. 5:2). Moulton[5] replies that "we must, I think, treat all the Pauline passages alike." But why? He does not claim such uniformity for γέγονα in any N. T. writer.[6] There is some analogy between ἔσχηκα and ἔθηκα and ἀφῆκα, and ἔσχον may be ingressive, not constative. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 145) makes a good deal out of the fact that ἔσχον occurs only 20 times in the N. T. and that thus ἔσχηκα may have come to mean 'possessed' (constative), but he admits that this does not suit in Ro. 5:2. He cites a possible example from B. U. 297 (ii/A.D.) τοῖς δικαίαν αἰτίαν ἐσχηκόσι καὶ ἄνευ τινὸς ἀμφισβητήσεως ἐν τῇ νομῇ γενομένους (=—οις). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 122) thinks that the perfect in the κοινή comes within the sphere of the aorist at times. Thackeray (Gr., p. 24) thinks that εἴληφα in Dan. θ 4:30[b] and ἔσχηκα, 3 M. 5:20, belong here. But if the whole case has to be made out from one example (2 Cor. 2:13; cf. 2 Cor. 7:5), it is at least quite problematical. The only substantial plea for taking ἔσχηκα as preterit here is the fact that Paul did have ἄνεσις for his spirit after Titus

[1] Cf. Buresch, Γέγοναν (Rh. M., 1891, p. 231 note).
[2] Prol., p. 146.
[3] Ib., p. 142.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200.
[5] Prol., p. 145.
[6] Ib., p. 146.

came. But it was a partial ἄνεσις as the Epistle shows. It is therefore possible that in 2 Cor. 2:13 we do have a present perfect= preterit punctiliar (cf. ἐξῆλθον), possible but not quite certain. Paul may have wished to accent the strain of his anxiety up to the time of the arrival of Titus. The aorist would not have done that. The imperfect would not have noted the end of his anxiety. It was durative plus punctiliar. Only the past perfect and the present perfect could do both. The experience may have seemed too vivid to Paul for the past perfect. Hence he uses the (historical dramatic) present perfect. That is certainly a possible interpretation of his idea. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 238) in the Additional Notes draws back a bit from the preterit use of ἔσχηκα. He had advanced it "with great hesitation" and as " a tentative account." "The pure perfect force is found long after Paul's day: thus in the formula of an IOU, ὁμολογῶ ἐσχηκέναι παρὰ σοῦ διὰ χειρὸς ἐξ οἴκου χρῆσιν ἔντοκον (B. U. 1015 in the early iii/A.D.), 'to, have received and still possess.'" We have εἴληφα and εἴρηκα left. Take εἴληφα. In Rev. 3:3 we have **μνημόνευε οὖν πῶς εἴληφας καὶ ἤκουσας καὶ τήρει, καὶ μετανόησον**. It is preceded by εὕρηκα in the proper sense. This is an exhortation about the future. If ἤκουσας had been ἀκήκοας no difficulty would exist. The perfect would emphasize the permanence of the obligation. It is as easy to say that ἤκουσας = a perfect as that εἴληφας = an aorist. Both are abstractly possible and neither may be true. The reception may seem more a matter to be emphasized as durative than the hearing (punctiliar). It is a fine point, but it is possible. Cf. πεποίηκεν καὶ ἐλέησεν in Mk. 5:19. Cf. Jo. 3:32. The mere fact of the use of aorists and perfects side by side does not prove confusion of tenses. It rather argues the other way. It is possible with Blass[1] to see the force of each tense in ἑώρακεν and ἤκουσεν in Jo. 3:32 (cf. 1 Jo. 1:1-3). Note also εἰσήγαγεν καὶ κεκοίνωκεν, (Ac. 2:28). Cf. Lu. 4:18 where the change is natural. Moulton[2] does find such confusion in the illiterate documents among the papyri. Simcox (*Lang. of the N. T.*, p. 105) wishes to know what "distinction of sense" exists between ἔλαβον and τετελείωμαι in Ph. 3:12. It is very simple and very clear. Ἔλαβον denies the sufficiency of Paul's past achievement, τετελείωμαι, denies it as a present reality. Cf. Ro. 13:12. I have already explained εἴληφα in Rev. 5:7 and 8:5. There is surely no trouble about εἴληφα in 2:28. In 11:17 again, **ὅτι εἴληφες τὴν δύναμίν σου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐβασίλευσας**, it is not εἴληφες (punctiliar-durative,

[1] G . of N. T. Gk., p. 199. [2] Prol., p. 142 f.

'receivedst and still hast') that calls for explanation, but ἐβασίλευσας, which may be used to accent the ingressive idea or as a practical equivalent of the perfect. The use of εἴρηκα (Rev. 7: 14) and εἴρηκαν (19:3) seems more like a real preterit than any other examples in the N. T. In 7:14, B reads εἶπον. I would not labour the point over these two examples. If such a confusion of tenses occurred anywhere in the N. T., the Apocalypse would be the place to expect it. And yet even the Apocalypse is entitled to a word in its defence on this point in spite of the fact that Moulton[1] "frankly yields" these instances and Blass[2] says that "the popular intermixture of the two tenses appears undoubtedly in the Apocalypse." It is to be remembered that the Apocalypse is a series of visions, is intensely dramatic. It is just here that the rhetorical dramatic (historical) perfect so freely granted in the orators would be found. It is wholly possible that in this use of εἴρηκα we have only this idiom. "In history the perfect has no place outside of the speeches and the reflective passages in which the author has his say."[3] It is curious how aptly Gildersleeve here describes these very instances of the present perfect which are called "aoristic." So I conclude by saying that the N. T. writers may be guilty of this idiom,[4] but they have not as yet been proven to be. Cf. ἐχάρην ὅτι εὕρηκα in 2 Jo. 4. The distinction between the perf. and pres. is sharply drawn in Jas. 3:7, δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται.

(ι) *The Periphrastic Perfect*. For the origin of this idiom see discussion in connection with the Past Perfect, (b), (n). The use of ἔχω (so common in later Greek and finally triumphant in modern Greek) has a few parallels in the N. T.[5] Cf. ἔχε με παρῃτημένον (Lu. 14:19) with Latin idiom "I have him beaten." Cf. ἔχω κείμενα (Lu. 12:19, pres. part. used as perf.), ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα (Mk. 3:1). Cf. Mk. 8:17; Heb. 5:14; Jo. 17:13, ἔχωσιν --πεπληρωμένην. Here the perf. part. is, of course, predicate, but the idiom grew out of such examples. The modern Greek uses not only ἔχω δεμένο, but also δεμένα, but, if a conjunctive pron. precedes, the part. agrees in gender and number (cf. French). So τὴν ἔχω ἰδωμένη, 'I have seen her' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 162). Passive is εἶμαι δεμένος. The use of γίνομαι is limited. Cf. ἐγένετο

[1] Prol., p. 145. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 200.

[3] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 396.

[4] E. J. Goodspeed (Am. Jour. of Theol., Jan., 1906, p. 102 f.) shows that the ostraca confirm the pap. in the free use of the perfect.

[5] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 438.

ἐσκοτωμένη (Rev. 16:10), a mixture of tenses (cf. Mk. 9:3). See Ex. 17:12; Ps. 72:14. Peculiar is γεγόνατε ἔχοντες in Heb. 5:12. It is εἰμί that is commonly used (about 40 times in the N. T.) with the perfect part. Cf. Num. 22:12; Is. 10:20. Burton[1] notes that the intensive use of the perfect tense (cf. past perfect) is more common than the extensive. As examples of the intensive (=present) take πεπεισμένος ἐστίν (Lu. 20:6). So Jo. 2:17; Ac. 2:13, etc. For the extensive use (= completed act) note ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον (Lu. 23:15). So Jo. 6:31; Heb. 4:2, etc. In Ac. 26:26 the main accent is on the punctiliar aspect (at the beginning, as in Jo. 6:31).

(κ) *Present as Perfect*. These examples, like **ἥκω, πάρειμι, ἠττάομαι, κεῖμαι**, have already been discussed under 1, (a), (η). Cf. **ἀπόκειται**, (2 Tim. 4:8).

(b) *The last Perfect* (**ὁ ὑπερσυντελικός**).

(a) *The Double Idea*. It is the perfect of the past and-uses the form of the present perfect plus special endings and often with augment. The special endings[2] show kinship with the aorist. As the present perfect is a blending in idea of the aoristic (punctiliar) and the durative present (a sort of durative aoristic present combined), so the past perfect is a blend of the aorist and the imperfect in idea.[3] It is continuance of the completed state in past time up to a prescribed limit in the past. As in the present perfect, so here the relation between the punctiliar and the durative ideas will vary in different verbs. The name **ὑπερσυντελικός** (*plus-quamperfectum*)= more than perfect in the sense that it always refers to an antecedent date, "a past prior to another past"[4] is no, always true.

(β) *A Luxury in, Greek*. The Greeks cared nothing for relative time, though that was not the only use for the past perfect, as just statd.[5] Ordinarily the aorist ind. was sufficient for a narrative unless the durative idea was wanted when the imperfect was ready to hand. Herodotus shows a fondness for the past perfect.[6] It disappeared in Greek before the present perfect,[7] though in the N. T. it still survives in current, but not common, usage.[8] It was never so frequent in Greek as the past perfect

[1] N. T. M. and T., p. 40.
[2] Giles, Man., p. 457.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201.
[4] Thompson, Synt., p. 217.
[5] Moulton., Prol., p. 148. It is absent from the Boeotian dial. (Claflin, Synt., etc., p. 72).
[6] Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 122.
[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 441.
[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201.

was in Latin. The N. T. idiom conforms to that of the older language.

(γ) *The Intensive Past Perfect.* Present perfects that had come to be mere presents through accent on the durative idea and loss of emphasis on the aoristic (punctiliar) are virtual imperfects when turned into the past. Cf. **ὡς εἰώθει** (Mk. 10:1). So **ᾔδειν** (Jo. 1:31), **ἱστήκεισαν** (Jo. 19:25; cf. Ac. 1:10 f.), **ἐπιποίθει**. (Lu. 11:22) and even **ἐγνώκειτε** (Mt. 12:7),[1] for **ἔγνωκα** sometimes is used like **οἶδα** (1 Jo. 2:4). So with **ἦν ἀπολωλώς** (Lu. 15:24; cf. **εὑρέθη**). Here we have a mere existing state in the past with the obscuration of the idea of completion (aoristic-punctiliar). But it is to be noted that the durative sense is usually a changed meaning from the aoristic sense. Cf. **οἶδα** from **εἶδον**. For this idiom in classic Greek see Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 103. Cf. also E. Schwartz, *Index to Eus*., pp. 214

(δ) *The Extensive Past Perfect*. The past perfect usually presents a completed state or fixed condition in past time. As already said, it is not necessarily "a blend of past and praeterpast."[2] In Latin the past perfect shows no trace of the *Aktionsart* of the perfect; the past perfect is just time relatively past. The Greek past perfect expresses a state following a completed act in past time.[3] Sometimes it is made clear by the context that a considerable space of time had intervened, though this is quite incidental with the Greek. Take Jo. 6:17, **καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει καὶ οὔπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς**. The verb in the sentence before is **ἤρχοντο** (descriptive) and the verb following is **διεγείρετο** (inchoative). The time of these imperfects is, of course, past. But the two intervening past perfects indicate stages in the going (**ἤρχοντο**) before they reached the shore. Both **ἤδη** and **οὔπω** help to accent the interval between the first darkness and the final appearance of Jesus which is soon expressed by the vivid historical present, **θεωροῦσιν** (6:19). Here we have a past behind a past beyond a doubt from the standpoint of the writer, and that is the very reason why John used the past perfect here. In verse 16, **ὡς δὲ ὀψία ἐγένετο κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταί**, he had been content with the aorist in both the principal and the subordinate clauses. He had not cared there to express relative time, to stress the interval at all. The tenses in Jo. 6:16-21, by the way, form a very interesting study. John[4] does, as a matter of fact, use the past perfect more

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 148. [2] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 397.
[3] Brugmann, K. Vergl. Gr., pp. 569, 576. Cf. Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., pp. 120 ff. [4] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 349.

frequently th n do the Synoptists. He uses it to take the reader "behind the scenes" and often throws it in by way of parenthesis. Thus in 1:4 the past perfect ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν points back to the aorist ἀπέστειλαν in 1:19. In 4:8 ἀπεληλύθεισαν is a parenthetical explanation of what the disciples had done before this incident with the woman. So in 9:22 συνετέθειντο has ἤδη and notes a previous agreement. In 11:13 εἰρήκει points to a time just before, but note ἔδοξαν. The tenses in 11:11-13 are, all interesting (εἶπε, λέγει, εἶπον, εἰρήκει, κεκοίμηνται, πορεύομαι, σωθήσεται). In 11:19 ἐληλύθεισαν denotes antecedent action, and in 11:30, τεθειμένος, the interval is marked. Cf. also 11:44, περιεδέδετο. In 11:57 δεδώκεισαν points backward as is true of **οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἦν** τεθειμένος (19:41). In 3:24 and 7:30; 8:20, the standpoint is later than the event described, but none the less it stretches backward though from a relatively future time. But this distinction is not confined to John. Cf. Mt. 7:25, τεθεμελίωτο, which points pack to verse 24. So in Mk. 14:44 δεδώκει refers to Judas' previous arrangement. Cf. also ἐκβεβλήκει in Mk. 16:9 with ἐφάνη. The tenses in Mk. 15:6-10 are interesting. The three past perfects all refer to antecedent action. Cf. ᾠκοδόμητο with ἤγαγον in Lu. 4:29, and with ἐπορεύετο in verse 30. In Lu. 16:20 ἐβέβλητο suggests that the poor man had been at the door some while. In Ac. 4:22 γεγόνει (cf. **τῷ γεγονότι)** does not precede ἀπέλυσαν verse 21) by any great amount of time, yet the interval is real (cf. 3:1-10).[1] In Ac. 9:21 ἐληλύθει is contrasted with ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας. In 14:23 cf. πεπιστεύκεισαν with παρέθεντο. Cf. Ac. 4:27 and 31. In 14:26 the reference is to the beginning of the tour from Antioch. In 20:16, κεκρίκει, and 20:38, εἰρήκει, the two ends of the action nearly come together, but in 21:29 the antecedent action is clear. In Jo. 11:30, **οὔπω ἐληλύθει—ἀλλ᾽ ἦν ἔτι--ὅπου ὑπήντησεν**, the three past tenses of the ind. come out well. In 11:56 f. **τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν; ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν** δεδώκεισαν, the three kinds of time (present, future, past) are all employed. But in 12:16 the aorist ind. is employed, **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸ πρῶτον—τότε ἐμνήσθησαν**, though antecedent time is indicated by **τὸ πρῶτον** and **τότε**. Here the past perfect would more exactly have marked off **τὸ πρῶτον**. If the previous time is to be depicted in its course, the past perfect is used (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 163).

(ε) *The Past Perfect of Broken Continuity*[2] (• • • > • • •). This is true of Lu. 8:29, πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν. It is an

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 201. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 148.

iterative past perfect in a series of links instead of a line, like the present perfect of broken continuity in Jo. 1:18. Cf. the perf. inf. in Ac. 8:11.

(ζ) *Past Perfect in Conditional Sentences*. Usually the aorist ind. occurs in these conditions of the second class determined as unfulfilled in relation to the past. But sometimes the past perfect appears. Cf. Jo. 19:11; Ac. 26:32; 1 Jo. 2:19. See Conditional Sentences, ch. XIX.

(η) *The Periphrastic Past Perfect.* This construction had already begun in ancient Greek. In the third person plural of liquid and mute verbs it was uniformly done for the sake of euphony. It was occasionally found also with other verbs. In the modern Greek[1] we find εἶχα δεμένο, 'I had bound,' ἤμουν δεμένος or εἶχα δεθεῖ. Ἔχω was at first more than a mere auxiliary, though in Herodotus it appears as a true auxiliary. The dramatists also use it often.[2] In the N. T. the examples with εἶχον are not pertinent. Cf. συκῆν εἶχέν τις πεφυτευμένην (Lu. 13:6); ἣν εἶχον ἀποκειμένην, (Lu. 19:20), really predicative accusative participles with ἔχω. But the past perfect with the perfect partic. and ἦν is rather common. Cf. Jo. 19:11. Burton[3] notes that about two-thirds of them are intensive, and only one-third extensive. As examples of the intensive use see Mt. 26:43, ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι; Lu. 15:24, ἦν ἀπολωλώς. Cf. also Lu. 1:7. Examples of the extensive type are ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες (Lu. 5:17); ἦσαν προεωρακότες (Ac. 21:29). For examples in the LXX see 2 Chron. 18:34; Judg. 8:11; Ex. 39: 23, etc. See also βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον (Ac. 8:16).

(θ) *Special Use of* ἐκείμην. This verb was used as the passive of τίθημι. The present was= a present perfect. So the imperfect was used as a past perfect, as in Jo. 20:12, ὅπου ἔκειτο τὸ σῶμα= 'where the body had lain' or 'had been placed.' So in Jo. 2:6 ἦσαν κείμεναι is a periphrastic past perfect in sense. Cf. Lu. 23:53, ἦν κείμενος. See also 19:20. Perhaps a similar notion is seen in ὁμοθυμαδὸν παρῆσαν (Ac. 12:20).

(c) *The Future Perfect* (ὁ μέλλων συντελικός). There was never much need for this tense, perfect action in future time.[4] It is rare in ancient Greek and in the LXX (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 194). The only active forms in the N. T. are εἰδήσω, (Heb. 8:11, LXX, possibly a mere future) and the periphrastic form ἔσομαι πεποιθώς (Heb. 2:13, LXX also). Both of these are intensive. Most of the MSS.

[1] Thumb, Handb., pp. 161, 165.
[2] Jebb in Vine. and Dickson's Handb., p. 329.,
[3] N. T. M. and. T., p. 45.
[4] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 395.

read κεκράξονται in Lu. 19:40, but ℵBL have κράξουσιν. This is also intensive (cf. κέκραγα), if it is accepted, as it is not by W. H. nor by Nestle. I note ἔσῃ μοι μεγάλην χάριταν κατ[α] τεθειμ[έ]νο(ς), B. G. U. 596 (A.D. 84). The modern Greek has a fut. perf. in θὰ ἔχω δεμένο (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 162). In ἥξουσιν (Lu. 19:43) we have a practical future perfect (intensive). For the rest the *futurum exactum* is expressed only by means of the perfect part. and εἰμί. This idiom is found in the LXX (the active in Gen. 43:8; 44:32; Is. 58:14, etc. The passive in Gen. 41:36; Ex. 12:6). N. T. examples are ἔσται δεδεμένον and ἔσται λελυμένον (Mt. 16: 19); ἔσται λελυμένα (18:18); ἔσονται διαμεμερισμένοι (Lu. 12:52). These all seem to be extensive. For a sketch of the future perfect see Thompson, *Syntax of Attic Greek*, p. 225 f. This tense died before the I future did.

3. THE SUBIUNCTIVE AND OPTATIVE. The perfect optative is not found in the N. T. It was always rare in the Greek of the early period. See Hatzidakis, *Einl.*, p. 219. The only inflected perf. subj. in the N. T. is εἰδῶ, which occurs ten times (Mt. 9:6; Mk. 2:10; Lu. 5:24, etc.). But in this form the perfect sense is gone. See ἵνα εἰδῆτε, P. B. M. 1178 (A.D. 194). Indeed, the perf. subj. was always very rare in Greek. In the Sanskrit the perf. tense, outside of the Vedic language, never developed to any extent except in the ind. and the participle.[1] In the classic Greek it was in subj. and opt. a mark of the literary style and did not really belong to the life of the people. The perf. subj. is absent from the vernacular modern Greek. A little reflection will slow how usually there was no demand for a true perfect, combining punctiliar and durative, in the subj. Even in the literary style of the older Greek, when the perf. subj. did occur it was often the periphrastic form in the active and nearly always so in the passive.[2] "The perfect of the side-moods is true to the kind of time, completion, intensity, overwhelming finality."[3] By "kind of tine" Gildersleeve means kind of action, not past, present or future. Cf. the LXX also, Is. 8:14; 10:20; 17:8. In Lu. 14:8 there appears to be a conscious change from κληθῇς to μήποτε ᾖ κεκλημένος, possibly suggesting a long-standing invitation by the latter. In Jo. 3:27, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον, it is punctiliar-durative. In 16:24, ἵνα ᾖ πεπληρωμένη (cf. 1 Jo. 1:4), the consummation is emphasized (durative-punctiliar), extensive per-

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 292.
[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 31 f. Cf. Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 140.
[3] Gildersleeve, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 01.

feet (completed act). The same thing is true of 17: 19, ἵνα ὦσιν ἡγιασμένοι, and 17:23, ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι. In Jas. 5:15, κἂν ᾖ πεποιηκώς, we seem to have the perfect of "broken continuity." In 2 Cor. 1:9, ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες ὦμεν, it is merely intensive.

4. THE IMPERATIVE. What has been said of the rarity of the perf. subj. can be repeated concerning the perf. imper. Out of 2445 imperatives in the Attic orators the speeches themselves show *only eight* real perfects (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, Part I, p. 158. Cf. also Miller, "The Limitation of the Imperative in the Attic Orators," *A. J. P.*, xiii, 1892, pp. 399-436). In Is. 4:1 one may note κελήσθω intensive. The perfect imper. is common in Homer.[1] In the late Greek it occurred most frequently in the purely intensive perfects or in the third person singular of other verbs.[2] But it is gone from the modern Greek and is nearly dead in the N. T. In Jas. 1:19 ἴστε may be imperative (intensive) or ind. See the formula ἔρρωσθε (Ac. 15:29) and ἔρρωσο in Text. Rec. (23:30).[3] The only other example is found in Mk. 4:39, σιώπα, πεφίμωσο, where it is also intensive like the others. The durative idea is in both σιώπα (linear pres.) and πεφίμωσο, 'put the muzzle on and keep it on.' The periphrastic perf. imper. occurs in Lu. 12:35, ἔστωσαν περιεζωσμέναι (intensive). Cf. καιόμενοι. The time of the perf. imper. and subj. is, of course, really future. Cf. p. 848 (a).

5. THE INFINITIVE. There were originally no tenses in the inf. (see Sanskrit), as has already been stated. But the Greek developed a double use of the inf. (the common use, and indir. discourse).

(a) **Indirect Discourse.** In indir. discourse (cf. ch. XIX) the tenses of the inf. had the element of time, that of the direct. But in the N. T. there is no instance of the perf. inf. representing a past perf. ind.[4] The tense occurs in indir. discourse, but the time is not changed. Cf. Ac. 14:19 ἔσυρον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, νομίζοντες ἤδη τεθνηκέναι, (12:14) ἀπήγγειλεν ἑστάναι. So εἰδέναι in Lu. 22:34; γεγονέναι (Jo. 12:29); γεγονέναι, (2 Tim. 2:18). These examples are also all intensive perfects. So with Col. 2:1, θέλω ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι. In 1 Tim. 6:17, παράγγελλε ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, μηδὲ ἠλπικέναι (indir. command), the intensive perf. again occurs. In Lu. 10:36, δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι, we have "the vivid present of story-telling."[5] Cf. πεπραχέναι (Ac. 25:25). On the whole the

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 22.
[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 23 f.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 2001,
[4] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 52.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 146. So Heb. 4:1.

perf. inf. is rather common (47 times, according to H. Scott) in the N. T.[1] See further Jo. 12:18; Ac. 16:27; 27:13; Ro. 15: 8; Heb. 11:3.

(b) Perfect Infinitive not in Indirect Discourse.

(a) *Subject or Object Infinitive*. Cf. 2 Pet. 2:21, **μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι**, where the tense accents the climacteric aspect (durative-punctiliar) of the act and rather suggests antecedence (extensive) to **ἦν**. In Ac. 26:32, **ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύντο**, we have an instance of the obj. inf. with implied antecedence (extensive). Note also **δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι** (Lu. 12:58). In Ac. 19:36 **κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν** is a periphrastic form of the subject inf. In 2 Cor. 5:11 note **πεφανερῶσθαι** with **ἐλπίζω**. Cf. 1 Pet. 4:3 (with **ἀρκετός**. Not very different is the use with **ὥστε** (Ro. 15:19).

(β) *With Prepositions.* At first it may seem surprising that the perfect tense should occur with the articular inf. after prepositions. But the inf. does not lose its verbal character in such constructions. It is still a verbal substantive. It is, of course, only by analogy that the tense function is brought into the infinitive. For the papyri note **ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονέναι**, P. Oxy. 294 (A.D. 22); **ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀπολελύσθαι σε**, P. B. M. 42 (B.C. 168). Cf. **μετὰ τὸ εἰρηκέναι** (Heb. 10:15), the only instance with **μετά**. Here the tense has the same force as **εἴρηκεν** in 10:9. It stands on record as said. We find it with **εἰς** (twice), as in Eph. 1:18, **εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι** (intensive) and **εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι** (Heb. 11:3). It is most frequent with **διά** and the acc. (7 times). So Mk. 5:4, **δεδέσθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι καὶ συντετρίφθαι** (extensive). See **οἰκοδομῆσθαι** (Lu. 6:48). Cf. Ac. 18: 2; 27:9. In 8:11 we have the perf. inf. of "broken continuity." In the N. T. the perf. inf. with prepositions appears only with **διά, εἰς** and **μετά.**

6. THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) *The Meaning*. The perf. part. either represents a state (intensive) or a completed act (extensive). Examples of the former are **κεκοπιακώς** (Jo. 4:6); **ἑστώς** (18:18); **τὸ εἰωθός** (Lu. 4:16). Instances of the latter occur in **ὁ εἰληφώς** (Mt. 25:24); **πεποιηκότες** (Jo. 18:18). The perf. part. is quite common in the N. T. and preserves the usual idea of the tense.

(b) *The Time of the Tense*. It is relative, not absolute. It may be coincident with that of the principal verb, usually so in the intensive use.[2] Cf. Jo. 4:6 **κεκοπιακὼς ἐκαθέζετο**, (19:33) **εἶδον ἤδη τεθνηκότα**, (Ro. 15:14) **ἐστε—πεπληρωμένοι**. But by suggestion the act may be represented as completed before that of

[1] W.41., p. 334. [2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 71.

the principal verb and so antecedent action. Thus ἱστήκεισαν—πεποιηκότες (Jo. 18:18); προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα (Ac. 18:2); ἀπολελυμένην (Lu. 16:18); εἰρηκότος (Mt. 26:75). This antecedent action may be expressed also by the intensive perfect as in ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθηνκώς (Jo. 11:44), but δεδεμένος is coincident action. So in Mk. 5:15 ἱματισμένον is coincident, but τὸν ἐσχηκότα antecedent. Cf. Rev. 6:9. The modern Greek keeps the perf. part. (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 167).

(c) *The Perfect Tense Occurs with Various Uses of the Participle*. The part. is used as attributive. Cf. **οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι** (Ac. 10:17). Sometimes a distinction is drawn between the aorist and the perf. part. Cf. **ὁ** λαβών in Mt. 25:20 with **ὁ εἰληφώς** (25:24); **ὁ** καλέσας in Lu. 14:9 with **ὁ κεκληκώς** (14:10). Cf. 2 Cor. 12:21; 1 Pet. 2:10. The predicate participle also uses it. Cf. Lu. 8: 46; 16:18, 20 f.; Jo. 19:33; Ac. 18:2; Heb. 13:23. With Rev. 9:1, **εἶδον** πεπτωκότα, compare Lu. 10:18, **ἐθεώρουν** πεσόντα (the state, the act).

(d) *The Periphrastic Participle*. There are two examples of this unusual idiom. Cf. Eph. 4:18 **ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ** διανοίᾳ **ὄντες**, (Col. 1:21) **ὄντας** ἀπηλλοτριωμένους. The durative aspect of the perfect is thus accented. Cf. Heb. 5:14 for **ἔχω** used periphrastically.

CHAPTER XIX

MODE (᾽ΕΓΚΛΙΣΙΣ)

Introductory. For a brief sketch of the number of the modes and the reasons for treating the indicative as a mode see Conjugation Of the Verb, chapter VIII, v, (a). References are there given to the pertinent literature. The use of ἄν is given a brief treatment below in connection with the modes. The subject of conjunctions is divided for logical consistency. The Paratactic Conjunctions belong to the same division with Paratactic Sentences, while Hypotactic Conjunctions fall under Hypotactic Sentences. The conjunctions could of course be treated in separate or as a division of the chapter on Particles (XXI).
That will be there done (v, 1) for Paratactic Conjunctions. Hypotactic Conjunctions will there receive only summary treatment and can best be discussed in detail in connection with subordinate clauses. And there are advantages in the present method. It needs to be said also that the division of the treatment of modes into those of Independent and Subordinate Sentences (A and B) is purely arbitrary and for the sake of clearness. There is no real difference in the meaning of a mode in an independent and a dependent sentence. The significance of each mode will be sufficiently discussed under A (Independent Sentences). The inclusion of all the subordinate clauses under mode is likewise for the sake of perspicuity. Voice, tense, mode thus stand out sharply.[1]
The difficulty of making a clear distinction in the significance of the mode has already been discussed in chapter VIII, pp. 321 ff.
A mood is a mode of statement, an attitude of mind in which the speaker conceives the matter stated.[2] Apollonius Dyskolos first described (moods as ψυχικαὶ διαθέσεις. That is a correct description of the function of mood as distinct from voice and tense.[3]

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 445 ff., has this plan. I had already made my outline before reading his treatment of the subject.

[2] Thompson, Synt. of Att. Gk., p. 185.

[3] Cf. Bru., Griech. Gr., p. 498; K.-G., I, p. 200; Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 220. See Sandys, Hist. of Class. Scholarship, III, p. 458.

The mode is the manner of the affirmation, while voice and tense have to do with the action of the verb (voice with relation of the subject to the action of the verb, tense with the state of the action). But even so the matter is not always clear. The mode is far and away the most difficult theme in Greek syntax. Our modern grammatical nomenclature is never so clumsy as here in the effort to express "the delicate accuracy and beauty of those slight *nuances* of thought which the Greek reflected in the synthetic and manifold forms of his verb."[1] So appeal is made to psychology to help us out. "If the moods ψυχικαὶ διαθέσεις, why is not every utterance modal? Why does not every utterance denote a state of the soul? A universal psychology would be a universal syntax."[2] Every utterance does denote a state of the soul. This is one argument for treating the indicative as a mode. The verb is necessarily modal from this point of view. But the term is naturally confined to the finite verb and denied to the infinitive and participle. Dionysius Thrax does call the infinitive a mode, but he is not generally followed.[3] Gildersleeve[4] notes also that "moods are temporal and tenses modal." He sees that the order moods and tenses is the natural sequence in the English (cf. chapter VIII, v, p. 320), but he follows the order tenses and moods in his *Syntax of Classical Greek*, though it is hard to separate them in actual study. Gildersleeve[5] laments also that διάθεσις came to be applied to voice and ἔγλισις to mode (cf. enclitic words as to accent), "but after all tone of utterance is not so bad a description of mood." It is possible that at the beginning the indicative was used to express all the various moods or tones of the speaker, as the accusative case originally included the whole field of the oblique cases. It was only gradually that the other moods were developed by the side of the indicative (thus limiting the scope of the ind.) to accent certain "moods of mind, i.e. various shades of desire,"[6] more sharply. Thompson calls this development "artificial," since no other race but the Greeks have preserved these fine distinctions between indicative, subjunctive, optative, imperative, not to say injunctive

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 136.

[2] Gildersl., "A Syntactician among the Psychologists," Am. Jour. of Jan., 1910, p. 74.

[3] Cf. Steinthal, Gesch. d. Sprachw., pp. 309, 628.

[4] Am. Jour. of Philol., XXIII, p. 127; XXX, p. 1.

[5] Ib., XXX, p. 1; Synt. of Classic. Gk., p. 79.

[6] Thompson, Synt., p. 510.

and future indicative (almost a mode to itself). But that is too severe a term, for the modes were a gradual evolution. The injunctive was the unaugmented indicative, like **λύου, λύεσθε, λύσασθε, λύθητε, λύετε, λύσατε,** σχές.[1] Moulton[2] says: "Syntactically it represented the bare combination of verbal idea with the ending which supplies the subject; and its prevailing use was for prohibitions, if we may judge from the Sanskrit, where it still remains to some extent alive. The fact that this primitive mood thus occupies ground appropriate to the subjunctive, while it supplies the imperative ultimately with nearly all its forms, illustrates the syntactical nearness of the moods. Since the optative also can express prohibition, even in the N. T. (Mk. 11:14), we see how much common ground is shared by all the subjective moods." Yes, and by the indicative also. The present indicative is often a practical future. Originally the subjunctive had the short vowel (cf. **ἴομεν** in Homer). The distinction between the indicative and subjunctive is not always clear.[3] The subjunctive in Homer is often merely futuristic. The affinity between the subjunctive and the optative is very close. The indicative continued to be used in the volitive sense (past tenses) and of command (future tense). Thus the other modes were luxuries of the language rather than necessities, while the indicative was the original possessor of the field. As already shown (chapter VIII, v) the injunctive survived in the imperative and subjunctive. The future indicative continued to fulfil the function of all the modes (cf. the indicative before the rise of the other modes). Thus the future indicative may be merely futuristic, or volitive, or deliberative. The same thing is true of the subjunctive and the optative. Cf. Moulton, *Prol*., p. 184 f. Thompson (*Syntax*, p. 186) curiously says that "thee indicative, however, assumed some of the functions of the other moods." If he had said "retained," he would have it right. He had just said properly enough: "It would be an error, with regard both to their origin and functions, to regard the moods as separate and water-tight compartments." The early process was from simplicity to variety and then from variety to simplicity (cf. again the history of the cases). The struggle between the modes has continued until in the modern Greek we have practically only the indicative and the subjunctive, and they

[1] Moulton, Probl, p..165.

[2] Ib. Cf. also Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 510. The injunctive had "a meaning hovering between the imperative, conjunctive and optative."

[3] Giles, Man., 459.

are in some instances alike in sound (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 115 f.). The subj. is "considerably reduced" in use in the modern Greek. The optative has disappeared entirely, and the imperative, outside the second person, and the future indicative are expressed by periphrasis. Even the infinitive and the participle in the **κοινή** have felt the inroads of the subjunctive.[1] It is true that as a rule we see the modes to best advantage in the simple sentence,[2] though essentially the meaning in the compound sentence is the same. But it is true, as Gildersleeve[3] urges, that "the predominance of parataxis over hypotaxis is a matter of style as well as of period. Hypotaxis holds fast to constructions that parataxis has abandoned. The futural subjunctive abides defiantly in the dependent clause of temporal sentences and dares the future indicative to invade its domain. The modal nature of the future, obscured in the principal sentence, forces itself upon the most superficial observer in the dependent clause." In a broad sense the indicative is the mode of objective statement in contrast with the subjective modes developed from it. But the description needs modification and is only true in a general sense. The N. T. idiom as of the **κοινή** in general will be found to differ from the classic Greek idiom here more than is true of the construction of the tenses.[4] The disappearance of the optative is responsible for part of this change. But the effort must now be made to differentiate the four modes in actual usage whatever may be true of the original idea of each. That point will need discussion also. The vernacular in all languages is fond of parataxis. See Pfister, "Die parataktische Darsteliungsform in der volkstumlichen Erzahlung" (*Woch. f. klass. Phil*., 1911, pp. 809-813).

A. INDEPENDENT OR PARATACTIC SENTENCES (**ΠΑΡΑΤΑΚΤΙΚΑ ᾽ΑΞΙΩΜΑΤΑ**)

I. The Indicative Mode (λόγος ἀποφαντικός or ἡ ὁριστικὴ ἔγκλισις).

1. MEANING OF THE INDICATIVE MODE.

The name is not distinctive, since all the modes "indicate." It is not true that the indicative gives "absolute reality,"[5] though it

[1] Thompson, Synt., p. 494. In the Sans. it was the subjunctive that went down in the fight. Cf. Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 201 f.

[2] Ib., p. 495.

[3] Am. Jour. of Philol., Jan., 1909, p. 2.

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 205.

[5] Bernhardy, Wiss. Synt. der griech. Sprache, p. 384.

is the "modus rectus." It does express "l'affirmation pure et simple."[1] The indicative does *state* a thing as true, but does not guarantee the *reality* of the thing. In the nature of the case only the *statement* is under discussion. A clear grip on this point will help one all along. The indicative has nothing to do with reality ("an sich").[2] The speaker *presents* something as true.[3] Actuality is implied, to be sure, but nothing more.[4] Whether it is true or no is another matter. Most untruths are told in the indicative mode. The true translation into Latin of **ὁριστική** would be *finitus* or *definitus*.[5] *Indicativus* is a translation of **ἀποσφαντικός**. The indicative is the most frequent mode in all languages. It is the normal mode to use when there is no special reason for employing another mode. The assertion may be qualified or unqualified.[6] This fact does not affect the function of the indicative mode to make a definite, positive assertion. Cf. Jo. 13:8, for instance. A fine study of the indicative mode is afforded in Jo. 1:1-18, where we have it 38 times, chiefly in independent sentences. The subjunctive occurs only three times (1:7 f.). The use of **ἦν, ἐγένετο, ἦλθεν, οὐκ ἔγνω, παρέλαβον, ἔλαβον, ἔδωκεν, ἐθεασάμεθα**, etc., has the note of certitude and confident statement that illustrate finely the indicative mode.

2. KINDS OF SENTENCES USING THE INDICATIVE.

(a) *Either Declarative or Interrogative.* The mere declaration probably (and logically) precedes in use the question.[7] But there is no essential difference in the significance of the mode. This extension of the indicative from simple assertion to question is true of all Indo-Germanic tongues.[8] Cf. Mt. 2:2; Mk. 4:7; Jo. 1:19. The simple assertion is easily turned to question. Cf. **ἐπείνασα γὰρ ἐδώκατέ μαοι φαγεῖν, ἐδίψησα καὶ ἐποτίσατέ με, κτλ**, and **πότε σε εἶδομεν πεινῶντα καὶ ἐθρέψαμεν, κτλ.** (Mt. 25:35-39). For the change fromquestion to simple assertion see **πιστεύεις τοῦτο; ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα** (Jo. 11:26 f.). Cf. Ac. 26:27. The formula **σὺ λέγεις** is sometimes used for the answer, as in Mt. 27:11; Lu. 22:70; Jo.18:37. So also **σὺ εἶπας** in Mt. 26:25, 64. The question without interrogative words is seen in Mt. 13:28; Jo. 13:6; Ac. 21:37; Ro. 2:21-23; 7:7, etc. Sometimes it is diffi-

[1] Vandacle, L'Otatif Grec, 1S97, p. 111.
[2] K.-G., Bd. I, p. 201.
[3] Ib. Der Redende stellt etwas als wirklich.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 445.
[5] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 297 f.
[6] Burton, and T., p. 73.
[7] Jann., Hisit. Gk. Gr., p. 445.
[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 205.

cult to tell whether a sentence is declarative or interrogative, as in 1 Cor. 1:13; Ro. 8:33 f.

For this very reason the Greek used various interrogatory particles to make plain the question. Thus ἆρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; (Ac. 8:30. Note the play on the verb). Cf. Lu. 18:8; Gal. 2:17. It is rare also in the LXX (cf. Gen. 18:9; 37:10; Jer. 4:10), but ἄρα is common.[1] It is a slight literary touch in Luke and Paul. The use of εἰ in a question is elliptical. It is really a condition with the conclusion not expressed or it is an indirect question (cf. Mk. 15:44; Lu. 23:6; Ph. 3:12). It is used in the N. T., as in the LXX quite often (Gen. 17:17, etc.). This construction with a direct question is unclassical and may be due to the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew הֲ by εἰ as well as by μή.[2] Cf. Mt. 12:10, **Εἰ** ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεῦσαι; see also Mt. 19:3; Mk. 8:23; Lu. 13:23; 22:49; Ac. 1:6; 7:1; 19:2; 21:37; 22:25. Note frequency in Luke. In Mk. 10:2 (parallel to Mt. 19:3) the question is indirect. The idiom, though singular, has "attained to all the rights of a direct interrogative"[3] by this time. The idiom may be illustrated by the Latin *an* which in later writers was used in direct questions. So *si*, used in the Vulgate to translate this εἰ, became in late Latin a direct interrogative particle. A similar ellipsis appears in the use of εἰ (cf. Heb. 3:11) in the negative sense of a strong oath (from the LXX also).[4] The particle ἦ is found in the LXX Job 25:5 B, but not in the N. T.[5] So far the questions are colourless.

The use of interrogative pronouns and adverbs is, of course, abundant in the N. T. Thus τίς, either alone as in Mt. 3:7, with ἄρα as in Mt. 24:45, with γάρ as in Mt. 9:5, with all as in Lu. 3:10.[6] See the double interrogative τίς τί in Mk. 15:24. For τί τοῦτο (predicative use of τοῦτο) see Lu. 16:2. For the ellipsis with ἵνα τί (cf. διὰ τί in Mt. 9:11; εἰς τί in Mk. 14:4) see Mt. 9:4, and for τί ὅτι note Lu. 2:49 (cf. τί γέγονεν ὅτι in Jo. 14:22). The use of τί in Ac. 12:18 and 13:25 is interesting. **Τί** is an accusative adverb in Mk. 10:18. A sort of prolepsis or double accusative occurs in οἶδα σὲ τίς εἶ (Mk. 1:24). Other pronouns used in direct questions are ποῖος (Mk. 11:28), πόσος (Mk. 6:

[1] Viteau, Etude sur le Grec du N. T. Le Verbe, p. 22. Some editors read ἄρα in Gal. 2:17, but see Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 259. See ἄρα in Mt. 18:1.

[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 260.

[3] W.-Th., p. 509.

[4] Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 179.

[5] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 22.

[6] Cf. Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 178.

38), ποταπός (Mt. 8:27). The sense of ὅ in Mt. 26:50 is disputed, as of ὅτι in Mk. 2:16; 9:11, 28; Jo. 8:25.[1] The use of interrogative adverbs is frequent. Cf. πότε (Mt. 25:38); ἕως πότε (Mt. 1:17); πῶς (Lu. 10:26); ποῦ (Lu. 8:25); ποσάκις (Mt. 18:21).

Alternative questions are expressed by ἤ alone as in 1 Cor. 9: 8, or with τί —ἤ as in Mt. 9:5. The case of ἢ τίς is different (Mt. 7:9).

Exclamations are sometimes expressed by the relative forms, like ὡς ὡραῖοι in Ro. 10:15, but more frequently by the interrogative proouns like πόσα (Mk. 15:4); πηλίκος (Gal. 6:11); τί (Lu. 12:49); ποσάκις (Mt. 23:37). Cf. πόσον in Mt. 6:23.

(b) *Positive and Negative*. If an affirmative or negative answer is expedited, then that fact is shown by the use of **οὐ** for the question expecting the affirmative reply and by **μή** for the negative answer. As a matter of fact, any answer may be actually given. It is only the *expectation* that is presented by **οὐ** or **μή**. This use of **οὐ** is like the Latin *nonne*. So **οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν ;** (Mt. 7:22). Cf. Mt. 6:25; 13:27; 13:55; Lu. 12:6; 15:8; 17:17; 1 Cor. 9:1; 14:23; Jas. 2:5; Heb. 3: 16, etc. This lis the common classic construction. The use of **οὐ** may suggest indignation as in **οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν**; (Mk. 14:60. Cf. **οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν** in verse 61). So with **οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων**; (Ac. 13:10). Surprise is indicated by **οὐκ ἄρα** in Ac. 21:38. **Οὐχί** is common. Cf. Lu. 6:39. **Οὐκοῦν** occurs once in the N. T. (Jo. 18:37). The presence of **μή** shows that the answer "no" is anticipated (the only instance of **μή** with the indicative in a principal sentence). Gildersleeve[2] calls **οὐ** "the masculine negative" and **μή** "the feminine negative." There is certainly a feminine touch in the use of **μή** by the woman at Jacob's well when she came to the village. She refused to arouse opposition by using **οὐ** and excited their curiosity by **μή**. Thus **μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός**; (Jo. 4:9).[3] The examples in the N. T. are very numerous. The shades of negative expectation and surprise vary very greatly. Each context supplies a slightly different tone. Cf. Mt. 7:9, 16; 1:23; 26:22, 25; Mk. 4:21; Lu. 6:39; Jo. 6: 67; 7:26, 35, 47, 51 f.; 21: 5; Ro. 9:14; 11:1. Both **οὐ** and **μή** may occur in contrast in the same sentence. So **μὴ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ, ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει**; (1 Cor. 9:8). Cf. Lu. 6: 39 **μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν ; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπε-**

[1] See oh. XV, Pronouns.

[2] Am. Jour. of Philol., Jan., 1910, p. 78.

[3] Cf. also Jo. 4:33.

σοῦνται; The use of **μήτι** is common (cf. **οὐχι**).[1] The combination **μὴ οὐ** will be discussed in the chapter on Particles, but it may be noted here that **οὐ** is the negative of the verb while **μή** is the interrogative particle expecting the answer "no." The English translation expects the answer "yes," because it ignores **μή** and translates only **οὐ**. Cf. 1 Cor. 9:4, 5; 11:22; Ro. 10:18, 19. The construction is in the LXX (Judg. 6:13, etc.) and in classic Greek. It is a rhetorical question, not a simple interrogative.[2] The kinds of sentences overlap inevitably so that we have already transgressed into the territory of the next group.

As already shown, the indicative is used indifferently with or without the negative in either declarative or interrogative sentences. The groups thus overlap. Cf., for instance, Jo. 1:2-8. The negative of a declarative independent sentence with the indicative is **οὐ**. This outright "masculine" negative suits the indicative. With questions, however, it is different, as has already been shown. Thus it is true that **μή** made a "raid" into the indicative, as **οὐ** did in the early language into the subjunctive.[3] The optative uses either **οὐ** or **μή**, but that is another story. The indicative with **οὐ** makes a pointed denial. Note the progressive abruptness of the Baptist's three denials in Jo. 1:20 f.

3. SPECIAL USES OF THE INDICATIVE.

(a) Past Tenses.

(α) *For Courtesy*. It is true that the indicative "is suited by its whole character only to positive and negative statements, and not to the expression of contingencies, wishes, commands or other subjective conceptions."[4] That is perfectly true. The indicative is the normal mode for saying a thing. The other modes Gildersleeve[5] aptly terms "side moods." I consider, as already explained, the indicative the mode par excellence, and I doubt the value of such language as "the modal uses of the indicative."[6] It is not so much that the indicative "encroached upon the other moods, and in so doing assumed their functions, especially in dependent sentences,"[7] as that the indicative, particularly in dependent sentences, retained to some extent all the functions of all the modes. It is true, as already said, that the indicative was

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 254.
[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 179.
[3] Cf. Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., Jan., 1910, p. 78.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 199.
[5] Synt. of Classic Gk., Pt. I, § 365.
[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 235.
[7] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 186.

always the most virile of all the modes and has outlived them all. But, after the other modes became fully developed, these less frequent uses of the indicative seemed anomalous. The courteous or polite use of the imperfect indicative is the simplest of these special constructions. Here the indicative is used for direct assertion, but the statement is thrown into a past tense, though the present time is contemplated. We do this in English when we say: "I was just thinking," "I was on the point of saying," etc. So Ac. 25: 22, ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι. Agrippa does not bluntly say βούλομαι (cf. Paul in 1 Tim. 2:8; 5:14) nor ἐβουλόμην ἄν, which would suggest unreality, a thing not true. He does wish. He could have said βουλοίμην ἄν, (cf. Ac. 26:29, where Paul uses the optative), but the simple ἐβουλόμην is better. The optative would have been much weaker.[1] In 2 Cor. 1:15 ἐβουλόμην πρότερον has its natural reference to past time. Cf. ἐβουλήθην in 2 Jo. 12 and Phil. 13, ἐβουλόμην, not 'would have liked' as Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 207) has it. In Gal. 4:20, ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι, Paul is speaking of present time (cf. ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι). He puts the statement in the imperfect as a polite idiom. The use of θέλω is seen in Ro. 16:19. The usual force of the mode and tense appears in ἤθελον in Jo. 6:21. The negative brings out sharply the element of will (cf. Lu. 19:14; Mt. 22:3). In Ro. 9:3, ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the same courteous even passionate) idiom occurs. It is not εὔχομαι as in 2 Cor. 13:7 (he does not dare pray such a prayer), nor did he do it (cf. ηὔχοντο Ac. 27:29). He was, however, on the verge of doing it, bit drew back. With this example we come close to the use of the indicative for unreality, the so-called "unreal" indicative. See also chapter on Tense.

(β) *Present Necessity, Obligation, Possibility, Propriety in Tenses of he Past.* This is the usual "potential" indicative. The imper ect of such verbs does not necessarily refer to the present.[2] Thus in Jo. 4:4, ἔδει αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρίας, it is simply a necessity in past time about a past event. So δεῖ in Jo. 4:20, 24 expresses a present necessity. This use of the imperfect ἔδει thus differs from either the present or the ordinary imperfect. The idiom is logical enough.[3] It was a necessity and the statement may be confined to that phase of the matter, though the necessity still exists. So Lu. 24:26, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν; Cf. also Mt. 18:33; 23:23; 25:27; Lu. 11:42; 13:16 (cf.

[1] W.-Th., p. 283.
[2] K.-G, Bd. I, p. 204 f.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 206.

δεῖ in verse 14); Ac. 27:21. It is an easy step from this notion to that of an obligation which comes over from the past and is not lived up to. The present non-fulfilment of the obligation is left to the inference of the reader or hearer. It is not formally stated. It happens that in the N. T. it is only in the subordinate clauses that the further development of this use of ἔδει comes, when only the present time is referred to. Thus in Ac. 24:19, οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι. They ought to be here, but they are not. Our English "ought" is likewise a past form about the present as well as about the past.[1] So 2 Cor. 2:3, ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν. In Heb. 9:26, ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν, there is an implied condition and ἔδει is practically an apodosis of the second-class condition, which see. The same process is seen in the other words. Thus in 2 Cor. 12:11, ἐγὼ ὤφειλον ὑφ' ὑμῶν συνίστασθαι, we have a simple past obligation. So in Lu. 7:41; Heb. 2:17. Note common use of the present tense also, as in Ac. 17:29. Cf. ὃ ὠφείλομεν ποιῆσαι πεποιήκαμεν (Lu. 17:10), where the obligation comes on from the past. But in 1 Cor. 5:10, ἐπεὶ ὠφείλετε ἄρα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελθεῖν, we have merely present time under consideration and a practical apodosis of a second-class condition implied. I do not agree with Moulton[2] that ἄν, in such instances has been "dropped." It simply was not needed to suggest the unreality or non-realization of the obligation. The context made it clear enough. **Χρή** occurs only once in the N. T. (Jas. 3:10), whereas προσήκει (Attic) is not found at all, nor ἔξεστι (but ἐξόν) nor ἐξῆν.[3] But ἐδύνατο is used of the present time. So Jo. 11:37. Cf. the apodosis in the second-class condition without to in Jo. 9:33; Ac. 26:32. The use of ὡς ἀνῆκεν (Col. 3:18) and ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν (Eph. 5:4) are both pertinent, though in subordinate clauses. Note in particular οὐ γὰρ καθῆκεν αὐτὸν ζῆν (Ac. 22:22), 'He is not fit to live.' In Mt. 26:24, καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, we have the apodosis without ἄν of a condition of the second class (determined as unfulfilled). There is no condition expressed in 2 Pet. 2:21, κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Moulton[4] finds the origin of this idiom in the conditional sentence, but Winer[5] sees in it merely the Greek way of affirming what was necessary, possible or appropriate in itself. So Gildersleeve.[6] The modern Greek preserves this idiom (Thumb,

[1] Our transl. therefore often fails to distinguish the two senses of ἔδει in Gk. Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 144 f. Cf. chapter on Tense.

[2] Prol., p. 200.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Glc., p. 206.

[4] Prol., p. 200.

[5] W.-Th., p. 282.

[6] Synt., Pt. I, p. 144.

Handb., p. 128). The use of **ἔμελλον** in Rev. 3:2 approaches this potential indicative. Cf. Thompson, *Syntax*, p. 274. For the use of the infinitive rather than the indicative see **ἢ — πεσεῖν**, in Lu. 16: 17. So also **ἵνα** and subjunctive as in Jo. 6:7. Cf. Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 21. The use of **ὀλίγου** or **μικροῦ** with an aorist does not occur in the N. T. Cf. Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 445.

(γ) *The Apodosis of Conditions of the Second Class*. This matter has already been touched on slightly and is treated at length under Conditional Sentences. It can be merely sketched here. The condition is not always expressed and **ἄν** usually is present. The use of **ἄν**, however, in the apodosis is not obligatory.[1] We know very little about the origin and meaning of **ἄν** anyhow. It seems to have a demonstrative sense (definite, then, in that case) which was shifted to an indefinite use. Cf. **τὸν καὶ τόν τὰ καὶ τά**.[2] Gildersleeve interprets it as a particle "used to colour the moods of the Greek language." With the past tenses of the indicative in independent sentences it is a definite particle. The effort to express unreality by the indicative was a somewhat difficult process. In Homer "the unreal imperfect indicative always refers to the past."[3] So in Heb. 11:15. Nothing but the context can show whether these past tenses are used in opposition to the past or the present. The **κοινή** received this idiom of the unreal indicative "from the earlier age as a fully grown and normal usage, which it proceeded to limit in various directions."[4] In Jo. 15:22 we have a good illustration of this construction. We know that **ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχοσαν** is in opposition to the present reality because it is followed by **νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν**. The same thing is seen in verse 24 when **νῦν δὲ ἑωράκασιν** follows. In verse 19 **ἂν ἐφίλει** is used, the usual construction. In Lu. 17:6 **ἐλέγετε ἄν** and **ὑπήκουσεν ἄν** are used after the protasis **εἰ ἔχετε** (first-class condition). This is a mixed condition. So also the marginal reading in W. H. in Jo. 8:39 is **ἐποιεῖτε** after **εἰ ἐστέ** and is followed by **νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτε** (cf. above). The absence of to seems more noticeable in John's Gospel. Cf. Jo. 19:11, **οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ οὐδεμίαν εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἄνωθεν**.[5] Paul has the same[6] idiom. Thus Gal. 4:15 **εἰ δυνατὸν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ μοι** and Ro. 7:7 **τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου, τήν τε**

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 205. [2] Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 168 f.

[3] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., Jan., 1909, p. 16. Cf. Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 251 f.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 199. [5] Here ℵA read **ἔχεις**.

[6] But not in Acts. Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 206.

γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος. The MSS. vary in the support of ἄν as in Gal. 4:15, where EKLP (and ℵ^{c} D^{c}) have it. In Jo. 18:36, B does not have ἄν, while in 8:19, D does not have it, and the other MSS. differ in the position of ἄν.[1] This particle comes near the beginning of the clause, though not at the beginning. It does not precede οὐκ (cf. Gal. 1:10). It is sometimes repeated in successive apodoses (cf. Jo. 4:10), but not always (cf. Lu. 12:39). Cf. Kuhner-Gerth, Bd. I, p. 247. On the use of ἄν in general see Thompson, *Syntax*, pp. 291 ff. Hoogeveer: (*Doctrina Partic. Linguae Graecae*, ed. sec., 1806, p. 35) makes ἄν mean simply *debeo*, a very doubtful interpretation. "The addition of ἄν to an indicative apodosis produced much the same effect as we can express in writing by italicizing 'if.'"[2] This emphasis suggests that the condition was not realized. The papyri likewise occasionally show the absence of ἄν.[3] The condition is not always expressed. It may be definitely implied in the context or left to inference. So κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν ἔπραξα αὐτό (Lu. 19:23) and καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ (Mt. 25:27). Here the condition is implied in the context, a construction thoroughly classical. But, in principal clauses, there is no instance of ἄν with a past tense of the indicative in a frequentative sense.[4] It only survives in relative, comparative or temporal clauses (cf. Mk. 6:56; Ac. 2:45; 4:35; 1 Cor. 12:2; Mk. 3:11; 11:19). So D in Mk. 15:6, ὃν ἂν ᾐτοῦντο. Both the aorist and the imperfect tenses are used thus with all in these subordinate clauses. There was, considerable ambiguity in the use of the past tenses for this "unreal" indicative. No hard and fast rule could be laid down. A past tense of the indicative, in a condition without ἄν, naturally meant a simple condition of the first class and described past time (cf. Heb. 12:25). But in certain contexts it was a condition of the second class (as in Jo. 15:22, 24). Even with ἄν it is not certain[5] whether past or present time is meant. The certain application to present time is probably post-Homeric.[6] The imperfect might denote[7] a past condition, as in Mt. 23:30; 24:43 (Lu. 12:39); Jo. 4:10; 11:21, 32; 1 Jo. 2:

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 206. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 200.

[3] Ib. Cf. Moulton, Class. Quart., Apr., 1908, p. 140. Moulton (Prol., p. 200) cites without ἄν O.P. 526 (ii/A.D.) οὐ παρέβενον, O.P. 530 (ii/A.D.) πάλιν σοι ἀπεστάλκειν (ii/B.c.) οὐκ ἀπέστηι, all apodoses of 2d class conditions. The mod. Gk. here uses the conditional θά (Thumb, Handb., p. 195).

[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 207. Cf. Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 170 f.

[5] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., § 399.

[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 236 f. [7] Moulton, Prol., p. 201.

19; Heb. 11:15, or, as commonly, a present condition (cf. Lu. 7: 39). The aorist would naturally denote past time, as in Mt. 11: 21. The two tenses may come in the same condition and conclusion, as in Jo. 14:28. The past perfect is found in the protasis, as in Mt. 12:7; Jo. 19:11. Once the real past perfect meets us in the conclusion (1 Jo. 2:19). And note a **ἂν ᾔδειτε** in Jo. 14:7.

(δ) *Impossible Wishes*. These impracticable wishes were introduced in Attic by **εἴθε** or **εἰ γάρ**, which used also **ὤφελον** with the infinitive. From this form a particle was developed **ὄφελον** (augmentless) which took the place of **εἴθε** and **εἰ γάρ**. The dropping of the augment is noted in Herodotus (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 201). As a matter of fact, this unfulfilled wish occurs only three times in the N. T.: once with the aorist about the past, **ὄφελόν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε** (1 Cor. 4:8), and twice with the imperfect about the present (2 Cor. 11:1; Rev. 3:15). **Ὄφελον** occurs once also with the future (Gal. 5:12). Many of the MSS. (D^cEFGKL) read **ὤφελον** in 2 Cor. 11:1, and a few do the same in 1 Cor. 4:8. The idiom occurs in the LXX and in the inscriptions. Cf. Schwyzer, Perg., p. 173. The modern Greek expresses such wishes by **νά** or **ἄς** and imperf. or aorist (Thumb, p. 128). For **ἔδραμον** in Gal. 2: 2, of unrealized purpose, see Final Clauses. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 127) quotes **ὄφελον ἔμεινας**, Achilles Tatius, II, 24, 3, and **ὤφελον ἐγὼ μᾶλλον ἐπύρεσσον,** Epict., *Diss*., 22, 12.

(b) **The Present.** In Mt. 12:38, **διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν**, the present seems rather abrupt.[1] In Jo. 12:21, **κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν**, this is felt so strongly that it is translated: 'Sir, we *would* see Jesus.' See also Jo. 6:67. Cf. **ἐβουλόμην** in Ac. 25:22 and **εὐξαίμην ἄν**, in 26:29. There does not seem to be the same abruptness in **θέλω** in 1 Cor. 7:7. Cf. also **φείδομαι** in 7:28. There were probably delicate nuances of meaning which sufficiently softened these words, shadings which now escape us. There is no difficulty about **ἀρκεῖ** in 2 Cor. 12:9. In a case like **ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν** (cf. **ἐρχόμεθα**) in Jo. 21:3, the suggestion or hint is in the fact, not in the statement. The indicative is a definite assertion. The nature of the case supplies the rest. In 1 Cor. 10:22, **ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον**; the indicative notes the fact, while the surprise and indignation come out in the interrogative form. The question in Jo. 11:47, **τί ποιοῦμεν**; is very striking. It may be questioned[2] if the point is the same as **τί ποιῶμεν**; (cf. Jo. 6:28), like the Latin *Quid faciamus*? The subjunctive of de-

[1] Cf. Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 21.
[2] Against Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 210.

liberation suggests doubt on the whole subject or expresses a wish to do something. Blass[1] cites the colloquial Latin for parallels for this idiom. But we do not need such parallels here. The inquiry of Caiaphas is rather indignant protest against the inactivity of the Sanhedrin than a puzzled quandary as to what they should do. The indicative suits exactly his purpose. He charges them with doing nothing and knowing nothing and makes a definite proposal himself. Winer sees the point clearly.[2] The same use of θέλω noted above appears in questions of deliberation as in θέλεις συλλέξωμεν; (Mt. 13:28). So βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω; (Jo. 18:39). Cf. Lu. 18:41. Possibility or duty may be expressed in questions also, as in πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν πονηροὶ ὄντες; (Mt. 12:34); τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ; (Ac. 16:30). This is the analytical method rather than trusting to the mode.[3] "It is found possible, and more convenient, to show the modal character of a clause by means of particles, or from the drift of the context, without a distinct verbal form."[4]

(c) **The Future.** The future indicative "was originally a subjunctive in the main"[5] and it has a distinct modal development. This fact comes out in the fact that the future tense of the indicative is a rival of the subjunctive, the optative and the imperative.[6] Like the subjunctive and optative the future may be merely futuristic (prospective) or deliberative or volitive. This matter has been discussed at length under Tenses, which see. As an example of the merely futuristic note Mt. 11:28, of the volitive see Lu. 13:9, of the deliberative note Jo. 6:68.

II. The Subjunctive Mode (ἡ ὑποτακτικὴ ἔγκλισις). Some of the Greek grammarians called it ἡ διστακτική, some ἡ συμβουλευτική, some ἡ ὑποθετική. But no one of the names is happy, for the mode is not always subordinate, since it is used freely in principal clauses, nor is it the only mode used in subordinate clauses. But the best one is ἡ διστακτική.

1. RELATIONS TO OTHER MODES.

The development of the modes was gradual and the differentiation was never absolutely distinct.

(a) *The Aorist Subjunctive and the Future Indicative*. These are closely allied in form and sense. It is quite probable that the future indicative is just a variation of the aorist subjunctive. Cf. ἔδομαι, πίομαι, φάγομαι. The subjunctive is always future, in

[1] Ib. Cf. Thompson, Synt., p. 187.
[2] W.-Th., p. 284.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 210.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 235.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 199.
[6] Thompson, Synt., p. 218.

subordinate clauses relatively future. Hence the two forms continued side by side in the language. There is a possible distinction. "The subjunctive differs from the future indicative in stating what is thought likely to occur, not positively what will occur."[1] But in the beginning (cf. Homer) it was probably not so. Brugmann (*Griech. Gr*., p. 499) pointedly contends that many so-called future indicatives are just "emancipated short-vowel conjunctives." Cf. Giles, *Manual*, pp. 446-448; Moulton, *Prol*., p. 149.

(b) *The Subjunctive and the Imperative.* These are closely allied. Indeed, the first person imperative in Greek, as in Sanskrit,[2] is absent in usage and the subjunctive has to be employed instead. There is a possible instance of the subjunctive as imperative in the second person in Sophocles, but the text is uncertain.[3] The use of **μή** and the aorist subjunctive in prohibitions of the second and third persons is also pertinent. Thus the subjunctive is in close affinity with the imperative.

(c) *The Subjunctive and the Optative.* They are really variations of the same mode. In my *Short Grammar of the Greek N. T.*[4] I have for the sake of clearness grouped them together. I treat them separately here, not because I have changed my view, but in order to give a more exhaustive discussion. The closeness of the connection between the subjunctive and the optative is manifest in the Sanskrit. "Subjunctive and optative run closely parallel with one another in the oldest language in their use in independent clauses, and are hardly distinguishable in dependent."[5] In the Sanskrit the subjunctive disappeared before the optative save in the imperatival uses. It is well known that the "Latin subjunctive is syncretistic, and does duty for the Greek conjunctive and optative."[6] Delbruck, indeed, insists that the two modes originally had the same form and the same meaning.[7] Delbruck's view has carried the bulk of modern opinion. But Giles[8] is justified in saying: "The original meaning of these moods and the history of their development is the most difficult of the many vexed questions of comparative syntax." It is true that

[1] Thompson, Gk. Synt., 1883, p. 133.
[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 216.
[3] Cf. Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 149.
[4] Pp. 129-131. [5] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 216,
[6] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., 1907, p. 191.
[7] Die Crundl. d. griech. Synt., p. 115 f.
[8] Comp. Plilol., p. 502.

the subjunctive in Greek refers only to the future, while the optative is not bound to any sphere.[1] But the optative is usually relatively[2] future like our "should," "could," etc. The use of the subjunctive was greater in Homer's time than afterwards. The independent subjunctive in particular was more freely used in Epic than in Attic. In the modern Greek[3] the subjunctive has not only displaced the optative, but the future indicative and the infinitive. But even so in modern Greek the subjunctive is relatively reduced and is almost confined to subordinate clauses (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 115, 126). The fut. ind. in modern Greek is really θά (θανά) and subj. G. Hamilton[4] overstates it in saying: "This monarch of the moods, which stands absolute and alone, has all the other moods dependent on it." It is possible that originally these two moods were used indifferently.[5] Vandacle[6] argues for a radical difference between the two moods, but he does not show what that difference is. There were distinctions developed beyond a doubt in actual use,[7] but they are not of a radical nature. The Iranian, Sanskrit and the Greek are the only languages which had both the subjunctive and optative. The Sanskrit dropped the subjunctive and the Greek finally dispensed with the optative as the Latin had done long ago.[8]

2. ORIGINAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE. Delbruck[9] is clear that "will" is the fundamental idea of the subjunctive, while "wish" came to be that of the optative. But this position is sharply challenged to-day. Goodwin[10] denies that it is possible "to include under one fundamental idea all the actual uses of any mood in Greek except the imperative." He admits that the only fundamental idea always present in the subjunctive is that of futurity and claims this as the primitive meaning from the idiom of Homer. Brugmann[11] denies that a single root-idea of the subjunctive can be found. He cuts the Gordian knot by three uses of the subjunctive (the *volitive*, the *deliberative*, the *futur-*

[1] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., Jan., 1909, p. 11.
[2] Cf. Buumlein, Unters. uber griech. Modi (1846, p. 25 f.).
[3] Cf. V. and D., Handb., p. 321 f.
[4] Latin of the Latins and Greek of the Greeks, p. 23.
[5] Bergaigne, De conjunctivi et optativi in indoeurop. linguis.
[6] L'optatif grec, p. xxiii. [7] Ib., p. iii.
[8] Jolly, Ein Kapitel d. vergl. Synt., Der Konjunktiv und Optativ, p. 119.
[9] Die Grundl., p. 116 f. Cf. Synt., II, pp. 349 ff.
[10] M. and T., App., Relation of the Optative to the Subjunctive and other Moods, p. 371.
[11] Griech. Gr., p. 499.

istic). W. G. Hale[1] identifies the deliberative and futuristic uses as the same. Sonnenschein[2] sees no distinction between volitive and deliberative, to which Moulton[3] agrees. "The objection to the term 'deliberative,' and to the separation of the first two classes, appears to be well grounded." He adds: "A command may easily be put in the interrogative tone." That is true. It is also true "that the future indicative has carried off not only the futuristic but also the volitive and deliberative subjunctives." But for practical purposes there is wisdom in Brugmann's division. Stahl[4] sees the origin of all the subjunctive uses in the notion of will. The future meaning grows out of the volitive. Mutzbauer[5] finds the fundamental meaning of the subjunctive to be the attitude of expectation. This was its original idea. All else comes out of that. With this Gildersleeve[6] agrees: "The subjunctive mood is the mood of anticipation," except that he draws a sharp distinction between "anticipation" and "expectation." "Anticipation treats the future as if it were present." He thinks that the futuristic subjunctive is a "deadened imperative."[7] But Monro[8] on the whole thinks that the futuristic meaning is older than the volitive. So the grammarians lead us a merry dance with the subjunctive. Baumlein[9] denies that the subjunctive is mere possibility. It aims after actuality, "a tendency towards actuality." At any rate it is clear that we must seek the true meaning of the subjunctive in principal clauses, since subordinate clauses are a later development, though the futuristic idea best survives in the subordinate clause.[10] In a sense Hermann's notion is true that three ideas come in the modes (*Wirklichkeit, Moglichkeit, Notwendigkeit*). The indicative is *Wirklichkeit*, the imperative is *Notwendigkeit*, while the subjunctive and the optative are *Moglichkeit*. I have ventured in my *Short Grammar*[11] to call the subjunctive and optative the modes of doubtful statement, to call,

[1] The Anticipatory Subjunctive in Gk. and Lat., Stud. Class. Phil. (Chicago), I, p. 6. See discussion of these three uses of fut. ind. under Tense.

[2] Cl. Rev., XVI, p. 166.

[3] Prol., p. 184.

[4] Synt., p. 235 f.

[5] Konjunktiv und Optativ, p. 8 f.

[6] Synt., Pt. I, p. 147.

[7] Ib., p. 148.

[8] Hom. Gr., p. 231.

[9] Unters. uber die griech. Modi, p. 35. Cf. Wetzel, De Conjunctivi et Optativi apud Graecos Usu, p. 7.

[10] Hammerschmidt, Uber die Grundb. von Konjunktiv und Optativ, p. 4.

[11] Pp. 129-131. As a matter of fact both Delbruck and Goodwin fail to establish a sharp distinction between the subjunctive and the optative. Cf. Giles, Man., p. 504.

while the indicative is the mode of positive assertion and the imperative that of commanding statement. The modes, as already seen, overlap all along the line, but in a general way this outline is correct. The subjunctive in principal sentences appears in both declarative and interrogative sentences. Cf. **εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πορὸς τὸν θεόν** (Ro. 5:1), **τί εἴπω ὑμῖν**; (1 Cor. 11:22). It is found in both positive and negative statements. Cf. **δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν**; (Mk. 12:14), **μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν** (Jo. 19:24). It is the mood of doubt, of hesitation, of proposal, of prohibition, of anticipation, of expectation, of brooding hope, of imperious will. We shall, then, do best to follow Brugmann.

3. THREEFOLD USAGE. The three uses do exist, whatever their origin or order of development.[1]

(a) *Futuristic*. This idiom is seen in Homer with the negative **οὐ** as in **οὐδὲ ἴδωμι**, 'I never shall see.' It is an emphatic future.[2] This emphatic future with the subjunctive is common in Homer with **ἄν** or **κεν** and once without. Gildersleeve[3] calls this the "Homeric subjunctive," but it is more than doubtful if the usage was confined to Homer. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 239) quotes P. Giles as saying: "This like does for many dialects what the subjunctive did for Greek, putting a statement in a polite, inoffensive way, asserting only verisimilitude." Note the presence of the subjunctive in the subordinate clauses with **ἐάν** (**εἰ**).[4] The presence of here and there with the subjunctive testifies to a feeling for the futuristic sense. See **ἥτις οὐ κατοικισθῇ** (Jer. 6:8). In the modern Greek, Thumb (*Handb*., p. 195) gives **ἃ δὲν πιστεύῃς**, where is for **οὐδέν**. The practical equivalence of the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative is evident in the subordinate clauses, particularly those with **εἰ, ἵνα, ὅς** and **ὅστις**. Cf. **ὃ προσενέγκῃ** (Heb. 8:3). This is manifest in the LXX, the N. T., the inscriptions and the late papyri.[5] Blass[6] pronounces **ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ** (Mk. 4:26) "quite impossible" against **א**BDI, A. But Moulton[7] quotes **οὐ τεθῇ** from inscriptions 317, 391, 395, 399 al. in Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii, 392. For the papyri, Moulton (*Prol*., p. 240) notes B. U; 303 (vi/A.D.) **παράσχω**= 'I will furnish,' A. P. 144 (v/A.D.) **ἔλθω**= 'I will come.' The itacisms in **–σῃ** and **–σει** prove less, as Moulton notes. The examples in the papyri of itacistic **–σει, --σῃ**, are "innumerable." In Ac. 5:15, W. H.

[1] Cf. Giles, Man., p. 505.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 198.
[3] Synt., Pt. I, p. 153.
[4] Brug., Greich Gr., p. 503.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 240.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 321.
[7] Prol., p. 240.

print ἵνα—ἐπισκιάσει (B, some cursives). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 136) is quite prepared to take πῶς φύγητε (Mt. 23:33) =πῶς φεύξεσθε. This is probably deliberative, but he makes a better case for ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται (Lu. 23:31). Blass[1] notes that "the mixture of the fut. ind. and aorist conj. has, in comparison with the classical language, made considerable progress." He refers to Sophocles, *Lexicon*, p. 45, where εἶπω σοι is quoted as = ἐρῶ σοι.[2] In a principal clause in Clem., *Hom*. XI. 3, we have καὶ οὕτως—δυνηθῇ, and Blass has noted also in Is. 33:24 ἀφεθῇ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἡ ἁμαρτία. We cannot, indeed, trace the idiom all the way from Homer. "But the root-ideas of the subjunctive changed it remarkably little in the millennium or so separating Homer from the Gospels; and the mood which was more and more winning back its old domain from the future tense may well have come to be used again as a 'gnomic future' without any knowledge of the antiquity of such a usage."[3] It was certainly primitive in its simplicity[4] even if it was not the most primitive idiom. The use of **οὐ** with the subj. did continue here and there after Homer's day. We find it in the LXX, as in Jer. 6:8 (above) and in the Phrygian inscription (above). In fact, in certain constructions it is common, as in **μὴ οὐ** after verbs of fearing and caution. Cf. 2 Cor. 12:20 and MSS. in Mt. 25:9 (**μή ποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ**). It is even possible that the idiom **οὐ μή** is to be thus explained. Gildersleeve[5] remarks on this point: "It might even seem easier to make a belong to αἰσχηνθῶ, thus combining objective and subjective negatives, but it must be remembered that **οὐ** with the subjunctive had died out (except in **μὴ οὐ**) before this construction came in." The vernacular may, however, have preserved **οὐ** with the subj. for quite a while. Jannaris[6] confidently connects **οὐ** in this idiom with the subj. and explains **μή** as an abbreviation of **μήν**. If either of these explanations is true, the N. T. would then preserve in negative principal sentences the purely futuristic subjunctive. Burton[7] is clear that anyhow "the aorist subjunctive is used with **οὐ μή** in the sense of an emphatic future indicative." The ancient Greek sometimes employed the present subjunctive in this sense, but the N. T. does not use it. But the LXX has it, as in Jer. 1:19. So in Is. 11:9 we find **οὐ μὴ κακοποιήσουσιν οὐδὲ μὴ δύνωνται**. The future ind. with **οὐ μή** is rare in the N. T., but **οὐ μή** with the aorist

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 208.
[2] See also Hatz., Einl., p. 218.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 186.
[4] Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 2, 372.
[5] Justin Martyr, p. 169.
[6] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 449.
[7] N. T. M. and T., p. 78.

subj. appears in the W. H. text 100 times.[1] It cannot be said that the origin of this a construction has been solved. Goodwin[2] states the problem well. The two negatives ought to neutralize each other, being simplex, but they do not (cf. **μὴ οὐ**). The examples are partly futuristic and partly prohibitory. Ellipsis is not satisfactory nor complete separation (Gildersleeve) of the two negatives. Perhaps **οὐ** expresses the emphatic denial and **μή** the prohibition which come to be blended into the one construction. At any rate it is proper to cite the examples of emphatic denial as instances of the futuristic subjunctive. Thus **οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω** (Heb. 13:5); **οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ** (Mk. 9:41); **οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω** (Mk. 14:25). Cf. Lu. 6:37 etc. See **οὐ μή** in both principal and subordinate clauses in Mk. 13:2. See also Tense.

It is a rhetorical question in Lu. 18:7 (note also **μακροθυμεῖ**.) rather than a deliberative one. In Rev. 15:4 we have the aor. subj. and the fut. ind. side by side in a rhetorical question, **τίς οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇ, κύριε, καὶ δοξάσει τὸ ὄνομα**; See also the **τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἕξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτόν—καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ**; (Lu. 11:5). It is difficult to see here anything very "deliberative" about **εἴπῃ** as distinct from **ἕξει.** It may be merely the rhetorical use of the futuristic subj. in a question. Have the grammars been correct in explaining all these subjunctives in questions as "deliberative"? Certainly the future incl. is very common in rhetorical and other questions in the N. T.

(b) *Volitive*. There is no doubt about the presence of the volitive subjunctive in the N. T. The personal equation undoubtedly cuts some figure in the shades of meaning in the moods, here as elsewhere.[3] Gildersleeve[4] would indeed make this "imperative sense" the only meaning of the mood in the standard language after Homer. He does this because the deliberative subjunctive expects an imperative answer. But, as already seen, that is a mooted question. Brugmann[5] takes pains to remark that the element of "will" in the volitive subjunctive belongs to the speaker, not to the one addressed. It is purely a matter of the context. It occurs in both positive and negative sentences and the negative is always **μή**. The usage is common in Homer.[6] Monro interprets it as expressing "what the speaker resolves or in-

[1] Moulton, Prol., 3d ed., p. 190. But in the Germ. ed., p. 300, Moulton names 74. He had given 78 in the first Engl. ed.

[2] M. and T., pp. 389 ff. See also pp. 101-105.

[3] Giles, Man., p. 505.

[4] Synt., Pt. I, p. 148.

[5] Griech. Gr., p. 500.

[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 197.

sists upon." In principle the hortatory subjunctive is the same as the prohibitive use with It was a necessity for the first person, since the imperative was deficient there. Moulton[1] ventures to treat this hortatory use of the first person subj. under the imperative, since the Sanskrit grammars give the Vedic subjunctive of the first person as an ordinary part of the imperative. The other persons of the Sanskrit subj. are obsolete in the epic period. Thus *bharama, bharata, bharantu* are compared with **φέρωμεν φέρετε, φερόντων** (Attic for **κοινή φερέτωσαν**). Moulton[2] appeals also to the combination of the first and second persons in constructions like **ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν**, (Mk. 14:42). This example illustrates well the volitive idea in **ἄγωμεν**.[2] The first person is usually found in this construction. Cf. also **ἄγωμεν** (Jo. 11:7); **φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν** (1 Cor. 15:32); **ἔχωμεν** (Ro. 5:1, correct text); **φρονῶμεν** (Ph. 3:15); **γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν** (1 Th. 5:6). Cf. Lu. 9:33 in particular (infinitive and subj.). In 1 Cor. 5: 8, **ὥστε ἑορτάζωμεν**, the subjunctive is hortatory and **ὥστε** is an inferential particle. Cf. further Heb. 12:1; 1 Jo. 4:7. As examples with **μή** see **μὴ σχίσωμεν** (Jo. 19:24); **μὴ καθεύδωμεν** (1 Th. 5:6). The construction continued to flourish in all stages of the language.[4] We have **δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν** (Mk. 12:7. Cf. **δεῦτε ἴδετε**, Mt. 28:6) and **ἄφες ἴδωμεν** (Mt. 27:49). In **ἄφες** the singular has become stereotyped.[5] This use of **ἄφες** was finally shortened into as in the modern Greek and came to be universal with the hortatory subjunctive of the first person and even for the third person imperative in the vernacular (as **ἂς ἔχῃ** for **ἐχέτω**). In the N. T. **ἄφες** is not yet a mere auxiliary as is our "let" and the modern Greek **ἂς**. It is more like "do let me go."[6] Radermacher *(N. T. Gr*., p. 134) quotes **ἄφες δείξωμεν**, Epict. I, 9, 15. In the first person singular the N. T. always has **ἄφες** or **δεῦρο** with the hortatory subjunctive.[7] Thus **ἄφες ἐκβάλω** (Mt. 7:

[1] Prol., p. 175. [2] Ib.

[3] See 1 Cor. 10 : 7-9 for the change from first to second persons.

[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 447.

[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 208. But see **ἄφετε ἴδωμεν**, (Mk. 15:36), though **א**D here read **ἄφες**.

[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 176. Jannaris (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 448) derives **ἄς** from **ἔασε** (**ἔασον**), **ἄσε.**

[7] It was rare in classic Gk. not to have **ἄγε** or **φέρε** or some such word. Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 88; Gildersl., *Synt*., Pt. I, p. 148 f. The volitive subj. is common in mod. Gk. (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 126) both for exhortations, commands, prohibitions and wishes. It occurs in the late pap. for wish, as **καταξιώσῃ**, P. Oxy. I, 128, 9. So in the inscr. **τοιαῦτα πάθῃ**, Pontica III, 62, 8

4) = Lu. 6:42 and δεῦρο ἀποστείλω (Ac. 7:34, LXX). Moulton[1] cites ἄφες ἐγὼ αὐτὴν θρνηήσω from 0. P. 413 (Roman period). We do not have to suppose the ellipsis of ἵνα, for ἄφες is here the auxiliary. In Jo. 12:7, ἄφες αὐτὴν ἵνα τηρήσῃ, it is hardly probable that ἄφες is just auxiliary,[2] though in the modern Greek, as already stated, as is used with the third person.

In the second person we have only the negative construction in prohibitions with the aorist subjunctive, a very old idiom[3] (see Tenses, Aorist). "The future and the imperative between them carried off the old jussive use of the subjunctive in positive commands of 2d and 3d person. The old rule which in ('Anglicistic') Latin made *sileas* an entirely grammatical retort discourteous to the Public Orator's *sileam*? — which in the dialect of Elis" (to go on with Moulton's rather long sentence) "produced such phrases as ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήται **Νικόδρομορ**— 'let Nicodromus attend to it,' has no place in classical or later Greek, unless in Soph., *Phil*., 300 (see Jebb). Add doubtfully Ll. P. 1, vs. 8 (iii/B.c.), Tb. P. 414 [26ff]. (ii/A.D.)." See Moulton, *Prol*., p. 178. In the LXX, Jer. 18:8, note καὶ ἐπιστραφῇ, parallel with ἀποστραφήτω in 18:11. In the modern Greek we have wishes for the future in the subj., since the opt. is dead. So ὁ θεὸς φυλάξῃ, God forbid' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 127). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 135) finds the subj. for wish in late papyri and inscriptions. It is even in the LXX, Ruth 1:9 A, δῴ κύριος ὑμῖν καὶ εὕρητε ἀνάπαυσιν, but B has optative. In the Veda the prohibitive *ma* is found only with the conjunctive, thus seeming to show that the imperative was originally used only in positive sentences. This idiom of μή and the aorist subj. held its own steadily in the second person. This point has been discussed at some length under Tenses. Take as illustrations the following: μὴ φοβηθῇς (Mt. 1: 20); μὴ νομίσητε (5:17); μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς (6:13). The use of ὅρα and ὁρᾶτε with μή and the aorist subj. is to be noted. Some of these are examples of asyndeton just like ἄφες. Thus ὅρα μηδενί μηδὲν εἴπῃς (Mk. 1:44; cf. Mt. 8:4). So also ὅρα μή (Rev. 22:9) where the verb ποιήσῃς is not expressed. Cf. LXX ὅρα ποιήσεις (Heb. 8: 5) ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω (Mt. 9:30) and ὁρᾶτε μὴ θροεῖσθε (24:6). With βλέπετε it is not always clear whether we have asyndeton (parataxis) or a subordinate clause (hypotaxis). In Lu. 21:8,

(Anderson-Cumont-Gregoire). Radermacher (N. T. Gk., p.128) cites also συντ μηθείησαν καὶ γένωνται, Acta Thomae, p. 129.

[1] Prol., p. 175. [2] Ib.

[3] Delbruck, Synt., p. 120; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 240.

βλέπετε μή πλανηθῆτε, we may (p. 996) have parataxis as is possible[1] in Heb. 12:25, βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε. Cf. Ac. 13:40; Gal. 5:15. These forms occur with the third person also, as βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανάσῃ (Mt. 24:4). But, *per contra*, see 1 Cor. 10:12 (μή ἔσται in Col. 2:8). In 1 Th. 5:15, ὁρᾶτε μή τις κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ τινὶ ἀποδῷ, parataxis is probable. But the third person aorist subj. occurs with μή alone as in μή τις οὖν αὐτὸν ἐξουθενήσῃ (1 Cor. 16:11); μή τίς με δόξῃ ἄφρονα εἶναι (2 Cor. 11:16); μή τις ὑμᾶς ἐξαπατήσῃ (2 Th. 2:3). Elsewhere μή and the aorist imperative occur in the third person. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 134) quotes μή and 3d person aor. subj. from κοινή writers, inscr. and papyri. Careless writers even use μὴ οὖν ἄλλως ποιῇς, B. G. U. III, 824, 17. Even Epictetus (II, 22, 24) has μὴ αὐτόθεν ἀποφαίνῃ. No less volitive is an example with οὐ μή, like οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε (Mt. 5: 20), which is prohibitive. So οὐ μὴ νίψῃς (Jo. 13:8); οὐ μὴ πίῃ (Lu. 1:15). There is the will of God in ἰῶτα ἕν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ (Mt. 5:18) in the third person. In Mt. 25:9, μή ποτε οὐ μὴ ἀρκέσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν, the subj. is probably futuristic (or deliberative). In a late papyrus, 0. P. 1150, 6 (vi/A.D.), note δεῖξον τὴν δύναμίν σον καὶ ἐξέλθῃ where the 3d pers. subj. imperative like Latin. There are examples in the N. T. where ἵνα seems to be merely an introductory expletive with the volitive subjunctive. Thus ἵνα ἐπιθῇς (Mk. 5:23); ἵνα ἀναβλέψω (10:51); ἵνα περισσεύητε (2 Cor. 8:7); ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν (Gal. 2:10. Note present tense); ἵνα φοβῆται, (Eph. 5:33) parallel with ἀγαπάτω. Cf. ἵνα—δώῃ (δῷ) margin of W. H., Eph. 1:17. Moulton[2] finds in the papyri (B. U. 48, ii/iii A.D.) ἐὰν ἀναβῇς τῇ ἑορτῇ ἵνα ὁμόσε γενώμεθα. So also he cites εἵνα αὐτὸν μὴ δυσωπήσῃς, F. P. 112 (99 A.D.), and ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὀλιγωρήσῃς (Cicero, *Att*. vi. 5). The modern Greek uses νά and subj. as imperative for both second and third persons (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 127 f.). Note also μὴ ἵνα ἀναστατώσῃς ἡμᾶς, B. G. U. 1079 (A.D, 41), not ἵνα μή. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 248) quotes Epict., IV, 1, 41, ἵνα μὴ μωρὸς ᾖ, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα μάθῃ. The use of θέλω ἵνα (cf. Mk. 6:25; 10:35; Jo. 17:24) preceded this idiom. Moulton[3] even suggests that προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν (Mk. 14:38) is as much parataxis as ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε (Lu. 12: 15). This "innovation" in the κοινή takes the place of ὅπως and the future ind. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 177 note) cites ὅπως μοι μὴ ἐρεῖς, Plato, 337 B, 'don't tell me,' where ὅπως=’in which case.’ The use of μή after words of caution and apprehension is probably

[1] But Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 278) holds the opposite view.
[2] Prol., p. 179. [3] Ib., p. 178.

paratactic in origin.[1] Moulton[2] notes the use of the present subj. with expressions of warning as well as the aorist. Thus in Heb. 12:15, ἐπισκοποῦντες μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἐνοχλῇ. But this construction borders so closely on subordinate clauses, if not clear over the line, that it will be best discussed there.

Subordinate clauses show many examples of the volitive subjunctive (as clauses of design, probably paratactic in origin, Moulton, *Prol*., p. 185). See δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν (Heb. 12:28). See discussion of Sub. Clauses.

(c) *Deliberative*. There is no great amount of difference between the hortatory (volitive) subjunctive and the deliberative. The volitive is connected with the deliberative in Mk. 6:24 f., **τί αἰτήσωμαι; θέλω ἵνα δῷς**. Thus **ποιήσωμεν**, 'suppose we do it,' and **τί ποιήσωμεν**; 'what are we to (must we) do?' do not vary much. The interrogative[3] is a quasi-imperative. Gildersleeve[4] notes in Plato (rare elsewhere in Attic) a "number of hesitating half-questions with **μή** or **μὴ οὐ** and the present subjunctive." It is possible that we have this construction in Mt. 25:9, **μή ποτε οὐ μὴ** (W. H. marg. just **οὐ**) **ἀρκέσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν**. It is but a step to the deliberative question.[5] This is either positive or negative, as in Mk. 12:14, **δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν**; So also **οὐ μή** as in Jo. 18: 11, **οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό**; Cf. also Lu. 18:7; Rev. 15:4. The aorist or the present tense occurs as in Lu. 3:10, **τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν;** and in Jo. 6:28, **τί ποιῶμεν**; so **λέγω** in Heb. 11:32. Cf. the indicative **τί ποιοῦμεν**; in Jo. 11:47 and the future **τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν;** (Ro. 9:14). The question may be rhetorical (cf. Mt. 26:54; Lu. 14:34; Jo. 6:68; Ro. 10:14) or interrogative (cf. Mt. 6: 31; 18:21; Mk. 12:14; Lu. 22:49).[6] The kinship between delib. subj. and delib. fut. ind. is seen in Mk. 6:37, **ἀγοράσωμεν καὶ δώσομεν**; The first person is the one of most frequent occurrence (cf. Ro. 6:1), **τί αἰτήσωμαι** (Mk. 6:24). But examples are not wanting for the second and third persons. Thus **πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης**; (Mt. 23:33); **τί γένηται**; (Lu. 23:31). See further Mt. 26:14; Ro. 10:54. It is sometimes uncertain whether we have the subjunctive or the indicative, as in **ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν**; (Mt. 11:3) and **ἐπαινέσω ὑμᾶς**; (1 Con 11:22). But note **τί εἴπω ὑμῖν**; in the last passage. In Lu. 11:5 we have both

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 212 f.
[2] Prol., p. 178.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 199, 229.
[4] Synt., Pt. I, p. 152. Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 92.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 211.
[6] Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, p. 77.

τίς ἔξει and **εἴπῃ**. So **τί δοῖ**, (Mk. 8:37, ACD **δώσει**) may be compared with **τί δώσει** (Mt. 16:26).[1] This ambiguity appears in **τί ποιήσω**; and **ἔγνω τί ποιήσω** in Lu. 16:3 f. The deliberative subj. is retained in indirect questions. Cf. Mt. 6:31 with Mt. 6:25. The kinship between the deliberative subj. in indirect questions and the imperative and the volitive subjunctive is seen in Lu. 12:4 f., **μὴ φοβηθῆτε—ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθεῆτε· φοβήθηε κτλ.** The deliberative subj., like the volitive, has various introductory words which make asyndeton (parataxis). These become set phrases like **ἄφεσς, ὅρα**. Thus **ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν**; (Mt. 26:17), **θέλεις εἴπωμεν**; (Lu. 9:54). In Lu. 18:41 we have **τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω**; and **ἵνα ἀναβλέψω** as the reply, using **ἵνα** in the brief answer. Cf. further Mt. 13:28. In Jo. 18:39, **βούλεσθε οὖν ἀπολύσω**, we probably have the subj. also. Some MSS. have **εἰ πατάξωμεν**; in Lu. 22:49.[2] We may leave further discussion of the subj. to the subordinate clauses. We have no examples in the N. T. of **ἄν** with the subj. in independent sentences (but see **κέ** and the subj. in Homer). In subordinate clauses **ἄν** is very common, though not necessary, as will be seen.[3] (Cf. discussion of **εἰ, ὅστις**.) But Jannaris[4] gives instances of **ἄν** with the subj. in principal clauses (futuristic) in Polybius, Philo, Plutarch, Galen, etc. With the disappearance of the fut. ind., the opt. and the imper., the subj. has the field as the "prospective mood." It is found in the modern Greek as in **τί νὰ γίνῃ** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 126).

III. **The Optative Mode** (**ἡ εὐκτικὴ ἔγκλισις**). It has already been shown that the optative does not differ radically from the subjunctive. Jannaris[5] calls the optative the "secondary subjunctive."

1. HISTORY OF THE OPTATIVE. For the facts see chapter on Conjugation of the Verb. It is an interesting history and is well outlined by Jannaris[6] in his Appendix V, "The Moods Chiefly Since A. (Ancient Greek) Times." It retreated first from dependent clauses and held on longest in the use for wish in independent sentences like **γένοιτο**. But even here it finally went down before the fut. ind. and subj. The optative was a luxury

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 210. Cf. K.-G., Tl. I, p. 221.

[2] Ib.

[3] Cf. Paley, The Gk. Particles, p. 5. See Koppin, Beitr. zu Entwick. and Ward. der Ideen uber die Grundb. d. griech. Modi (1880).

[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 564. On the subj. see further Earle, Cl. Papers, p. 221.

[5] Ib., p. 450.

[6] Ib., pp. 560-567.

of the language and was probably never common in the vernacular. Certainly it is very rare in the vernacular **κοινή** (both inscriptions and papyri). It is a literary mood that faded before the march of the subj. In a hundred pages of the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon the optative occurs 350 times. He had a "hyperorthodox love of the mood."[1] Plato's *Phaedo* shows it 250 times in a corresponding space, but Strabo has it only 76, Polybius 37, Diodorus Siculus 13 times in a hundred pages.[2] The 67 examples in the N. T. are in harmony with the **κοινή** usage. Gildersleeve pithily says: "The optative, which starts life as a wish of the speaker, becomes a notion of the speaker, then a notion of somebody else, and finally a gnomon of obliquity" (*A. J. of Phil*., 1908, p. 264). In the LXX the optative is rare, but not so rare as in the N. T., though even in the LXX it is replaced by the subj. (Thackeray, *Gr.*, p. 193) as in the late papyri and inscriptions (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.,* pp. 128, 135).

2. SIGNIFICANCE. There is no definite distinction between the subjunctive and the optative in the Sanskrit.[3] The Latin put all the burden on the subj., as the Greek finally did. The Sanskrit finally made the optative do most of the work. In a word, the optative is a sort of weaker subjunctive.[4] Some writers make the opt. timeless and used definitely of the past.[5] It is rather a"softened future"' sometimes flung back into the past for a *Standpunkt*. We do not[7] know "whether the opt. originally expressed wish or supposition." The name does not signify anything. It "was invented by grammarians long after the usages of the language were settled."[8] They just gave it the name **εὐτική** because at that time the only use it had without **ἄν** was that of wishing. The name is no proof that wishing was the primitive or the only function or the real meaning of the mode. We have precisely the same difficulty as in the subjunctive. Indeed, the

[1] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Phil., Jan., 1909, p. 19. According to Vandacle (L'Optatif Grec, p. 251) Plato et Xen. "ont donne a l'optatif la plus grande extension possible; Xenophon marque l'apogee." The optative he also describes as "un instrument d'une delicatesse infinie." See further Kupff, Der Gebr. d. Opt. bei Diod. Sic. (1903); Reik, Der Opt. bei Polyb. und Philo (1907).

[2] Schmid, Der Gebr. des Optativs bei Diod. Sic., 1903, p. 2.

[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 218. In the original speech there was no clear distinction between the subj. and the opt. (Curtius, Temp. und Modi, 1846, p. 266).

[4] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 384.

[5] Baumlein, Griech. Modi, p. 177.

[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 229.

[7] Ib., p. 231.

[8] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 375.

optative has three values, just like the subjunctive, viz. the futuristic (potential), the volitive (wishes) and the deliberative.[1] In the first and third kinds ἄν is usually present, but not always. Brugmann[2] notes only two, omitting the deliberative as some scholars do for the subj. He does reckon a third use in indirect discourse, but this is merely the opt. in subordinate sentences and may be either of the three normal usages. The rare fut. opt. in indirect discourse illustrates the point (not in the N. T.). There is no doubt of the distinction between the futuristic (potential) with negative **οὐ** (cf. futuristic subj. in Homer) and the volitive use with **μή** (cf. subj. again).[3] But there was also a "neutral sense" that can hardly be classed either as futuristic or volitive.[4] Gildersleeve[5] calls this the "optative in questions," usually with ἄν. This is the deliberative use.

3. THE THREE USES.

(a) *Futuristic or Potential.* We begin with this whether it is the first in time or not. Delbruck[6] has taken several positions on this point. The use of the negative **οὐ** here shows its kinship with the future (cf. fut. ind. and aorist subj. in Homer).[7] The ἄν was not always present in Homer and it is not the ἄν that gives the potential idea to the mode. In poetry the use without ἄν continued. "The optative is the ideal mood of the Greek language, the mood of the fancy."[8] Moulton[9] puts it clearly: "It was used to express a future in a milder form, and to express a request in deferential style." Radermacher cites from Epictetus, II, 23, 1, ἂν ἥδιον ἀναγνῴη — ἄν τις ῥᾳον ἀκούσει, showing clearly that the opt. and the fut. ind. are somewhat parallel. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 194) cites Deut. 28:24 ff., where the opt. and fut. ind. alternate in translating the same Hebrew. I do not agree with Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 128) in seeing in ἤθελον παρεῖναι (Gal. 4:20) a mere equivalent of θέλοιμι ἄν. See imperfect ind. The presence of ἄν gives "a contingent meaning"[10] to the verb and makes one think of the unexpressed protasis of the fourth-class condition. The

[1] Giles, Man., p. 510.
[2] Griech. Gr., pp. 504 ff.
[3] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 375.
[4] Ib., p. 4.
[5] Synt., Pt. I, p. 154. Stahl (Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 236 f.) notes a "concessive opt.," which is an overrefinement. It is merely a weakened form of wish (K.-G., Bd. I, p. 228) or of the potential use.
[6] Cf. his Konjunktiv and Optativ, Syntaktische Forschungen, Att.-indische Synt. In the last of these he suggests that the potential and wishing functions are distinct in origin.
[7] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 219.
[8] Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 153.
[9] Prol., p. 197.
[10] Ib., p. 166.

idiom has vanished as a living form from the vernacular κοινή in the N. T. times.[1] It appears only in Luke's writings in the N. T. and is an evident literary touch. The LXX shows it only 19 times outside of 4 Maccabees and 30 with it.[2] Moulton' notes one papyrus which does not have ay (cf. Homer), though he would suspect the text and read as Mahaffy does οὐθὲν ἃ[ν] ἐπείπαιμι, Par. P. 63 (ii/B.C.). But curiously enough Luke has only one instance of this "softened assertion" apart from questions. That is in Ac. 26:29 (critical text) εὐξαίμην ἄν. This fact shows how obsolete the idiom is in the κοινή. The use of av here avoids the passionateness of the mere optative (Gildersleeve, *Syntax*, p. 157). The other examples in Luke's writings are all in questions and may be compared with the subj. in deliberative questions. Only two examples appear of the opt. with ἄν in direct questions. They are πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσει με; (Ac. 8:31. The only instance of a protasis in connection with an optative apodosis in the N. T.) and τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; (Ac. 17:18). Both are rhetorical questions and the second has a deliberative tone; see (c). In Ac. 2:12, E has τί ἂν θέλοι. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 198) cites τίς ἂν δῴη from Job 31:31 and holds that it does not differ from τίς δῴη elsewhere (Num. 11:29). The other instances of ἄν and the opt. are all in indirect questions, but the construction is not due to the indirect question. It is merely retamed from the direct. The use of the optative in an indirect question when the direct would have the indicative or the subjunctive is not the point. This is merely the classic sequence of modes in indirect questions. See Lu. 8:9, ἐπηρώτων τίς εἴη. So Lu. 22:23 (cf. ἄν. in 24). Cf. Ac. 21:33. In Lu. 1:29, D adds ἄν and MSS. vary with some of the other examples (cf. Lu. 18:36). So ἄν is correct in Lu. 15:26. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 198) cites Esth. 13:3 πυθομένου — πῶς ἂν ἀχθείη and inscr. Magnes. 215 (i/A.D.) ἐπερωτᾷ— τί ἂν ποιήσας ἐδεῶς διατελοίη. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 198) argues for "a minimum of difference" in the examples of indirect questions with and without ἄν. The difference is in the direct question. The examples with ἄν (W. H.'s text) in indirect questions are Lu. 1:62; 6:11; 9:46; 15:26; Ac. 5:24; 10:17.[4] In all of these instances the deliberative ele-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 197 f.; Blass, Gr. of N.T. Gk., p. 220. [2] Prol., p. 197.

[3] Ib., p. 198. He notes also 4 Macc. 5:13, συγγνώσειεν without ἄν. In the Pap. ἄν is usually present with the potential opt. (Radermacher, *N. T. Gk*., P. 129). Sometimes 'laws occurs with the opt., ἴσως--ἀπορήσειεν in Joh. Philop.

[4] Burton, M. and T., p. 80; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 220:

ment is undoubtedly present; see (c). The same thing is true of Lu. 3:15 (**μή ποτε**) Ac. 17:27 (**εἰ**), but Ac. 25:16 (**πρὶν ἤ** in indirect discourse for subj. of the direct) is futuristic.

(b) *Volitive*. Moulton[1] calls this use the "Optative Proper," a curious concession to the mere name. It has been the most persistent construction of the optative, and (in independent clauses) thirty-eight of the sixty-seven examples of the N. T. come under this category.[2] Fifteen of the thirty-eight instances belong to **μή γένοιτο**, once in Lu. 20:16, and the other fourteen in Paul's Epistles (10 in Romans, 1 in 1 Cor., 3 in Gal.). Thumb considers the rare use of **μὴ γένοιτο** in modern Greek (the only relic of the optative) a literary phenomenon, but Moulton[3] notes that Pallis retains it in Lu. 20:16. Moulton compares the persistence of the English optative in the phrase "be it so," "so be it," "be it never so humble," etc.[4] So he notes it in the papyri for oaths, prayers and wishes.[5] 0. P. 240 (i/A.D.) **εὖ εἴη**, O. P. 715 (ii/A.D.) **ἔνοχοι εἴημεν**, 0. P. 526 (ii/A.D.) **χαίροις**, L. Pb. (ii/B.C.) **ὃς διδοίη σοι**, B. M. 21 (ii/B.C.) **σοὶ δὲ γένοιτο**. The N. T. examples are all in the third person except Phil. 20, **ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην**. One is a curse **μηκέτι μηδεὶς φάγοι** (Mk. 11:14) and is equivalent to the imperative. "There is a strong inclination to use the imperative instead of the optative, not only in requests, where the imperative has a legitimate place in classical Greek as well, but also in imprecations, where it takes the place of the classical optative: **ἀνάθεμα ἔστω**, Gal. 1:8 f. Cf. 1 Cor. 16:22."[6] Only in Mk. 11:14 and Ac. 8:20, **τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη,** do we have the optative in imprecations in the N. T. The opt. comes very near the imper. in ancient Greek sometimes (Gildersleeve, p. 155). Cf. **γίνοιτο**, P. Par. 26 (B.c. 163). In Ac. 1:20, where the LXX (Ps. 109:8) has **λάβοι**, Luke gives **λαβέτω**.[7] There are only 23 examples of the volitive optative in independent clauses outside of **μὴ γένοιτο**. Paul has 15 of this 23 "(Ro. 15:5, 13; Phil. 20; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18; 4:16, and the rest in 1 and 2 Th.), while Mark, Luke, Acts, Hebrews, 1 Peter and 2 Peter have one apiece, and Jude two."[8] They are all examples of the aorist optative except the present in Ac. 8:20. The negative is **μή** and **ἄν** is not used. In

[1] Prol., p. 194.
[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 79; Moulton, Prol., p. 194.
[3] Ib., p. 240.
[4] Cf. Sweet, New Eng. Gr.: Synt., pp. 107 ff.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 195 f. 7 Ib.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. 1'. Gk., p. 220. [8] Moulton, Prol., p. 195.

2 Th. 3:16 δῴη is opt., not the subj. δώῃ. In 1 Th. 3:12 the context shows that περισσεύσαι is opt. (not aor. inf. nor aor. middle imperative).[1] The rare use of the volitive opt. with εἰ (twelve cases in the N. T., but four belong to indirect questions), will be discussed under Conditional Sentences. If ἵνα δῴη is the correct text in Eph. 1:17, we probably have a volitive optative, the ἵνα being merely introductory (cf. examples with the subj.).[2] It is hardly a case of final ἵνα with the optative. Blass[3] reads δῷ here subj. after B. In modern Greek Dr. Rouse finds people saying not μὴ γένοιτο, but ὁ θεὸς νὰ φυλάξῃ (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 249), though νά is not here necessary (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 127). The ancient idiom with εἴθε and εἰ γάρ is not found in the N. T., as stated already several times. Ὄφελον with the future ind. occurs for a future wish (Gal. 5:12).

(c) *Deliberative*. There is little more to add here. The LXX[4] gives instances of τίς δῴη; (Num. 11:29; Judg. 9:29; 2 Sam. 18:33, etc.) without ἄν as in Homer, where a deliberative subj. would be admissible. See also Ps. 120 (119):3, τί δοθείη σοι καὶ τί προστεθείη σοι; In Lu. 6:11 Moulton[5] remarks that τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν in the indirect question is "the hesitating substitute for the direct τί ποιήσομεν;" Why not rather suppose a "hesitating" (deliberative) direct question like τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; (Ac. 17:18). As already remarked, the context shows doubt and perplexity in the indirect questions which have ἂν and the opt. in the N. T. (Lu. 1:62; 6:11; 9:46; 15:26; Ac. 5:24; 10:17). The verbs (ἐνένευον, διελάλουν, εἰσῆλθεν διαλογισμός, ἐπυνθάνετο, διηπόρουν) all show this state of mind. See indirect question εἰ βούλοιτο in Ac. 25:20 after ἀπορούμενος. Cf. 27:39. The deliberative opt. undoubtedly occurs in Lu. 3:15, διαλογιζομένων μή ποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ Χριστός. It is not therefore pressing the optative unduly to find remnants of the deliberative use for it (cf. subj. and fut. indicative).

[1] They are all exx. of the third person save Phil. 20. Here is the list (with Burton's errors corrected by H. Scott): Mk. 11:14; Lu. 1:38; 20:16; Ac. 8:20; Ro. 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11; 15:5, 13; 1 Cor. 6:15; Gal. 2:17; 3:21; 6:14; 1 Th. 3:11, 12 bis; 5:23 bis; 2 Th. 2:17 bis; 3:5, 16; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18; 4:16; Phil. 20; Heb. 13:21; 1 Pet. 1:2; 2 Pet. 1:2; Ju. 2, 9.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 196.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 211.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 194.

[5] Ib., p. 198. On the "development principle" of the opt. see Mutzbauer, Konj. and Opt., p. 155.

IV. The Imperative (ἡ προστατικὴ ἔγκλισις).

1. ORIGIN OF THE IMPERATIVE. See chapter on Conjugation of the Verb for discussion of the various devices used by this latest of the modes in order to get a foothold. Giles,[1] after giving the history of the imperative forms (five separate strata), curtly dismisses it as not properly a mode and declines to discuss it under syntax. So Radermacher passes it by in his *N. T. Gr.* Moulton,[2] on the other hand, takes it up "first among the moods" because "it is the simplest possible form of the verb." It is the simplest in one of its forms like the interjectional ἄγε, but it is also the latest of the modes and is without a distinct set of endings. Besides, it never dislodged the aorist subj. from the second person in prohibitions and finally gave up the fight all along the line. The modes were slower than the tenses in making sharp distinctions anyhow, and in the Sanskrit "no distinction of meaning has been established between the modes of the present-system and those (in the older language) of the perfect- and aorist-systems."[3] The ambiguity of the imperative persists in the second person plural present where only the context can decide the mode. Thus ἐραυνᾶτε (Jo. 5:39); πιστεύετε (14:1); ἀγαλλιᾶσθε (1 Pet. 1:6); οἰκοδομεῖσθε (2:5); τελεῖτε (Ro. 13:6); καθίζετε (1 Cor. 6:4); cf. Jo. 12:19. The perfect form ἴστε (Jas. 1:19; Heb. 12:17) shows the same situation.

2. MEANING OF THE IMPERATIVE. In original significance it was demand[4] or exhortation. But, as will be shown, it was not confined to this simple idea. Besides, the notion of command (or prohibition) was expressed in various ways before the imperative was developed. These uses of the other modes continued to exist side by side with the imperative till the N. T. time. Examples of this will be given directly. The imperative itself was extended to include various shades of the future ind., the subj. and the opt. There is a general sense in which the imperative is distinct, as is seen in ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (Mt. 5:44), but this idea of command easily softens to appeal as in **κύριε, σῶσον,** ἀπολλύμεθα (Mt. 8:25).

3. DISAPPEARANCE OF THE IMPERATIVE FORMS. It was the last mode to get on its feet. It followed the optative into oblivion save in the second person (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 154). There the forms held on in the main, but the present subjunctive with **μή** came also into use instead of **μή** and the present imper., and

[1] Man., pp. 464-473, 502.
[2] Prol., p. 171.
[3] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 220.
[4] Delbruck, Die Grundl., p. 120.

finally the hortatory (positive) subj. also appeared as imper. In the third person (both positive and negative with **μή**) **ἵνα** and the subj. drove out the imperative. Thus the imperative forms in modern Greek present a wreck, if indeed they were ever much else.[1] The imperative, like the subjunctive, is always future in time, though it may apply to the *immediate* future as in "quit that."

4. ALTERNATIVES FOR THE IMPERATIVE. These, under all the circumstances, can be logically treated before the imperative itself. Indeed, they have already been discussed in the preceding remarks on tense and mode, so that little in addition is required.

(a) *The Future Indicative*. See ch. XVIII, Tense, where it is shown that the *Volitive Future* is the equivalent of the imperative. The fut. ind., like the subj. and the opt., may be merely futuristic or volitive, or deliberative. The volitive future is a matter of context and tone of voice, to be sure, but that is true also of the subj. and opt., and, in truth, of the real imperative. But more of the "tone of the imperative" further on. English, as well as Greek, continues to use this volitive future. Both positive and negative (**οὐ**) commands are given by the fut. ind. The negative is sometimes **μή** as in **μὴ βουλήσεσθε εἰδέναι** (Demosthenes), **μὴ ἐξέσται** (B. U. 197, i/A.D.), **μηδένα μισήσετε** (Clem., *Hom*., III, 69).[2] So also **οὐ μή** with the fut. ind. is sometimes prohibition, as in **οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο** (Mt. 16:22). Cf. also Gal. 4:30. But it is commonest in the simple future like **σὺ ὄψῃ** (Mt. 27:4); **ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε** (27:24); **ἐκκόψεις** (Lu. 13:9); **οὐκ ἔσεσθε** (Mt. 6:5), etc. It is true that this use of **οὐ** proves the origin of this idiom to be "a purely futuristic form,"[3] as is the case with the question **οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων**; (Ac. 13:10), but the tone of this future is volitive (imperatival). The Latin use of the volitive future coincides with that of the Greek. Gildersleeve[4] says: "It is not a milder or gentler imperative. A prediction may imply resistless power or cold indifference, compulsion or concession." The exact shade of idea in this volitive future must be watched as closely as the imperative itself. Cf. **καλέσεις** (Mt. 1:21) with **σὺ ὄψῃ** (Mt. 27:4). Blass[5] denies that this is a "classical" idiom (against

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 449, 451, 555 ff.; V. and D., Handb. (Jebb), p. 322 f.; Thumb, Handb., p. 127.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 177. Cf. Gildersl., Synt., p. 117.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 177.

[4] Synt., Pt. I, p. 116. Cf. W.-Th., p. 316.

[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 209.

Gildersleeve) and rather minimizes its use in the N. T. Many of the examples do come from the 0. T. (LXX) legal language. Certainly in the LXX the fut. ind. often replaces the imperative under the influence of the Hebrew (Thackeray, *Gr*., p. 194). But examples occur where the two are equivalent. Cf. ἀγαπήσεις in Mt. 5:43, with ἀγαπᾶτε in 5:44, ἐρεῖτε in Mt. 21:3, with εἴπατε in Mk. 11:3. Some MSS. have ἔστω rather than gurat in Mt. 20:26.

(b) *The Subjunctive*. The volitive subjunctive is quite to the point. In the first person this use of the subj. held its own always in lieu of the imperative. It is needless to repeat the discussion of this matter (see Subjunctive in this chapter). The use of ἵνα with the subj. in an imperatival sense is seen Mk. 5:23 (6:25); Eph. 5:33 is there discussed also. Cf. Tit. 2:4. Let **μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν**, (Jo. 19:24) serve as an example. So in the second person the aorist subj. held its place in prohibitions past **κοινή** times to the practical exclusion of the aor. imper. with **μή**. The two constructions existed in the **κοινή** side by side with the third person. Thus **μὴ γνώτω** (Mt. 6:3) and **μή τις ἐξουθενήσῃ** (1 Cor. 16:11). Cf. δός and **μὴ ἀποστραφῇς** in Mt. 5:42. The final triumph of the subj. over the imperative (save in the second person) has been shown. Cf. the fate of the opt. before the subj.

(c) *The Optative.* There is only one example, **μηκέτι μηδεὶς φάγοι** (Mk. 11:14) in the N. T. The distinction between a curse and a prohibition is not very great. The parallel passage in Mt. 21: 19 has[1] **οὐ μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται** (volitive subj.).

(d) *The Infinitive.* The idiom is very frequent in Homer.[2] It occurs chiefly after an imperative. The command is carried on by the infinitive. There is no need for surprise in this construction, since the probability is that imperative forms like δεῖξαι (like the Latin *legimini*, Homeric λεγέ-μεναι) are infinitive in origin.[3] It is true that the accent of the editors for the aorist active optative is different from the aorist active inf. in forms like **κατευθύναι, περισσεύσαι** (1 Th. 3:11 f.), but the MSS. had no accent. We could properly print the infinitive if we wished.[4] So as to παρακαλέσαι (2 Th. 2:17) where the accent is the same for both infinitive and optative (the imper. form aor. mid. sec. singl. is παρακάλεσαι). Cf. βάπτισαι and βαπτίσαι, one and the same form. The idiom is less frequent in the Attic[5] outside of laws and maxims,

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 179.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 162.
[3] Giles, Man., p. 468.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 179.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 222.

but happens to be the one infinitive construction that is alive in the Pontic dialect to-day.[1] Moulton[2] expresses surprise at the rarity of this use of the inf. in the N. T., since it is common in the papyri. Cf. ἐξεῖναι, μισθῶσαι, A. P. 86 (1/A.D.). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 248) notes that Burkitt (*Evang. da-Mepharr*. ii, 252 f.) reads ταῦτα δὲ ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφεῖναι in Mt. 23:23. Blass[3] notes also a revival of the simple inf. or the accusative and infinitive in the later language in legal phraseology. He explains the idiom as an ellipsis, but Moulton is undoubtedly correct in rejecting this theory. There is no need of a verb of command understood in view of the etymology of a form like βάπτισαι. The use of χαίρειν as greeting in epistles (with the nominative) is explained in the same way. Cf. Ac. 15 23; 23:26; Jas. 1:1. It is the absolute use of the infinitive as often. It is very common in the papyri, as **Π**ολυκράτης τῶι πατρὶ χαίρειν, P. Petr. II, xi, 1 (iii/B.C.). So Moulton (*Prol*., p. 180) denies the necessity of the ellipsis of a verb of command. In Ro. 12:15 χαίρειν and κλαίειν are clearly parallel with εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε. So in Ph. 3:16 στοιχεῖν is to be compared with the hortatory φρονῶμεν. Blass[4] needlessly wishes to emend the text in 2 Tim. 2:14, so as not to read μὴ λογομαχεῖν. This use of the inf. occurs also in Tit. 2:9. We probably have the same construction in μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι (2 Th. 3:14), though it may be explained as purpose. In 1 Cor. 5:12 κρίνειν is the subject inf. In Lu. 9:3 after εἶπεν the quotation begins with **M**ηδὲν αἴρετε and is changed to μήτε ἔχειν (indirect command). In Mk. 6:8 f. both forms are indirect (one with ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν—the other with μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι. The marg. in W.H. has μὴ ἐνδύσησθε. The MSS. often vary between the middle inf. and imper. or subj. Winer[5] thinks that expositors have been unduly anxious to find this use of the infinitive in the N. T. But it is there. See further chapter XX, Verbal Nouns.

(e) *The Participle.* Winer[6] found much difficulty in the absolute use of the participle in the N. T. The so-called genitive absolute is common enough and the participle in indirect discourse representing a finite verb. It would seem but a simple step to use the participle, like the infinitive, in an independent sentence without direct dependence on a verb. Winer admits that Greek prose writers have this construction, though "seldom." He ex-

[1] Hatz., Einl., p. 192. Cf. Thumb, Hellen., p. 130 f.
[2] Prol., p. 179 f.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 222.
[4] Ib.
[5] W.-Th., p. 316.
[6] Ib., pp. 350 ff.

plains it on the ground of ellipsis of the copula as is so common with adjectives (cf. Mt. 5:3-11). He passes the poets by (often the truest index of the vernacular) and admits "the Byzantine use of participles simply for finite verbs." T. S. Green[1] says: "The absolute use of the participle as an imperative is a marked feature of the language of the N. T." He explains it as an "Aramaism." To this W. F. Moulton[2] expresses surprise and admits only "the participial anacoluthon," which, by the way, is very much the same thing. But J. H. Moulton[3] has found a number of examples in the papyri where the participle is fairly common for the indicative. The instances in the papyri of the participle in the sense of the imperative are not numerous, but one of them seems very clear. Thus Tb. 59 (i/B.c.) **ἐν οἷς ἐὰν προσδέησθέ μου ἐπιτάσσοντές μοι προθυμότερον**. It is preceded by a genitive absolute. Moulton gives another equally so: G. 35 (i/B.C.) **ἐπιμελόμενοι ἵν' ὑγιαίητε**. Moulton[4] cites also the Latin form *sequimini* (= **ἑπόμενοι**) for the second middle plural present indicative. The similar looking form *sequimini* imperative has an infinitive origin, as already shown. See chapter XX, Verbal Nouns, for other examples and further discussion. On the whole, therefore, we must admit that there is no reason *per se* why the N. T. writers should not use the participle in lieu of the imperative. It is, of course, a loose construction, as ellipsis is and anacoluthon is, but it is not the mark of an uneducated person. In the papyrus example (Tb. 59) given above Grenfell and Hunt call the writer "an official of some importance." Moulton[5] also translates Thumb[6] concerning the "hanging nominative" (common in classical and **κοινή** Greek) as saying that the usage "is the precursor of the process which ends in modern Greek with the disappearance of the old participial construction, only an absolute form in —**οντας** being left." In the ellipsis of the copula it is not always clear whether the indicative or the imperative is to be supplied. Cf. **εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός** (2 Cor. 1:3). Shall we supply **ἐστιν** or **ἤτω** (**ἔστω**) as we have it in 1 Cor. 16:22? In a case like 1 Pet. 3:8 f. it is plain that the unexpressed **ἔστε** would be imperative, but Moulton notes the curious fact that **ἔστε** (imperative) does not appear in the N. T. at all, though we have **ἴσθι** five times, **ἔστω** or **ἤτω** fourteen, and **ἔστωσαν** twice.[7] There are in-

[1] Gr., p. 180.
[2] W.-Moulton, p. 732, n. 5
[2] Prol., p. 223.
[4] Ib.
[5] Ib., p. 225.
[6] Hellen., p. 131.
[7] Mr. H. Scott notes the absence of **ἔστε** in the H. R. Conc. of the LXX, in Veitch, in Kuhner-Bl., Mayser, Helbing, Thackeray. In Goodspeed's

stances more or less doubtful, as ἐπιρίψαντες (1 Pet. 5:7), which is naturally taken with ταπεινώθητε as Moulton[1] now admits. He evidently reacted too strongly against Winer. This use of the participle should not be appealed to if the principal verb is present in the immediate context. Sometimes it is a matter of punctuation as in Lu. 24:47, where W. H. give in the margin ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων, instead of Ἰερουσαλήμ· ὑμεῖς. The marginal punctuation takes the participle as an imperative. The MSS. sometimes vary, as when ℵC give ἐνδείξασθε in 2 Cor. 8:24, while B, etc., have ἐνδεικνύμενοι.[2] But a number of unmistakable examples appear both in Paul and Peter, though "Paul was not so fond of this construction as his brother apostle."'[3] Thus ἔχοντες (1 Pet. 2:12) must be so explained or taken as anacoluthon (cf. ἀπέχεσθαι). So ὑποτασσόμενοι (1 Pet. 2:18; 3:1) reminds one of Eph. 5:22, an "echo" according to Moulton. Other examples occur in 1 Pet. 3:7, 9, possibly 16 also; 4:8 ff. Besides ἀνεχόμενοι and σπουδάζοντες (Eph. 4:2 f.) and ὑποτασσόμενοι (5:2) in Paul the most outstanding example is in Ro. 12:9 f., 16 f. These participles occur in the midst of imperatives or infinitives as imperatives (12:15). The asyndeton makes it impossible to connect with any verb. In verse 6 ἔχοντες appears as a practical indicative. Moulton[4] adds to these 2 Cor. 9:11 f. and Col. 3:16. See also Heb. 13:5. But Lightfoot[5] put in a word of caution when he said: "The absolute participle, being (so far as regards mood) neutral in itself, takes its colour from the general complexion of the sentence." The participle is not technically either indicative, subjunctive, optative or imperative. The context must decide. In itself the participle is non-finite (non-modal) like the infinitive, though it was sometimes drawn out into the modal sphere.

5. USES OF THE IMPERATIVE.

(a) *Command or Exhortation.* In general the imperative keeps within the same limits observed in the classical language, but that is not a narrow groove.[6] It is the mood of the assertion of one's will over another or the call of one to exert his will. Thus

Index Pat. he finds it only in 1 Clem. 45:1, and the accent is doubtful here. He finds it also in Test. XII Pat. Reub. 6:1. It could have been used in Napht. 3:2 and in Ign. Eph. 10:2.

[1] Prol., p. 181, against his former view in Expositor, VI, x. 450.

[2] Ib.

[3] Ib.

[4] Ib.

[5] On Col. 3 : 16 f.

[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 221.

ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (Mt. 5:44); εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμιεῖόν σου καὶ πρόσευξαι (6:6); πάντοτε χαίρετε (1 Th. 5:16). Moulton[1] finds the imperatives "normal in royal edicts, in letters to inferiors, and among equals when the tone is urgent, or the writer indisposed to multiply words." The imperatives in Rev. 22:11 are probably hortatory.

(b) *Prohibition*. This is just a negative command and differs in no respect save the presence of the negative **μή**. Thus **μὴ κρίνετε** (Mt. 7:1), **μὴ φοβεῖσθε** (Jo. 6:20). Often the presence of the imperative in the midst of indicatives is shown by **μή** as in **μὴ πλανᾶσθε** (1 Cor. 6:9). We do, indeed, have a with the imperative in marked contrast, where the force of the negative is given to that rather than to the mode. Thus in 1 Pet. 3:3, **ἔστω οὐχ ὁ --κόσμος, ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος**. The same explanation applies to **οὐ μόνον—ἀλλά καί** in 1 Pet. 2:18, but **μή μόνον** is regular in Jas. 1:22, etc., because of **γίνεσθε** understood. In cases of contrast with **οὐ**— ἀλλά (with participles and imperatives) the reason for **οὐ** is thus apparent (H. Scott). In Mt. 5:37 **οὒ οὔ** (like **ναὶ ναί**) is the predicate (like a substantive), not the negative of **ἔστω**. In 2 Tim. 2:14 **ἐπ' οὐδὲν χρήσιμον** (a parenthetical expression of **μὴ λογομαχεῖν** used as an imperative), the negative goes specifically with the single word **χρήσιμον**. Cf. also 1 Cor. 5:10. The upshot is that **μὴ** remains the negative of the imperative. Cf. **μή μοι κόπους πάρεχε** (Lu. 11:7).

(c) *Entreaty*. A command easily shades off into petition in certain circumstances. The tone of the demand is softened to pleading.[2] Moulton[3] notes that the imperative has a decided tone about it. "The grammarian Hermogenes asserted harshness to be a feature of the imperative; and the sophist Protagoras even blamed Homer for addressing the Muse at the beginning of the Iliad with an imperative."[4] The N. T. shows a sharp departure in the use of the imperative in petitions (rare in the older Greek and in the **κοινή**). The prophet pleads with the imperative, not with potential optative or future indicative. Jesus spoke with authority and not as the scribes.[5] "Moreover, even in the language of prayer the imperative is at home, and that in its most urgent form, the aorist. Gildersleeve observes (on Justin Martyr, p. 137), 'As in the Lord's Prayer, so in the ancient Greek liturgies the aorist imper. is almost exclusively used. It is the

[1] Prol., p. 173.
[2] Gilders1., Synt., Pt. I, p. 158.
[3] Prol., p. 172.
[4] Ib.
[5] Mt. 7:29.

true term for instant prayer.'"[1] Gildersleeve[2] denies that the N. T. shows "the absolute indifference that some scholars have considered to be characteristic of Hellenistic Greek" in the use of the imperative. He credits Mr. Mozley with the observation that "the aorist imperative is regularly used in biblical Greek when the deity is addressed; and following out this generalization Herr Krieckers, a pupil of Thumb's, has made a statistical study of the occurrences of the two tenses in Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, YEschylos, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, with the result that in prayers addressed by men to men both present and aorist are often used, whereas in prayers addressed by men to gods the aorist largely predominates." Examples[3] of the imperative in petitions appear in Mk. 9:22, **βοήθησον ἡμῖν** (Lu. 17:5) **πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν**, (Jo. 17:11) **τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου**.

(d) *Permission*. All this is in strict line with the ancient Greek.[4] A good illustration is seen in Mt. 26:45, **καθεύδετε λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε**. This is not a question nor necessarily irony. It is too late to do Christ any good by keeping awake. He withdraws his plea for watchfulness. There is irony in **πληρώσατε** (Mt. 23:32), though it is the permissive use of the imperative. The note of permission is struck in **ἐλθάτω** and **ἐπιστραφήτω** (Mt. 10:13). Cf. the fut. ind. in Lu. 10:6. See further **χωριζέσθω** (1 Cor. 7:15); **ἀγνοείτω**) (14:38, W. H. marg.). In 2 Cor. 12:16 **ἔστω δέ** is like our 'Let it be so' or 'Granted.' In Mt. 8:31 **ἀπόστειλον** is entreaty, **ὑπάγετε** (32) is permissive. In 1 Cor. 11:6 **κειράσθω** is probably hortatory.

(e) *Concession or Condition*. It is an easy step from permission to concession. This also is classical.[5] Take Jo. 2:19, **λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν.** This is much the same as **ἐὰν λύσητε**. It is not a strict command. We have parataxis with **καί**, but it is equivalent in idea to hypotaxis with **ἐάν**. So with **ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν** (Jas. 4:7 f.); **ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν** (LXX), **καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός** (Eph. 5:14). See also **μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε· ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε· δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν** (Lu. 6:37 f.). Then again **μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοί, καὶ πάντα ἀποδώσω**

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 173.
[2] Am. Jour. of Philol., Apr., 1909, p. 235.
[3] Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 80.
[4] Cf. Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 158; Miller, The Limitation of the Imperative in the Attic Orators, Am. Jour. of Philol., 1892, pp. 399-436.
[5] Cf. K.-G., Bd. I, p. 236.

σοι (Mt. 18:26). So also **τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ** (Lu. 10:28); **ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε** (Jo. 1:39). Cf. **δεῦτε καὶ ποιήσω** (Mt. 4:19). Sometimes two imperatives are connected by **καί** when the first suggests concession. Thus Eph. 4:26, **ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε**. So also **ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε** (Jo. 7:52). Cf. **ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε** (Jo. 1:46). This seems simple enough.

(f) *In Asyndeton*. It is a regular classic idiom[1] to have **ἄγε**, **φέρε** with another imperative. **Ἄγε** with **κλαύσατε** (Jas. 5:1) is an interjection like **δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι** (Mt. 19:21) and **δεῦτε ἴδετε** (Mt. 28:6). See also Jo. 4:29; 21:12; Rev. 19:17. More common is **ὕπαγε** and **ὑπάγετε** with another imperative. So **ὕπαγε πρῶτον διαλλάγηθι** (Mt. 5:24); **ὑπάγετε ἀπαγγείλατε** (28:10). See further Mt. 8:4; 18:15; 21:28; 27:65; Mk. 1:44; 6:38, etc. In Mt. 16:6 we have **ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε**. Cf. also Lu. 12:15. But asyndeton occurs in Mt. 24:6, **ὁρᾶτε μὴ θροεῖσθε.** So **ὁρᾶτε βλέπετε** (Mk. 8:15). In Mt. 9:30 the persons and numbers are different, **ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω**. In Rev. 19:10, **ὅρα μή**, the verb with **μή** is not expressed. For **ὅρα ποιήσεις** see also Heb. 8:5 (LXX). The simplest form of asyndeton is seen in Ph. 3:2, **βλέπετε, βλέπετε, βλέπετε**.

(g) *In Subordinate Clauses*. The reason for treating this subject here is that it is so rare that one may not catch it in the discussion of subordinate clauses. It is well established, though rare, in Demosthenes, Lysias, Plato, Thucydides and the tragic poets.[2] The case of **ὥστε** at the beginning of a clause is not pertinent, for there it is a mere inferential conjunction, as, for instance, 1 Cor. 3:21, **ὥστε μηδεὶς καυχάσθω**. Here **ὥστε** is not a hypotactic conjunction. Neither is the recitative **ὅτι**, in point, as in 2 Th. 3:10, **τοῦτο παρηγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω**. In 1 Cor. 1:31 there is probably an ellipsis of **γένηται** after **ἵνα**, and the imperative **καυχάσθω** is in the direct quotation after **γέγραπται**. In 1 Pet. 1:6, **ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε** (probably imperative), W. H. begin a new sentence, but **ᾧ** points back directly to **καιρῷ** as its antecedent. The same situation occurs in 1 Pet. 3:3 with **ὧν ἔστω**. In both examples the imperative appears with the relative. Two other instances of this construction are found in 1 Peter (a peculiarity of this Epistle). They are **ᾧ ἀντίστητε** (5:9) and **εἰς ἣν στῆτε** (5:12). We see it also in Heb. 13:7, **ὧν—μιμεῖσθε**, and in 2 Tim. 4:15, **ὃν καὶ σὺ φυλάσσου**. Cf. 0. P. 1125, 19 (ii/A.D.), **ὧν θέμα καθαρὸν ἀπὸ πάντων ἀναδότω**.

[1] Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 162.
[2] lb., p. 167.

Διό at the beginning of the sentence was hardly felt as a relative (inferential particle), but see 1 Cor. 14:13, **διὸ προσευχέσθω.**[1]

(h) *The Tenses*. This matter received adequate discussion under Tenses. It may simply be noted here that in positive sentences the aorist imperative is naturally common, especially frequent in the N. T. Cf. **εἴσελθε--πρόσευξαι** (Mt. 6:6). The distinction between the present and the aorist is well seen in **ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει** (Jo. 5:8). See also Jo. 2:16 and Ac. 12:8. As an example of the periphrastic present note **ἴσθι ἔχων** (Lu. 19:17). The perfect is almost non-existent, but note **πεφίμωσο** (Mk. 4:39). The present imper. second person alone occurs in prohibitions which are forbidden as in course of action or as a present fact ('quit doing it').[2] Cf. Ro. 6:13 for sharp differences in idea between **μὴ παριστάνετε** (course of action) and **παραστήσατε** (at once and for all). In the third person a prohibition may be either in the aorist imperative or the aorist subj. See the subj. mode for further remarks concerning the failure of the second person imperative aorist in prohibitions.

(i) *In Indirect Discourse*. This subject will receive adequate treatment under this head (see below). All that is attempted here is to indicate that, when the imperative is not quoted directly (cf. 2 Th. 3:10), it may be expressed in an indirect command either by the infinitive (cf. **λέγων μὴ περιτέμνειν μηδὲ περιπατεῖν** in Ac. 21:21) or by a conjunction like **ἵνα** as in Mk. 6:8, or thrown into a deliberative question as in **ὑποδείξω τίνα φοβηθῆτε** (Lu. 12 :5):

B. DEPENDENT OR HYPOTACTIC SENTENCES (ΥΠΟΤΑΚΤΙΚΑ ᾽ΑΞΙΩΜΑΤΑ)

Introductory.

(a) *Use of Modes in Subordinate Sentences*. There is no essential difference in the meaning of the modes in subordinate clauses from the significance in independent sentences. The division is not made on the basis of the modes at all. Leaving out the imperative because of its rarity in subordinate sentences,the other three modes occur in almost all the subordinate clauses. The same mode-ideas are to be sought here as there. The subordinate clauses make no change in the meaning of mode, voice or tense. Burton[3] does say: "Others, however, give to the mood or

[1] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 511.
[2] Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 164. See also Thompson, Synt., p. 190 f.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 81.

tense a force different from that which they usually have in principal clauses. Hence arises the necessity for special treatment of the moods and tenses in subordinate clauses." I cannot agree to this as the reason for the separate treatment. Sometimes in indirect discourse after secondary tenses there may be a sequence of modes (true also in ancient Greek with final clauses after secondary tenses), but that is so slight a matter that it bears no sort of proportion to the subordinate clauses as a whole. Gildersleeve (*A. J. of Phil*., XXXIII, 4, p. 489) regards the subordinate sentence as "the Ararat in the flood of change" and parataxis and hypotaxis as largely a matter of style. Some of the modal uses have survived better in the subordinate clauses, as, for instance, the futuristic aorist subj. (cf. **ὅστις ἀρνήσηται** in Mt. 10:33), but the subordinate clause did not create the idiom. Originally there were no subordinate sentences.[1] "In dependent, clauses the choice of the mood is determined by the nature of each individual case"[2] as is true also of independent sentences. The qualification made above about the sequence of modes was always optional and is absent from the N. T. except a few examples in Luke. The great wealth of subordinate clauses in Greek with various nuances demand separate discussion. But we approach the matter with views of the modes already attained.

(b) *The Use of Conjunctions in Subordinate Clauses.* In chapter XXI, Particles, full space will be given to the conjunctions (co-ordinating, disjunctive, inferential, subordinating). Here it is only pertinent to note the large part played in the Greek language by the subordinating conjunctions. It must be admitted that the line of cleavage is not absolute. The paratactic conjunctions were first on the field.[3] Popular speech has always had a fondness for parataxis.[4] In the modern Greek vernacular "the propensity for parataxis has considerably reduced the ancient Greek wealth of dependent constructions " (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 185). Hence long periods are rare. So the Hebrew used ו both as paratactic and hypothetic. In the Greek **καί** we see a partial parallel.[5] In Mt. 26:15, **τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι κἀγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω**, the **καί** is almost equivalent to **ἐάν.** So often in Luke, as in 9:51, **ἐγένετο δὲ--καί**, the **καί** clause is (like **ὅτι)** the logical subject of **ἐγένετο**. The common use of the recitative **ὅτι** illustrates well the close connection besubordinate and independent sentences. The **ὅτι** shows

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 552.
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 452.
[5] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 552.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 451.
[5] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 194.

that the clause is the object of the preceding verb, but the clause is preserved in the direct (co-ordinate) form. Cf. λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς (Jo. 10:36). Thus again a subordinate clause may be so loosely connected with the principal clause as to be virtually independent.[1] Thus the relative, as in Latin, often introduces a principal sentence, a paragraph, forsooth, as ἐν οἷς (Lu. 12:1) and ἀνθ' ὧν (12:3). But, on the whole, we can draw a pretty clear line between the independent and the dependent clause by means of the conjunctions. The case of asyndeton, treated elsewhere (cf. The Sentence), concerns chiefly parataxis, but some examples occur in hypotaxis, as in καὶ ἐγένετο—εἶπέν τις (Lu. 11:1) where the εἶπέν clause is the logical subject of ἐγένετο.

(c) *Logical Varieties of Subordinate Clauses.* Each subordinate clause sustains a syntactical relation to the principal clause after the analogy of the case-relations. The normal complete sentence has subject, predicate, object. Each of these may receive further amplification (see chapter X, The Sentence). The predicate may have a substantive (as subject or object). This substantive may be described by an adjective. An adverb may be used with predicate, adjective or substantive. Thus the sentence is built up around the predicate. In the same way each subordinate sentence is either a substantive (subject or object like an ὅτι clause), an adjective like ὅστις or an adverb like ὅπου. This is therefore a point to note about each subordinate clause in order to get its exact syntactical relation to the principal clause. It may be related to the predicate as subject or object, or to the subject or object as adjective, or to either as adverb. A relative clause may be now substantive, now adjective and now adverb. In simple truth most of the conjunctions have their origin as relative or demonstrative pronouns. In Kuhner-Gerth[2] the subordinate clauses are all discussed from this standpoint alone. Thumb (*Handb*., pp. 186 ff.) follows this plan. One questions the wisdom of this method, though in itself scientific enough. Burton[3] has carefully worked out all the subordinate clauses from this standpoint, though he does not adopt it. Then, again, one may divide these clauses according to their form or their meaning.[4] Viteau[5] combines both ideas and the result is rather confusion than clarification. There may be a series of subordinate clauses, one dependent on the other. So in 1 Cor.

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 194.
[2] Ti. II, 2. Bd., pp. 354-459.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 82.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 194 f.
[5] Le Verbe: Syntaxe des Propositions, pp. 41-144.

1:14, **εὐχαριστῶ ὅτι οὐδένα ὑμῶν ἐβάπτισα εἰ μὴ Κρίσπον καὶ Γαΐον ; ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε**. See also Mk. 6:55 and section 10 in this chapter. The infinitive and the participle are used also in subordinate clauses, but they do not directly concern the problem of the modes save in indirect discourse. They are so important and partake of the functions of both noun and verb to such an extent that they demand a separate chapter —XX.

1. RELATIVE SENTENCES.

(a) *Relative Sentences Originally Paratactic.* The relative **ὅς**, as is well known, was first an anaphoric substantive pronoun.[1] At first the relative clause was paratactic, a principal sentence like the other.[2] Cf. **ὅς γάρ** in Homer, where **ὅς** may be taken[3] as demonstrative or relative. In its simplest form the relative was unnecessary and was not even a connective. It was just a repetition of the substantive.[4] "The relative force arises where **ὅς** (and its congeners) connects and complements."[5] Indeed, the relative sentence is probably the oldest form of parataxis.[6] It is only by degrees that the relative clause came to be regarded as a subordinate clause.[7] As a matter of fact, that was not always the case, as has been seen in such examples as **ἐν οἷς, ἀνθ' ὧν** (Lu. 12:1, 3). But it is not true that this subordination is due to the use of the subjunctive mode.[8] The effect of case-assimilation (cf. gender and number) and of incorporation of the antecedent was to link the relative clause very close to the principal sentence.[9] Cf. Heb. 13:11.

(b) *Most Subordinate Clauses Relative in Origin.* This is true not merely of **ὅτι** and **ὅτε** which are accusative forms[10] of **ὅ**, but also of other adverbs, like the ablative **ὡς, ὅπως, ἕως**. These subordinating conjunctions therefore are mostly of relative origin."

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 556. [2] Ib., p. 559.

[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 186. Stahl, Hist.-krit. Synt., p. 523, points out that the relative sentence is either "synthetic or parathetic."

[4] Schmitt, Uber den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartik. im Griech., 1889, p. 12.

[5] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 383.

[6] Frenzel, Die Entwick. des relat. Satzb. im Griech., 1889, p. 4.

[7] Thompson, Synt., p. 383.

[8] Baron, Le Pronom Relat. et la Conj. en Grec, 1892, p. 61.

[9] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 557. It was not always done (attraction) either in Herod. or Thuc. Cf. Reisert, Zur Attraktion der Relativsatze in der griech. Prosa, p. 30 f.

[10] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 561. [11] Thompson, Synt., p. 384.

Cf. ἵνα, ὁπότε and perhaps εἰ. **Πρίν, ἐπεί, ἄχρι, μέχρι** are not relative. Thus the subordinate clauses overlap. Burton,[1] indeed, includes ἕως under relative sentences. That is not necessary, since thus nearly all the subordinate clauses would properly be treated as relative sentences. See the relative origin of various conjunctions well worked out by Schmitt,[2] Weber[3] and Christ.[4] These clauses are mainly adverbial, though objective (and subject-clause also) ὅτι (indirect discourse) is substantive simply. The word ὡς occurs in Homer with the three values of demonstrative, relative and conjunction (cf. English "that").[5] But here we pass by these conjunctions from relative or demonstrative roots.[6] The relative pronoun alone, apart from the adverbial uses, introduces the most frequent subordinate clause, probably almost equal in some authors to all the other classes put together. In 1 Peter the relative construction is very common. Cf. 1 Pet. 1:6-12; 2:21-24. At any rate it is the chief means of periodic structure.[7] Take as an instance the period in Ac. 1:1-2. Note ὧν, ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας, οὗς, οἷς, all the subordinate clauses in the sentence except infinitive and participles. See also 1 Cor. 15:1-2, where four relatives occur and τίνι λόγῳ is almost like a relative. Cf. further Ro. 9: 4 f. The relative sentence may be repeated indefinitely with or without καί.

(c) *Relative Clauses Usually Adjectival.* They are so classed by Kuhner-Gerth.[8] The descriptive use followed the original substantive idiom just as the relative itself was preceded by the demonstrative. Thus the use of the relative clause as subject or object like ὁ and the participle is perfectly consistent. So ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέξηται δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με (Lu. 9:48). Cf. also Mk. 9:37; Ac. 16:12. The descriptive character of the relative clause is well shown in τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος ὅ ἐστιν ῥῆμα θεοῦ (Eph. 6:17). Cf. ὅς in 1 Tim. 3:16. The adjectival use of the relative sentence is accented by the use of the article with it in Ro. 16:17, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε ποιοῦντας. Here the relative clause is adjectival, but in itself a mere incident between τούς and ποιοῦντας.

[1] N. T. M. and T., pp. 126
[2] Ober den Ursprung des Substantivsatzes mit Relativpartik. im Griech.
[3] Entwickelungsgesch. der Absichtsatze.
[4] Der Substantivs. und das Rel. ὡς.
[5] Baron, Le Pronom Rel. et la Conjonction en Grec, p. 130.
[6] Frenzel, Die Entw. des rel. Satzb. im Griech., p. 4.
[7] J. Classen, Beob. uber den homerischen Sprachgeb., 1867, p. 6.
[8] Bd. II, pp. 420 ff.

The clause is simply adjectival with **πᾶς ὅς** in Lu. 12:8. That comes to be its most usual character. So with **δι' ἧς** is in Heb. 12:28.

(d) *Modes in Relative Sentences.* There is nothing in the relative pronoun or the construction of the clause *per se* to have any effect on the use of the mode.[1] The relative, as a matter of fact, has no construction of its own.[2] In general in dependent clauses the choice of the mode is determined by the nature of the individual case.[3] Outside of relative clauses the choice in the N. T. is practically confined to the indicative and the subjunctive. The optative holds on in one or two examples. With the relative some examples of the imperative occur, as has already been shown. Cf. 1 Cor. 14:13; Tit. 1:13; 2 Tim. 4:15; 1 Pet. 5:9; Heb. 13:7. Cf. **ὅθεν κατανοήσατε** (Heb. 3:1). But the mode is not due at all to the relative. In a word, the relative occurs with all the constructions possible to an independent sentence.[4] The indicative is, of course, the natural mood to use if one wishes to make a direct and clear-cut assertion. Thus **οὐδείς ἔστιν ὅς ἀφῆκεν τὴν οἰκίαν** (Mk. 10:29). Cf. Jo. 10:12. The various uses of the subjunctive occur with the relative. The deliberative subj. is seen in **ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ κατάλυμά μου ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω**; (Mk. 14:14; Lu. 22:11).[5] Prof. Earle, in a fine paper on "The Subj. of Purpose in Relative Clauses in Greek" (*Class. Papers,* 1912, pp. 213 ff.) shows how Xenophon, Soph., Eurip., Plato and other Attic writers use the idiom. Cf. Xen., *Anab*., II, 4, 20, **οὐχ ἕξουσιν ἐκεῖνοι ὅποι φύγωσιν**. See also Tarbell, *Class. Review,* July, 1892, "The Deliberative Subj. in Relative Clauses in Greek." The subj. may be volitive as in Ac. 21:16, **ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνί τινι**, and in Heb. 8:3, **ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκῃ** (cf. **ὃ προσφέρει** in Heb. 9 : 7). In Heb. 12: 28, **δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν**, the subj. may be conceived as either volitive (hortatory) or merely futuristic, more probably volitive like **ἔχωμεν**. Clearly futuristic is the subj. in Mt. 16:28, **οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου**. These examples appear isolated. Cf. subj. with **ὥστε** (not relative) as in 1 Cor 5:8, **ὥστε ἑορτάζωμεν** (deliberative). But the futuristic subj., so rare in the independent sentence after Homer, is very common in the relative clause with

[1] See, *per contra*, Baron, Le Pronom Rel. et la Conjonction en Grec, pp. 61

[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 189.

[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 452. [4] Thompson, Synt., p. 383.

[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 217, explains this subj. as due to a "final meaning." D in Mk. reads **φάγομαι**.

ἂν and sometimes without ἄν. It is not the ἄν that determines the subj., but the subj. usually has ἄν. Thus ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ and ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ Rec. (Mk. 8:35). Cf. ὅστις τηρήσῃ (Jas. 2:10), though AKLP read τηρήσει (itacism). Cf. Mt. 10:33 and 38. In such relative sentences the future indicative is also very common, the two forms being closely allied in form and sense. Cf. ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσει. (Lu. 12:8). See also ὅστις ὁμολογήσει and ὅστις ἀρνήσηται (Mt. 10:32 f.).

(e) *Definite and Indefinite Relative Sentences*. Goodwin[1] has made popular the custom of calling some relative sentences " conditional relatives." He has been followed by Burton.[2] Jannaris[3] considers conditional relative clauses "virtually condensed clauses capable of being changed into conditional protases." Almost any sentence is capable of being changed into some other form as a practical equivalent. The relative clause may indeed have the resultant effect of cause, condition, purpose or result, but in itself it expresses none of these things. It is like the participle in this respect. One must not read into it more than is there. Cf. ὃς ἔχει ὦτα (Mk. 4:9) and ὁ ἔχων ὦτα (Mt. 13:9). Cf. εἴ τις in Mk. 4:23. One might as well say that ὁ λαμβάνων (Jo. 13:20) is the same thing as ὃς λαμβάνει (cf. Mt. 10:38). There is a change from participle to relative clause in Mt. 10:37 f., 41 f. Cf. Mt. 12: 30, 32; Lu. 9:50. So then ἂν τινα πέμψω (Jo. 13:20) is a conditional clause.[4] It is true that ὅν τινα does not occur in the N. T., but εἴ τις and ὅστις differ in conception after all, though the point is a fine one. The MSS. sometimes vary between εἴ τις and ὅστις as we see in Mk. 8:34; 1 Cor. 7:13. In Jo. 14:13 f. note ὅτι ἂν αἰτήσητε and ἐάν τι αἰτήσητε. Note the distinction between ὃ κεχάρισμαι and εἴ τι κεχάρισμαι, in 2 Cor. 2:10. In Mk. 8:34 f. note εἴ τις θέλει — ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ. What is true is that the relative sentences are either definite or indefinite. It is not a question of mode nor of the use of ἄν, but merely whether the relative describes a definite antecedent or is used in an indefinite sense. The definite relative is well illustrated by 2 Th. 3:3, πιστὸς δέ ἐστιν ὁ κύριος ὅς στηρίξει, or Mk. 1:2, τὸν ἄγγελόν μου ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν μου. So also χάριν δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν (Heb. 12:28). Cf. ὅ προσενέγκῃ (Heb. 8:3). But indefinite is ὃς ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ (Mk. 4:25). In the same verse καὶ ὃς οὐκ ἔχει is indefinite, but καὶ ὃ ἔχει is definite. Indefinite also is ὅσοι ἥψαντο (Mt. 14:36) and

[1] Moods and Tenses, p. 197.
[2] N. T. M. and T., p. 119.
[3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 470.
[4] Cf. Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 169.

ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο (Mk. 6:56). So also with **πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ** (Lu. 12:10) and **πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσει** (12:8). Cf. **ὃς ἔσται** (17:31) with **ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ** (17:33) and **ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει**. Cf. Ac. 7:3, 7; Gal. 5:17. That it is not a question of mode is thus clear. Cf. **ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ** with **ὃς ἂν ἀπολέσει** (Mk. 8:35). Thus note in Mk. 4:25 **ὃς γὰρ ἔχει δοθήσεται αὐτῷ**, but in Lu. 8:18 **ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ**.[1] So in Lu. 12:8 we have **πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί**, but in Mt. 10:32 **πᾶς ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί.** The use of **ὅστις** is pertinent. It is either indefinite, as here, from the sense of **τις**= 'any one' or definite from the sense of **τις** = 'somebody in particular,' as in Lu. 9:30, **ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλείας**. Examples of the definite use of **ὅστις** may be seen in Mt. 7:26; 16:28; 22:2; 27:55, 62, etc. The indefinite use is seen in **πᾶς ὅστις ἀκούει** (Mt. 7:24), **ὅστις ἔχει** (Mt. 13:12), **ὅστις ὑψώσει** (Mt. 23:12), but apparently no instance of **ὅστις ἄν** and the future ind. occurs. The indefinite use of **ὅστις** with the subj. and **ἄν** is uniform (11 examples), as in **ὅστις ἐὰν ᾖ** (Gal. 5:10), **ὅστις ἄν ποιήσῃ** (Mt. 12:50). Cf. Col. 3:17. We also find **ὅστις ἀρνήσηται** (Mt. 10: 33), **ὅστις τηρήσῃ** (Jas. 2:10), but the definite use in Mk. 9:1. In 2 Cor. 8:12, **εἰ ἡ προθυμία πρόκειται, καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχῃ, εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει**, there is a pointed distinction between the subjunctive and the indicative modes.[2] Thus the indicative occurs with either the definite or the indefinite and the subjunctive with the indefinite 122 times, the definite only Mk. 9 : 1= Mt. 16:28. One may make a positive statement about either a definite or an indefinite relative or a doubtful assertion about either. The lines thus cross, but the matter can be kept distinct. The distinction is clearly perceived by Dawson Walker.[3] The subjunctive with the indefinite relative, like that with **ὅταν** and **ἐάν**, is futuristic (cf. also future indicative). Moulton (*Prol*., p. 186) argues that, since this subj. is futuristic and the aorist describes completed action, the aorist subj. here is really a future perfect. "Thus Mt. 5:21, **ὃς ἂν φονεύσῃ**, 'the man who has committed murder.'" But this seems rather like an effort to introduce the Latin idiom into the Greek and is very questionable.

(f) *The Use of ἄν in Relative Clauses.* This is the place for more discussion of **ἄν**, though, sooth to say, the matter is not perfectly clear. See also Conditions. It is probably kin to the Latin *an* and the Gothic *an*, and had apparently two meanings,

[1] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 139.
[2] Cf. W.-Th., p. 307.
[3] Elem. Gk. Synt., 1897, p. 7. Cf. Baumlein, Unters. etc., p. 315.

'else' and 'in that case rather.' Monro[1] argues that the primary use of ἄν and κέν is with particular and definite examples. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 166) translates ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕλωμαι by the Scotch 'I'll jist tak her mysel'.' There was thus a limitation by circumstance or condition. The use of ἄν with relative, temporal and conditional clauses "ties them up to particular occurrences" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 186). It is not always quite so easy as that. This use of modal ἄν appears rarely in modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 188). "It is a kind of leaven in a Greek sentence; itself untranslatable, it may transform the meaning of a clause in which it is inserted" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 165). That is putting it a bit strong. I should rather say that it was an interpreter of the sentence, not a transformer. Moulton counts 172 instances of modal ἄν, (ἐάν) in the N. T. (p. 166). Matthew leads with 55, then Mark 30, Gospel of Luke 28 and Acts only 10, Paul's Epistles 27, the Johannine writings only 20, Hebrews 1, James 1. Mr. H. Scott fears that these figures are not correct, but they are approximately so. The MSS. vary very much. These examples occur with incl. or subj. Moulton finds 739 cases of modal ἄν in the LXX (Hatch and Redpath). Of these 40 are with opt. (26 aorist), 56 with ind. (41 aorist, 6 imp., 1 plup., 1 pres., 7 fut. ind.), the rest with subj. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 165) finds modal ἄν in the κοινή decreasing and unessential with ind., subj. or opt. in relative, temporal, final or conditional clauses. The use with indefinite or general statements was rare in Homer, but gradually came to be more frequent. But in the N. T. some examples of the definite use of ἄν survive especially in temporal clauses. So in Rev. 8:1, ὅταν ἤνοιξεν. But ὅταν στήκετε (Mk. 11:5) may be general. There is doubt also about ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο (11:19). But in Mk. 6:56, ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο, the construction is rendered more definite by ἄν, though ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο in the same verse is indefinite. In Mt. 14:36 we have ὅσοι ἥψαντο, which is not more definite than Mark's construction.[2] In Rev. 14:4, ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγει, the construction is indefinite. In Ac. 2:45 and 4:35, καθότι ἄν τις εἶχεν, we have repetition and so a general statement to that extent. In Mk. 3:11, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, it is general. In most instances in the N. T., therefore, the use of ἄν is clearly in indefinite relative clauses whether with the indicative or subjunctive.[3] It

[1] Hom. Gr., p. 263 f.

[2] *Per contra* see W.-Th., p. 306.

[3] Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 217) quotes ἃς ἂν συντελέσουσιν, from an inscr. in Viereck's Sermo Graecus, p. 38.

cannot he said that ἄν is necessary with the indefinite relative and the indicative. It does not occur in the N. T. with ὅστις and the future incl, but we have both ὅστις ὁμολογήσει (Mt. 10:32) and ὅς ἂν ὁμολογήσει, (Lu. 12:8); ὃς ἔσται (Lu. 17:31) and ὃς ἂν ἀπολέσει (Mk. 8:35). For ὃς ἂν and fut. ind. see Compernass, *De Sermone Pis*., p. 38. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 145) cites ὃς δ' ἂν ἀδικήσει**,** Inscr. Petersen-Luschan, *Reisen*, p. 174, N. 223, 21. As already seen, the relative with the subj. usually has ἄν, as εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε (Lu. 10:8); ὅτι ἂν προσδαπανήσῃς (10: 35). Cf. ᾧ ἂν βούληται (10:22). In a few examples the best MSS. do not have ἄν, as in ὅστις ἀρνήσηται (Mt. 10:33); ὅστις τηρήσῃ--πταίσῃ δέ (Jas. 2:10). The use of ἐάν like ἄν has been shown (cf. Orthography) to be very common with relatives at this period. It is immaterial which is found. So ὃς ἐὰν λύσῃ and ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ (Mt. 5:19). The MSS. often vary between ἐάν and ἄν, as in Mt. 10:14; Ac. 7:7. So also ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε (Mt. 7:12) and ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε (Mt. 21:22). But in the N. T., as in the papyri, ἄν is twice as common in relative clauses. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 145) quotes ὅσοι – ἐγλίπωσι, Inscr. Perg. 249, 26, and ὃς ἀναστραράξῃ (or ἂν ἀστ**.**) I. Gr. XII, 1, 671. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 169) cites C.P.R. 237 (ii/A.D.), ὅσα αὐτῷ προστέκηται. He (ib., p. 168) quotes ὅσ' ἂν πάσχετε F.P. 136 (iv/A.D.), ὅσα ἐὰν παρελαβόμην B.M. 331 (ii/A.D.). The ἄν is not repeated with the second verb. So ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ (Mt. 5:19). There is no instance of ἄν in a relative clause with an optative in the N. T. But in Gen. 33:10 the LXX has ὡς ἄν τις ἴδοι πρόσωπον θεοῦ**.** So οἷς ἐὰν τύχοι, F.P. (see Moulton, *Cl. Rev*., 1901, p. 32). Radermacher (*N. T., Gr*., p. 131) cites καθ' ὃ ἂν μέρος στρέγοιτο from Philo. There is one instance of ἄν with the infinitive in the N. T. (2 Cor. 10: 9), ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκροφβεῖν ὑμᾶς, but ἄν is here probably the same as ἐάν and ὡς ἄν = 'as if.' The upshot of it all is that ἄν has no peculiar construction of its own. It is more frequent with the subjunctive than with the indicative in relative sentences, but is not absolutely essential with either mode.[1] In the Attic the subj. is invariable with ἄν, but "in the less cultured Hellenistic writers" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 166) it occurs with the ind. also. Curiously in the Gospel of John ap occurs with ὅστις only in the neuter (Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 304). Always in the N. T. ὅτι ἐάν= ὅτι ἄν unless in Mk. 6:23 the correct text is ὅτι ὃ ἐάν as in margin of W. H. The text is probably correct (cf. Lu. 10:35; Ac. 3:23, etc.).

[1] Cf. K.-G., Bd. II, pp. 421, 424.

(g) *Special Uses of Relative Clauses.* As in Latin,[1] the relative clause may imply cause, purpose, result, concession or condition, though the sentence itself does not say this much. This is due to the logical relation in the sentence. The sense glides from mere explanation to ground or reason, as in **ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι**, (Gal. 2:10). In 1 Cor. 3:17, **ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς**, there is an argument in **οἵτινες**. This is clearly true[2] in Ro. 6:2, **οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ**; Cf. also Ac. 10:41, **οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ**. See Gal. 5:4, **οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε**. Cf. Latin *qui, quippe qui*. A good example is seen in Ro. 8:32, or **ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο**. Cf. also **ἃ ἔμελλον** (Rev. 3:2) and the common **ἀνθ' ὧν** (Lu. 1:20). Cf. Ac. 10:47; Ro. 1:25, 32; Ph. 2: 20; Col. 3:5. Only the ind. mode occurs in the N. T. in this construction.[3] Purpose is also found in relative clauses (cf. Latin *qui= ut is*). Either the future ind. or the subj. is used for this construction. When the subj. occurs it is probably volitive.[4] So Burton[5] would explain all the cases of subj. of purpose with relatives, but wrongly. The use in Mk. 14:14 is analogous to the retention of the subj. of deliberation in an indirect question. Cf. the subj. of purpose with relative clause in Attic Greek.[6] But the subj. construction is Homeric (like Latin also). The Attic idiom is the future ind., and the future ind. also appears in the N. T. So **ὃς κατασκευάσει** (Mk. 1:2= Mt. 11:10 = Lu. 7:27), **ὃς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει,** (1 Cor. 4:17) which may be contrasted with the merely explanatory relative **ὅς ἐστίν μου τέκνον** in the same sentence. So **οἵτινες ἀποδώσουσιν αὐτῷ** (Mt. 21:41); **οἳ προπορεύσονται**. (Ac. 7:40; Ex. 32:1); **οὐκ ἔχω ὃ παραθήσω** (Lu. 11:6) where the Attic Greek would[7] have **ὅτι**. Sometimes **ἵνα** occurs where a relative might have been used. So 2 Cor. 12:7 **ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ --ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ**, (Jo. 5:7) **οὐκ ἔχω ἄνθρωπον ἵνα βάλῃ με**, (9:36) **ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν**. Cf. Gal. 4:5; Rev. 19:15. Viteau[8] strikingly compares Mt. 10:26, **ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται** and **ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται**, with Mk. 4:22, **ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ** and **ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν**. The variety of construction with **ὅς** is illustrated by Mt. 24:2 (Lu. 21:6), **ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται**, and Mk. 13:2, **ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ**.

[1] Draeger, Hist. Synt., Bd. II, p. 527.
2 Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 118.
[3] Cf. K.-G., Bd. II, p. 421.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 185.
[5] N. T. M. and T., p. 126.
[6] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 217.
[7] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 218.
[8] See Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 135.

The classic idiom preferred the fut. ind. for purpose with the relative (Schmid, *Atticismus*, IV, p. 621), but Isocrates (IV, 44) has **ἐφ᾽ οἷς φιλοτιμηθῶσιν**. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 138) cites for the **κοινή** Diod. XI, 21, 3, **δι᾽ οὗ τρόπου**—**ἀνέλῃ**; XIV, 8, 3, **δι᾽ ὧν ἐξέλωσιν**; Ach. Tatius, IV, 16, 13, **ὅσον**—**λάβῃ**, etc.

Purpose is often contemplated result so that the consecutive idea follows naturally that of design. Only the ind. future is used in the N. T., unless one follows Blass[1] in taking **ὃ προσενέγκῃ** (Heb. 8:3) as result. A good instance of the future ind. is in Lu. 7:4, **ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ**, which may be profitably compared[2] with the non-final use of **ἵνα** in Jo. 1:27, **ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω**. Burton[3] prefers to call this a "complementary limitation of the principal clause," a sort of secondary purpose. But the notion is rather that of contemplated result. The relative denotes a kind of consequence from a particular quality or state.[4] See also Ph. 2:20 **οὐδένα ἔχω ἰσόψυχον ὅστις**—**μεριμνήσει**, Mk. 10:29 **οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν τὴν οἰκίαν**, Lu.7:49 **τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃς καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἀφίησιν**; Cf. 2 Th. 3:3 **πιστὸς ὅς** with 1 Jo. 1:9 **πιστὸς ἵνα.**

An example[5] of the concessive use of **οἵτινες** is seen in Jas. 4:14, **οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε τῆς αὔριον ποία ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν**.

The conditional use of the relative clause is only true in a modified sense, as already shown. The relative **ὅς** and **ὅστις**, whether with or without does not mean **εἴ τις** or **ἐάν τις**, though the two constructions are very much alike. There is a similarity between **εἴ τις θέλει** (Mk. 9:35) and **ὃς ἂν θέλῃ** (10:43). But I do not agree to the notion of Goodwin[6] and Burton[7] that in the relative clauses we have a full-fledged set of conditional sentences on a par with the scheme with the conditional particles. That procedure is entirely too forced and artificial for the Greek freedom and for the facts. There is a general sort of parallel at some points, but it is confusion in syntax to try to overdo it with careful detail as Viteau[8] does. **Ἄν** is not confined to the relative and conditional sentences, but occurs with **ἕως, πρίν, ὡς**, and **ὅπως** (temporal and final clauses). The indefinite relative like **ὅς ἐὰν θέλῃ** (Mk. 8:35) or **ὅστις ὁμολογήσει** (Mt. 10:32) is quite similar in idea to a conditional clause with **ἐάν τις** or **εἴ τις**. But, after all, it is not a conditional sentence any more than the so-called

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 218.
[2] Blass, ib., cites also **ἱκανὸς λῦσαι** in Mk. 1:7.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 126.
[4] Cf. K.-G., Bd. II, p. 422.
[6] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 118.
[6] M. and T., pp. 195 ff.
[7] N. T. M. and. T., pp. 119 ff.
[8] Le Verbe, pp. 136 ff.

causal, final, consecutive relative clauses are really so. It is only by the context that one inferentially gets any of these ideas out of the relative. All that is true about the indefinite relative clauses has already been explained under that discussion. I therefore pass by any treatment of the kinds of conditional sentences in connection with the relative clauses.

(h) *Negatives in Relative Clauses*. When the subj. occurs the negative is **μή**, as in is **ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ** (Lu. 8:18), but **οὐ μή** is found in Mk. 13:2, **ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ**. So in Mk. 9:1= Mt. 16:28 we have **οὐ μή**. With the indicative the negative is **οὐ,** in **ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει** (Mt. 10:38); **ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι καθ᾽ ὑμῶν** (Lu. 9:50). Occasionally when the relative is indefinite the subjective negative **μή** occurs with the indicative. So **ᾧ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα** (2 Pet. 1: 9); **ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ** (1 Jo. 4:3); **ἃ μὴ δεῖ** (Tit. 1:11). So also D in Ac. 15:29. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 171) calls this use of **μή** a survival of literary construction. He gives also some papyri examples (ib., p. 239) of **μή** in relative clauses: B.U. 114 (ii/A.D.) **ἣν ἀποδέδωκεν αὐτῷ μήτε δύναται λαβεῖν**, C.P.R. 19 (iv/A.D.) **ἃ μὴ συνεφώνησα**. The use of **μή** in relative clauses is more common in the **κοινή** than in the classic Greek (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 171). He cites examples from late Greek writers. There is nothing gained by explaining **οὐ** in relative clauses after the fashion of **εἰ οὐ** in conditional sentences as is done by Burton.[1]

2. CAUSAL SENTENCES.

(a) *Paratactic Causal Sentences*. These do not properly belong here, but there are so many of them that they compel notice. The common inferential particle **γάρ** introduces an independent, not a dependent, sentence. Paul uses it usually to introduce a separate sentence as in Ro. 2:28; 1 Cor. 15:9. In 1 Cor. 10:17 both **ὅτι** and **γάρ** occur. It will be treated in the chapter on Particles. Phrases like **ἀνθ᾽ ὧν** (Lu. 12:3), **διό** (Mt. 27:8), **διόπερ** (1 Cor. 8:13), **ὅθεν** (Ac. 26:19), **δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν** (2 Tim. 1:6, 12), **οὗ χάριν** (Lu. 7:47) are not always regarded as formally causal. The construction is sometimes paratactic. Indeed, the subordination of the **ὅτι** and **διότι** clauses is often rather loose.[2] Thus there is very little difference between **ὅτι** (begins the sentence with W. H.) in 1 Cor. 1:25 and **γάρ** in 1:26. Cf. also **ἐπειδή** in 1:22. See further **ὅτι** in 2 Cor. 4:6; 7:8, 14, and **διότι** in Ro. 3:20; 8:7. The causal sentence is primarily para-

[1] N. T. M. and T., p. 180.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 274. Cf. also Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 98.

tactic. See Mt. 6:5; Lu. 11:32; 1 Cor. 15:29; Heb. 10:2.

The subordinate relative is a later development.[1]

(b) *With Subordinating Conjunctions.* One may say at once that in the N. T. the mode is always the indicative. There is no complication that arises save with **ἐπεί** when the apodosis of a condition of the second class is used without the protasis as in Heb. 10:2, **ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο**. Here the construction is not due at all to **ἐπεί**. In the same way we explain **ἐπεὶ ἔδει** in Heb. 9:26 and **ἐπεὶ ὠφείλετε ἄρα** in 1 Cor. 5:10. There is ellipsis also in the rhetorical question in 1 Cor. 15:29, **ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν**; But in Ac. 5:38 f. two complete conditional sentences (**ἐάν** and **εἰ**, protasis and apodosis) occur with **ὅτι**. In a word, it may be said that the indicative is used precisely as in the paratactic sentences. Cf. Jo. 14:19, **ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσετε.**

The negative is usually **οὐ** as in 1 Jo. 2:16. Once in the N. T., Jo. 3:18, **ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν**, we have **μή**, but **οὐ** is seen in 1 Jo. 5:10, **ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν**. "The former states the *charge*, *quod non crediderit*, the latter the simple *fact, quod non credidit*" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 171). Cf. **ὅτι μή** in Epictetus IV, 4, 11; IV, 5, 8-9. Cf. Abbott, *Joh. Gr*., pp. 162, 535. The distinction is subtle, **μή** being more subjective and ideal. In Heb. 9:17, **ἐπεὶ μὴ τότε** (or **μή ποτε**) **ἰσχύει**, we likewise meet **μή**. In B. G. U. 530 (i/A.D.), **ἐπὶ μὴ ἀντέγραψας αὐτῇ—ὅτι οὐκ ἔπεμψας πρός σε**, note **ἐπὶ (εἰ) μή** and **ὅτι οὐκ** with true distinction. With **οὐ** we have the objective fact, with **μή** the element of blame (**μέμφεται**) appears. "The comparison of Plutarch with the N. T. shows a great advance in the use of **ὅτι μή**" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 239). Cf. also E. L. Green, *Gildersleeve Studies*, pp. 471 ff.; Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 171. He cites **ὅτι μὴ ἔχεις**, Epictetus IV, 10, 34. It is making inroads on **ὅτι οὐ.**

We sometimes have **ἀνθ' ὧν** in a truly causal sense as in Lu. 1: 20, and that is true also of **ὅθεν** in Mt. 14:7. In Heb. 2:18 **ἐν ᾧ** is practically causal. So also **ἐφ' ᾧ** is causal in Ro. 5:12; 2 Cor. 5:4; Ph. 4:10. Cf. **καθὰ** = 'if right,' P. Oxy. 38 (A.D. 49). The classical **ἐφ'ὥτε** does not occur in the N. T. See **ἐφ' ᾧ δώσει**, on condition that he give,' P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66).

Then **ὡς** may have almost the force of a causal particle as in Jo. 19:33; Mt. 6:12 (cf. Lu. 11:4, **καὶ γάρ**); 2 Tim. 1:3. The same thing is true of **καθώς** in Jo. 17:2. **Καθ' ὅσον** is causal in Heb. 7:20 (9:27) and **ἐφ' ὅσον** in Mt. 25:40, 45. So **καθότι** in Lu. 19:9 (cf. 1:7). In Ac. 17:31 HLP. read **διότι**. None of these

[1] Cf. Nilsson, Die Kausalsatze itn Griech. his Arist. I, Die Poesie.

particles are strictly causal, but they come to be so used in certain contexts in the later Greek. We have **ὡς ὅτι** in 2 Cor. 5:19; **ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ** (cf. our "since that"). Here the Vulgate has *quoniam*. But in 2 Cor. 11:21 the Vulgate renders **ὡς ὅτι** by *quasi*, as in 2 Th. 2:2, **ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν**. Cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 321 f. It is found also in Esther 4:14 and is post-classical.[1]

Διότι is found in the Lucan writings, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, James and 1 Peter. In the modern Greek[2] it takes the form **γιατί**. Once (Ro. 8:21) some MSS. (W. H. read **ὅτι**) have **διότι** in the sense of objective **ὅτι** ('that') as in later Greek (cf. late Latin *quia* = *quod*). Instances of causal **διότι** may be seen in Lu. 1:13; Ro. 1:19, etc. It is compounded of **διά** and **ὅτι** (cf. English "for that"). In Ph. 2:26 **διότι** is causal and **ὅτι** is declarative. In modern Greek **διότι**, survives in **ἡ καθαρεύουσα**. The vernacular has **ἀφοῦ, ἐπειδή, γιατί** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 194).

But all other causal particles are insignificant beside **ὅτι** which grew steadily in use.[3] It was originally merely relative and paratactic.[4] In 1 Jo. 4:3 note **ὅ** — **ὅτι** and **ὅτι ὅ** in Ro. 4:21. It is accusative neuter rel. **ὅτι** (cf. **ὅτι ἂν προσδαπανήσῃς**, Lu. 10:35) and is more common as the objective particle in indirect discourse (subject or object clause) than as a causal conjunction. In 1 Jo. 5:9 **ὅτι** occurs twice, once as causal and once as objective particle. In 2 Th. 3:7 f. exegesis alone can determine the nature of **ὅτι**. In Jo. 3:19 Chrysostom takes **ὅτι** = 'because.' Cf. also Jo. 16:8-11 (see Abbott, *Johannine Gr*., p. 158). The English "the reason that" (vernacular "the reason why") is similar. It is very common in 1 John in both senses. In Jo. 1:15 causal **ὅτι** occurs three times in succession. In Lu. 9:49, **ἐκωλύομεν αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν**, the present is used because of a sort of implied indirect discourse. In Mk. 9:38 W. H. read **ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει**. A good example of causal **ὅτι** is seen in Ro. 5:8. The precise idea conveyed by **ὅτι** varies greatly. In Jo. 9:17, **τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠνέῳξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς**; the use of **ὅτι** wavers between objective and causal. Cf. also Mk. 6:17. But we need not appeal to the Hebrew[5] for a justification of this balancing of two ideas by **ὅτι**. So in Jo. 2:18, **τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς**; Akin to this construction is that in

[1] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 98..
[2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 454.
[3] Ib.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 189.
[5] As Viteau does in Le Verbe, p. 100. The LXX does show the idiom, as in 1 Ki. 1:8, **τί ἔστι σοι ὅτι κλαίεις;**

Jo. 14:22, **τί γέγονεν ὅτι**, which is shortened into **τί ὅτι** in Ac. 5: 4, 9. There is a correspondence sometimes between **διὰ τοῦτο** and **ὅτι**. (Jo. 10:17); **διὰ τί** and **ὅτι** (Ro. 9:31 f.). **Οὐχ ὅτι** may be either objective or causal as in Ph. 4:11, 17; 2 Th. 3:9. In the ancient Greek it meant 'not only do I say that, but I also say.' But in the N. T. it either means 'I say this not because' or 'I do not mean to say that,' and usually the latter according to Abbott.[1]

We must have a word about **ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, ἐπειδήπερ**. As a matter of fact **ἐπει-δή-περ** (note the composition) appears in the N. T. only in Lu. 1:1 (Luke's classical introduction). This is undoubtedly a literary touch.[2] **᾽Επειδή** is read by W. H. in Lu. 7:1 and Ac. 13:46, but **ἐπεὶ δέ** is put in the margin. Eight other examples remain, all in Luke (Gospel and Acts) and Paul (1 Corinthians and Philippians). Cf. Lu. 11:6; 1 Cor. 1:21 f. **᾽Επεί**, obsolescent in the late Greek,[3] is almost confined to Luke, Paul, the author of Hebrews. Elsewhere in Matthew, Mark and John. Two of these are examples of the temporal use (Mk. 15:42; Lu. 7:1 W. H. marg.). The ordinary causal sense is well illustrated in Mt. 21:46, **ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην εἶχον**. The classical idiom of the ellipsis with **ἐπεί** has already been mentioned and is relatively frequent in the N. T. Cf. Ro. 3:6; 11:22; 1 Cor. 14:16; 15:29; Heb. 9:26; 10:2. It occurs in the simplest form in **ἐπεὶ πῶς** (Ro. 3:6) and **ἐπεὶ τί** (1 Cor. 15:29). In 1 Cor. 14:16, **ἐπεὶ ἐάν**, it is equivalent to 'otherwise' and in Ro. 11:22 to 'else,' **ἐπεί ἐάν σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ**. The apodosis of a condition of the second class occurs in 1 Cor. 5:10; Heb. 9:26; 10:2.

Verbs of emotion in classical Greek sometimes used **εἰ** (conceived as an hypothesis) rather than **ὅτι** (a direct reason).[4] The N. T. shows examples of **θαυμάζω εἰ** in this sense (Mk. 15:44; 1 Jo. 3:13), though **θαυμάζω ὅτι** is found also[4] (Lu. 11:38; Gal. 1: 6). **᾽Οτι** is the N. T. construction[5] with **ἀγανακτέω** (Lu. 13:14); **ἐξομολογέομαι** (Mt. 11:25); **εὐχαριστέω** (Lu. 18:11); **μέλει** (Mk. 4: 38); **χαίρω** (Lu. 10:20); **χολάω** (Jo. 7:23). Cf. **ὅτι** and **ἐφ᾽ ᾧ** in Ph. 4:10. On the possible causal use of **ὅτε** and **ὅταν** see article by Sheppard, *The Cl. Rev.*, Sept., 1913.

(c) *Relative Clauses*. This matter received sufficient discussion under Relative Clauses. For examples of **ὅς** take Ro. 8:32;

[1] Joh. Gr. p. 162.
[2] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 101.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 454.
[4] Cf. ib.
[5] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 101.

Heb. 12:6. For ὅστις note Mt. 7:15; Ho. 6:2. See also **οὗ χάριν** (Lu. 7:47) and **δι' ἣν αἰτίαν** (8:47).

(d) **Διὰ τό** *and the Infinitive*. The construction is common in the N. T., occurring thirty-two times according to Votaw[1] as compared with thirty-five for the 0. T. and twenty-six for the Apocrypha. It is particularly frequent in Luke.[2] Cf. Lu. 2:4; 18:5; Ac. 4:2; 8:11, etc. It is not in John except in 2:24, **διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν**. Blass[2] rejects it here because the Lewis MS. and Nonnus do not have the passage. Here note that **ὅτι** is used side by side with **διὰ τό**. So in Jas. 4:2 f. we have **διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς** and **διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε** on parity. Cf. Phl. 1:7 **καθώς** and **διὰ τό.** In Mk. 5:4, **δαὶ τὸ δεδέσθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι καὶ συντετερίφθαι**, note the perfect tense and the repetition of the infinitive. Burton[3] thinks that here **διά** gives rather the evidence than the reason. Why not both? There is one example of the instrumental use of the infinitive to express cause, **τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με** (2 Cor. 2:13). The text of B has six examples in the LXX[4] (cf. 2 Chron. 28:22, **τῷ θλιβῆναι αὐτόν**). No examples of **ἐπὶ τῷ** occur.[5]

(e) *The Participle.* We do not have **ἅτε, οἷον, οἷα**, as in classical Greek, to give the real reason. That is given simply by the participle as in **δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι** (Mt. 1:19). It is "exceedingly common" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 230). Cf. Jas. 2: 25; Ac. 4:21. But **ὡς** occurs with the participle to give the alleged reason, which may be the real one or mere assumption. Thus in Mt. 7:28 f., **ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς**, the first **ὡς** gives the ostensible (and true ground) of the astonishment of the people. Cf. also Lu. 16:1;. Ac. 2:2. But in Lu. 23:14, **ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν**, Pilate does not believe the charge against Jesus to be true. So also with **ὡς μελλόντων** in Ac. 27:30.

3. COMPARATIVE CLAUSES. The discussion in my *Short Grammar*[6] forms the basis of this section. The conjunctions employed are all of relative origin, but the construction deserves separate treatment.

(a) *The Relative* **ὅσος**. This is a classic idiom and occurs only in Hebrews, except once in Mark. In Heb. 1:4 the correlative is expressed and the comparative form of the adjective is found

[1] The Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20. Mr. II. Scott notes pres. 24, aor. 1 (Mt. 24 : 12), perf. 7 times.

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.

[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 161.

[4] Votaw, The Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 29.

[5] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 101.

[6] Chapter XXVIII..

in both clauses. Both correlative and relative are here in the instrumental case, **τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ᾽ αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα**. The same phenomena are present in 8:6, save that the correlative is absent. In 10:25 there is no comparative in the relative clause. The others are examples of **καθ᾽ ὅσον**. In 3:3 there is no correlative, but the comparative appears in both clauses. In 7:20 f. the correlative is **κατὰ τοσοῦτο**, but there is no comparative in the relative clause. This is probably causal in idea, as is true of **καθ᾽ ὅσον** in 9:27, where there is no comparative, though we have the correlative **οὕτως καί**. The example in Mk. 7:36, **ὅσον δὲ αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον**, lacks the correlative and has no comparative with the relative, but has a double comparison in the principal clause. In Jo. 6:11 and Rev. 21:16, **ὅσον** is simply relative, not a conjunction. The causal and temporal uses of **ὅσον** are discussed elsewhere.

(b) Relative **ὅς** with **κατά**. The singular **καθό** is found only in Ro. 8:26 **καθὸ δεῖ**, 1 Pet. 4:13 **καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε**, and 2 Cor. 8:12 **καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχῳ εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει**, where a good distinction is drawn between the subjunctive and the indicative. Cf. 0. P. 1125, 14 (ii/A.D.) **καθὸ μισθοῖ μέρος**. The construction with **ἐάν** is like that of the indefinite relative with **ἐάν** (**ἄν**) and the subj. The plural **καθά**, is found only once in the N. T. (Mt. 27:10). **Καθάπερ**, however, is found seventeen times (three doubtful as compared with **καθώς**, Ro. 9:13; 10:15; 2 Cor. 3:18) and all in Paul's writings save in Heb. 4:2 (without verb). It is thoroughly Attic and a slight literary touch. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:10. The mode is always indicative, but cf. **καθὰ ἀρέσκῃ** in Gen. 19:8. In Ro. 12:4 the correlative is **οὕτως**.

(c) **Καθότι** *in a Comparative Sense*. It occurs only twice (Ac. 2:45; 4:35) and the same idiom precisely each time, **καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν**. Here ay seems to particularize each case from time to time (note imperfect tense), the iterative use of **ἄν**, (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 167). This usage approaches the temporal in idea. The classic idiom of the aorist ind. with **ἄν**, no longer appears with these conjunctions.

(d) **Ὡς** *and its Compounds.* These are the most common comparative particles. The most frequent of all is **ὡς** itself which has various other uses as exclamatory (**ὡς ὡραῖοι οἱ πόδες** in Ro. 10: 15), declarative like **ὅτι** (Ac. 10:28), causal (Mt. 6:12), temporal (Lu. 12:58), with the infinitive (Lu. 9:52; Heb. 7:9), as a final particle (**ὡς τελειώσω**, Ac. 20 : 24, W. H. text), with superlative

adverbs (ὡς τάχιστα, Ac. 17:15), with the sense of 'about,' as ὡς δισχίλιοι (Mk. 5:13) and with participles (ὡς μέλων, Ac. 23: 20). The richness of this particle is thus illustrated. But the comparative relative adverb is the origin of them all. In Heb. 3:11; 4:3 ὡς may be consecutive 'so,' but ὡς is more often comparative than anything else. Usually ὡς has a correlative. Thus οὕτως—ὡς (1 Cor. 4:1); ὡς—οὕτως (Ac. 8:32); ὡς---οὕτως καί (2 Cor. 7:14); ὡς—καί (Gal. 1:9); ἴσος--ὡς καί (Ac. 11:17); καί--ὡς καί (Mt. 18:33). But often no correlative is expressed (cf. Mt. 8:13).[1] The verb is not always expressed. Thus ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί (Mt. 6:5). This predicate use of ὡς is very extensive. Cf. ὡς καί (1 Cor. 7:7). The mode is usually the indicative, as in Mk. 10:1, but the subj. occurs in Mk. 4:26, ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ (cf. ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν). Blass[2] considers this "quite impossible," but it is read by ℵBD. Some late MSS. add ἐάν and others read ὅταν, but surely ἐάν (ἄν) is not "indispensable" to the subj. (cf. Mt. 10:33). In Gal. 6:10, ὡς καιρὸν ἔχωμεν, the temporal ὡς is likewise minus ἄν. See Relative Clauses and discussion of ἄν which is by no means necessary in these subj. clauses. Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 164. In 1 Th. 2:7, ὡς ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα, we do have ἐάν, but the construction in Mark is not lawless. **K**αθώς comes next to ὡς in frequency (chiefly with Luke and Paul). It sometimes has the correlative. So οὕτως καθώς (Lu. 24:24); καθώς —οὕτως (Jo. 3:14); καθώς — οὕτως καί (2 Cor. 8:6); καθὼς καί — οὕτως καί (Col. 3:13); καί --καθὼς καί (Ro. 1:13); καθώς—καί (Jo. 15:9); ὁμοίως καθώς (Lu. 17:28), and note κατὰτὰ αὐτά in verse 30. The correlative is not always expressed (Mt. 21: 6). So in Col. 1:6, καθὼς καί. Sometimes the principal clause is unexpressed as in 1 Tim. 1:3, or only οὐ occurs, as οὐ καθώς (1 Jo. 3: 12; Jo. 6:58). It is a late word but is abundant in the papyri. In the N. T. it occurs only with the indicative. The word, as already noted, sometimes has a causal sense (Ro. 1:28). It may have a temporal signification in Ac. 7:17. It occurs in indirect question in Ac. 15:14, and is epexegetical in 3 Jo. 3. **K**αθώσπερ is read only once in the N. T. (Heb. 5 : 4), though W. H. put it in the margin in 2 Cor. 3:18 (text καθάπερ). Ὡσεί is classical, but has no verb (cf. Mt. 3:16; Mk. 9:26, etc.) in the N. T., though it occurs with the participle ὡσεί πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα (Mt. 9:36). Cf. also Ro. 6:13. It is used in the sense of 'about' as in Lu 9:14, 28, etc. It is commonest in the Gospels and Acts.

[1] In general correlatives are rare in the LXX. Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 142.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 321.

In 2 Cor. 10: 9 we have **ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν** (here alone in the N. T. with infinitive) = 'as if to frighten.' **Ὥσπερ** occurs with the indicative as in Mt. 6:2. In Mt. 25:14 a parable is thus introduced, but with no correlative. But we have the correlative in Ro. 5:19 (6:4), **ὥσπερ—οὕτως καί**. So Jo. 5:21. So **ὥσπερ—ὡσαύτως** (Mt. 25:14-18); **ὥσπερ—οὕτως** (13:40). We find **ὥσπερ** also with the participle (cf. Ac. 2:2). Often the verb is wholly wanting as in Mt. 6:7. We meet **ὡσπερεί** only once (1 Cor. 15:8) and that without a verb.

4. LOCAL CLAUSES. These are all relative adverbial sentences and are usually treated with relative sentences, but they are worthy of a separate note. The adverbs (conjunctions) used are **ὅθεν, οὗ, ὅπου**. With **ὅθεν** only the indicative is found as in Lu. 11:24, **ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον**. More common than **ὅθεν** is **οὗ** as in Mt. 2: 9, **οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον**. Cf. past perfect in Ac. 20:8. It occurs mainly in Luke's writings and always with the indicative save once in 1 Cor. 16:6, **οὗ ἐὰν πορεύωμαι**. Here the indefinite relative naturally has **ἄν** and the subjunctive. **Οὗ** is used with verbs of motion as well as with those of rest as this passage shows. Cf. also Lu. 10:1, **οὗ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι**. But **ὅπου** is the usual local conjunction in the N. T., particularly in Matthew, Mark and John (Gospel and Revelation). It occurs with verbs of rest as in Mk. 2:4, **ὅπου ἦν**, and of motion as in Jo. 7:34, **ὅπου ὑπάγω**. The indicative is the usual mode. Once, Mk. 6:56, **ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο**, we find **ἄν** to emphasize the notion of repetition in the imperfect tense, but this is not necessary. Cf. **ὅπου ἤθελες** (Jo. 21: 18). Note the emphatic negative in **ὅπου οὐ θέλεις** (*ib*.). Cf. also **ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγει** (Rev. 14:4) where **ἄν** occurs with the present ind. (indefinite relative). In **ὅπου φάγω** (Mk. 14:14; Lu. 22:11), as noted on p. 964, the subj. is probably deliberative, answering to **ποῦ φάγω** in the direct question. Cf. **οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ** (Lu. 9:58). But the subj. with **ἐάν** in **ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ** (Lu. 9: 57) is the common futuristic subj. So in the parallel passage in Mt. 8:19. See further Mt. 24:28; 26:13; Mk. 6:10; 9:18; 14:9, 14. Curiously enough all the N. T. instances of **ὅπου** with the subj. are found in the Synoptic Gospels. There is ellipsis of the copula in Rev. 2:13, as is not infrequent with relatives. **Ὅπου** is used also in metaphorical relations, as in Heb. 9:16. The correlative adverb **ἐκεῖ**, occasionally appears with **ὅπου** as in Lu. 12:34; 17:37; Jo. 12:26. **Καί** is a correlative in Jo. 17:24. The use of **ὅπου** in classical Greek is confined to indefinite sentences, but the N. T. shows a frequent use (especially in John)

where there is a definite antecedent.[1] Cf. Jo. 1:28; 4:46; 7:42; 10:40; 12:1, etc.

5. TEMPORAL CLAUSES.

(a) *Kin to Relative Clauses in Origin and Idiom*. Blass[2] bluntly says that temporal clauses introduced by ὅτε and ὅταν "are generally only a special class of relative sentence, and exhibit the same constructions." The same thing is true of local sentences. Burton[3] carries this conception to such a point that he has no separate treatment of temporal sentences at all. This is surely going too far. Thompson[4] sees the matter rightly when he says: "The vague original relative import becomes specialized." Hence we expect to find both definite and indefinite temporal clauses as with other relative (and local) clauses. Definite temporal clauses may be illustrated by Mt. 7:28, **ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι**. The indefinite is shown in Jo. 15:26, **ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος**. The temporal clause may be indefinite in its futurity, frequency and duration.[5] Indefinite futurity is the most common, indefinite duration the least common. The modes used in temporal clauses in the N. T. are the indicative and the subjunctive. These uses conform to the historical development of the two modes. There is one example of the optative in a temporal clause (Ac. 25:16, **πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαί τινα ἄνθρωπον πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς κατηγόρους τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος**). Here, as is evident, the optative is due to indirect discourse, not to the temporal clause. The subjunctive with ἂν (**πρὶν ἢ ἂν ἔχῃ--λάβῃ**) occurs rather than the optative according to sequence of modes. This sequence was optional and a classic idiom, and so is found in the N. T. only in Luke's writings. Observe that **ἔστιν**, is retained in the indicative. This sentence is a fine illustration of the Greek subordinate clauses. In the context in Acts it is seen that four dependent clauses precede the **πρὶν ἤ** clause in the long sentence. The use of ἄν or ἐάν in temporal clauses has very much the same history as in other relative clauses. The usage varies with different conjunctions and will be noted in each instance. The point of time in the temporal clause may be either past, present or future. It is a rather complicated matter, the Greek temporal clause, but not so much so as the Latin cum clause, "in which the Latin lan-

[1] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 152 f.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 218.
[3] N. T. M. and T., pp. 118, 126 ff.
[4] Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 329.
[5] Ib., p. 328.

guage is without a parallel."[1] The different constructions may be conveniently grouped for discussion. Just as the optative with temporal clauses vanished, so there came a retreat of various temporal conjunctions. As a result in the later Greek the construction is much simpler.[2]

(b) *Conjunctions Meaning 'When.*' The classic use of the optative for repetition with such clauses has been effectually sidetracked in the vernacular **κοινή** (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 130). Only the ind. and subj. modes occur in these clauses. **᾽Επει** has vanished[3] in this sense, save in Lu. 7:1 where it is a variant (margin in W. H. and Nestle) for **ἐπειδή**, the correct text. Curiously enough this is also the only instance of the temporal use of **ἐπειδή** in the N. T., **ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν**. It is a definite point of time in the past and naturally the indicative occurs. There are three examples of all with the subjunctive (Mt. 2:8, **ἐπὰν εὕρητε**; Lu. 11:22, **ἐπὰν νικήσῃ**; 11:34, **ἐπὰν ᾖ** where it is parallel with **ὅταν ᾖ**. There are only two instances of **ἡνίκα** (2 Cor. 3:15, 16, **ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται, ἡνίκα ἐὰν ἐπιστρέψῃ**. It is the indefinite idea as the subjunctive shows. Note and **ἐάν** (indefinite also and with notion of repetition). Nestle (AEH) reads **ὁπότε ἐπείνασεν** in Lu. 6:3, but W. H. and Souter (**ℵ**BCD) have **ὅτε. ᾽Οπόταν** does not occur in the N. T. **᾽Οτε** and **ὅταν**, are both common and in all parts of the N. T. The connection between **ὅτε** (cf. **ὅ-θεν**, Brugmann, *Griech. Gr.*, p. 254) and Homeric **ὅτε** and **ὅσ τε** (Monro, *Hom. Gr.*, p. 191) is disputed.[4] Cf. the conjunction **ὅ** from **ὅς** and **ὅτι** from **ὅστις**. Homer used **ὅτε** as a causal conjunction like **ὅτι**. Only the indicative (see below) mode appears with **ὅτε** in the N. T., but it occurs with past, present and future. Usually the events are definite, as in Mt. 21:1, **ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς ᾽Ιεροσόλυμα**. The present time is rare, as in **ὅτε γέγονα ἀνήρ** in 1 Cor. 13:11; **ὅτε ζῇ** in Heb. 9:17. In Mk. 11:1 **ἐγγίζουσιν** is the historic present. The great bulk of the examples are in the past with the aorist indicative, though the imperfect occurs for custom or repetition, as in Jo. 21:18; Col. 3:7. The future indicative is naturally indefinite even when **ὅτε** is preceded by a word like **ὥρα** (Jo. 4:21, 23) or **ἡμέρα** (Ro. 2: 16. Incorporated in W. H.). Souter's Rev. Text (so W. H.) has

[1] W. G. Hale, Stud. in Class. Philol., The *Cum* Constructions, 1887, p. 259. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 466.

[3] **᾽Επεί** was rare in Homer. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 226.

[4] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 189 ff.; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 561; Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 444 f.

ἕως εἴπητε in Lu. 13:35, but Nestle still reads ἕως ἥξει ὅτε εἴπητε. The text is in much confusion, but at any rate here is manuscript evidence for the subjunctive with ὅτε without ἄν. This is in harmony with what we saw was true of ὅς and ὅστις. It is also a well-known Homeric idiom.[1] Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 164) cites ὅτε ἄρξηται (Vettius, pp. 106, 36). **Ὅταν**, naturally occurs more frequently with the subjunctive for indefinite future time. It is usually the aorist tense, as in Mt. 24:33, ὅταν ἴδητε. The present subj. does occur when the notion of repetition is implied, as in Mt. 15:2, ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν. Cf. Mt. 6:2. Once the idea of duration seems manifest (Jo. 9:5, ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὦ), but usually it is future uncertainty simply. It is not necessary to take the common aorist subj. here as the Latin futurism exactum.[2] Cf. ὅταν παραδοῖ in Mk. 4:29. The ἄν (ὅτε ἄν) is always present save in the doubtful ὅτε εἴπητε of Lu. 13:35. **Ὅτε** with the subj. is found in poetry and in the Byzantine writers.[3] So Test. XII Pat. Levi 2:10 ὅτε ἀνέλθῃς ἐκεῖ. On the other hand a number of examples occur of ὅταν with the indicative (cf. ἐάν and ὅπου ἄν) with the indicative). Homer, *Iliad*, 20, 335, has ὅτε κεν ξυμβλήσεαι αὐτῷ. So in Rev. 4:9 we find ὅταν δώσουσιν. The close affinity in form and meaning of the aorist subj. with the future indicative should cause no surprise at this idiom. In Lu. 13:28 BD read ὅταν ὄψεσθε, though W. H. put, ὄψησθε in the text. A good many manuscripts likewise have ὅταν with the future ind. in Mt. 10:19 and 1 Tim. 5:11. Cf. ὅταν ἔσται in Clem., Cor. 2, 12, 1. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 168) notes in the papyri only a small number of examples of ἄν with temporal clauses and the ind. Thus ὅταν ἔβημεν in Par. P. 26 (ii/B.C.); ἐπὰν ἐπυθόμην in B. U. 424 (ii/iii A.D.); ὁπόταν ἀναιροῦνται in B. U. 607 (ii/A.D.). It is common in the LXX, Polybius, Strabo, etc. See Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 463; Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 164. Ramsay (*Cit. and B.*, ii, p. 477, no. 343) gives ὅταν ἔζων ἐγώ a "curious anti-Christian inscription" (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 239). A few instances occur of ὅταν, with the present indicative. So ὅταν στήκετε in Mk. 11:25. Here[4] some MSS. have the subj., as in Ro. 2:14 some read ὅταν ποιεῖ. Cf. also various readings in Mk. 13:4, 7. This construction is not unknown in earlier writers, though more common in the κοινή. Cf. Ex. 1:16; Ps. 101:3;

[1] Cf. Mutzbauer, Konjunktiv and Optativ, p. 97.
[2] W.-M., p. 387.
[3] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 125. Cf. Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 463.
[4] Cf. W.-M., p. 388,

Prov. 1:22; Josephus, *Ant*., xii, 2, 3; Strabo, I, 1, 7; *Act. Apocr*., 126. In 2 Cor. 12:10, **ὅταν ἀσθενῶ**, we probably have the present subj. Cf. 1 Th. 3:8, **ἐὰν στήκετε**. The examples of **ὅταν** with the aorist or imperfect indicative are more numerous. In Thucydides **ὅτε** was always definite and **ὁπότε** indefinite.[1] **Ὅταν**, with the optative appears in Xenophon.[2] The Atticists have **ἐπειδάν** and **ὁπόταν** (*sic*) with the opt. (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 165). In the **κοινή** the field of **ὅταν** is widened, as already shown. Agathias uses **ὅταν** with the aorist indicative.[3] It is common in the Septuagint to have **ὅταν** with past tenses (Gen. 38:11; 1 Sam. 17:34, **ὅταν ἤρχετο**; Ps. 119:7, **ὅταν ἐλάλουν**; Num. 11:9; Ps. 118:32; Dan. 3:7).[4] The usual notion is that of indefinite repetition. Thus we note it in Polybius 4, 32, 5, **ὅταν μὲν οὗτοι ἦσαν ἐγένετο τὸ δέον**. Strabo I, 1, 7 has **ὅταν φησίν**. Cf. also 13, 7, 10. In Tobit 7:11 observe **ὁπότε ἐάν.** In Mk. 3:11 we have **ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ**. Cf. **ὅπου ἄν** and **ὅσοι ἄν** in Mk. 6: 56. But the **κοινή** writers used **ὅταν** with the aorist indicative for a definite occurrence. This is common in the Byzantine[5] writers. In the modern Greek **ὅταν** is freely used with the indicative.[6] See Philo II, 112, 23, **ὅταν εἰς ἔνοια ἦλθεν**. Blass[7] calls this quite incorrect, though the LXX has **ὡς ἂν ἐξῆλθεν Ἰακώβ** (Gen. 27:30; cf. 6:4) of "a single definite past action.[8]" There are two examples in the N. T., Mk. 11:19, **ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως** (possible to understand it as repetition), and Rev. 8: 1, **ὅταν ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν ἑβδόμην**. But, as Moulton (*Prol*., p. 248) observes, it is possible to regard **ἐξεπορεύοντο** in Mk. 11: 19 as pictorial rather than iterative and the papyri examples of **ὅταν**, as seen above, allow either usage. Simcox[9] explains this "lapse" on the ground that Mark and the author of the Apocalypse are the least correct of the N. T. writers. But the idiom belonged to the vernacular **κοινή**. See Ex. 16:3, **ὄφελον ἀπεθάνομεν—ὅταν ἐκαθίσαμεν ἐπὶ τῶν λεβήτων καὶ ἠσθίομεν ἄρτους. Ὁσάκις** is only used with the notion of indefinite repetition. It occurs

[1] Winifred Warren, A Study of Conjunctional Temp. Clauses in Thucydides, 1897, p. 73. **Ὅτε** is found twice in 1 Thuc. with the optative, but Miss Warren reads **ὁπότε**.

[2] Baumlein, Unters. uber die griech. Modi und die Partik. **κέν** und **ἄν**, 1846, p. 322.

[3] Reffel, Uber den Sprachgebr. des Agathias, p. 24.

[4] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 123; W.-M., p. 388 f.

[5] W.-M., p. 389.

[6] Ib.; Mullach, Vulg., p. 368.

[7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 218.

[8] W.-M., p. 389.

[9] Lang. of the N. T., p. 111.

four times in the N. T. (1 Cor. 11:25 f.; Rev. 11:6), each time with ἐάν and the subjunctive. These points are all obvious.

Ὡς is rather common in the N. T. as a temporal conjunction. It is originally a relative adverb from ὅς and occurs in a variety of constructions. The temporal use is closely allied to the comparative. Cf. ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, (Lu. 24:32). So Jo. 12: 36. The temporal aspect is sharp in Mk. 9:21 where ὡς means 'since.' The examples in the N. T. are usually in the aorist or imperfect indicative as in Jo. 6:12, 16; Ac. 8:36 and chiefly refer to definite incidents. In 1 Cor. 12:2, ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε, we have the imperfect ind. with ἄν for the notion of repetition (cf. ὅταν). So in *Aristeas* 7, 34, ὡς ἂν ηὔξαντο. In modern Greek σάν, (from ὡς ἄν) is used for 'when' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 192). The use of ὡς ἄν= 'as if' is that of conditional, not modal, ἄν, and is very common in the papyri (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 167). See Conditions., As early as i/B.C. the papyri show examples of ὡς ἄν=ὅταν (originally ὡς ἄν='as soon as'). Cf. Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 164;. Rhein. Mus., 1901, p. 206; Hib. P. I, 44, 45. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 164) gives ὡς ἄν οἶμαι, Dion. Hal. and Dio Chrys., ὡς ἂν ἄμεινον ἔδοξεν, Luc. *Alex*. 22. But ὡς is used a few times with the subjunctive, thrice with ἄν (Ro. 15:24; 1 Cor. 11:34; Ph. 2: 23), once without ἄν (Gal. 6:10), ὡς καιρὸν ἔχωμεν. In classical Greek this futuristic subj. would have ἄν (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 248 f.). With the last construction compare Mk. 4:26. In the temporal use ὡς ἄν is not common in Attic. In Mk. 9:21 note πόσος χρόνος—ὡς. In Ac. 17:15 we have ὡς τάχιστα, a remnant of the rather frequent use of ὡς with superlative adverbs. It is possible that καθώς has a temporal sense in Ac. 7:17 (cf. 2 Macc. 1:31).

(c) *The Group Meaning 'Until' ('While')*. The words in this list have a more complex history than those in the preceding one. They are ἄχρι, μέχρι, ἕως and πρίν. Ἄχρι (twice in the N. T., ἄχρις, Gal. 3:19 and Heb. 3:13) is more frequently a preposition (cf. ἄχρι καιροῦ, Lu. 4:13) than a conjunction. It is rare in Greek prose and ἄχρι ἄν only in poetry.[1] But Philo (I, 166, 20) has ἄχρις ἂν—σβέσειε. But the simple conjunction is less frequent than the compound form (preposition and relative), as ἄχρι οὗ (Lu. 21:24) and ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας (Mt. 24:38). Sometimes the MSS. vary between ἄχρι, μέχρι, and ἕως, as in Mt. 13:30 (preposition). Cf. Ac. 1:22. Past tenses of the indicative are used of an actual historical event. No example of the simple ἄχρι ap-

[1] Meisterh.-Schwyzer, Gr. d. attisch. Inschr., p. 251.

pears in this construction in the N. T., but we have ἄχρι οὗ ἀνέστη (Ac. 7:18) and ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν (Lu. 17:27). The only instance of the present ind. is in Heb. 3:13, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται. Here the meaning is 'so long' (linear) or 'while' (cf. ἕως). The more common use is with reference to the indefinite future. In two instances (Rev. 17:17, ἄχρι τελεσθήσονται, and 2:25, ἄχρι οὗ ἂν ἥξω**.** This latter could be aorist subj.) the future indicative is read. Elsewhere we meet the subjunctive, either without ἂν (ἄχρι σφραγίσωμεν, in Rev. 7:3 and ἄχρι τελεσθῇ in 20:3, 5; ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ in 1 Cor. 11:26; ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας γένηται in Lu. 1:20) or with ἄν (ἄχρις ἂν ἔλθῃ in Gal. 3:19, though W. H. put just ἄχρις οὗ in the margin). Here the time is relatively future to the principal verb προσετέθη, though it is secondary. The subj. is retained instead of the optative on the principle of indirect discourse. As a matter of fact ἄν occurs only twice, the other instance being Rev. 2:25 above. Cf. ἄχρις ὅταν πληρωθῇ, 0. P. 1107, 3 (v/A.D.). **Μ**έχρις (so twice, Mk. 13:30; Gal. 4:19, and once **μ**έχρι, Eph. 4:13) occurs only three times as a conjunction. In Eph. 4:13 it is **μ**έχρι simply, in the other examples **μ**έχρις οὗ. In all three instances the aorist subj. is used without ἄν, for the indefinite future. The use as a preposition is more frequent. Cf. **μ**έχρι **Ἰ**ωάνου (Lu. 16:16) and **μ**έχρις αἵ**μ**ατος (Heb. 12:4). It means 'up to the point of.'[1] The **κοινή** writers show a rather varied use of **μ**έχρι (cf. Diodorus, Strabo, Polybius, Josephus, Justin Martyr). They, like the papyri, have **μ**έχρι and **μ**έχρις οὗ with and without ἄν, (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 140). **Ἕ**ως is much more frequent in the N. T. both as preposition (cf. ἕως ὅτου, Mt. 11:23) and as conjunction. The prepositional use is illustrated also in ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν (Ac. 8:40). The prepositional use (more frequent than the conjunctional) goes back as far as Aristotle and denotes the *terminus ad quem*. **Ἕ**ως is Attic for Homeric ἦος and Doric ἄς.[2] As with ἄχρι and **μ**έχρι, we find ἕως alone as a conjunction (Mt. 2:9), ἕως οὗ (Mt. 14:22) and ἕως οὐρανοῦ (5:25). It is used both with the indicative and the subjunctive. When an actual event is recorded in the past only the aorist indicative is used. This is the usual classic idiom.[3] So ἕως ἦλθεν (Mt. 24:39), ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν (1: 25), ἕως ὅτου ἐφώνησαν, (Jo. 9:18). When the present ind. appears with ἕως the notion is 'while,' not 'until,' and it is either a contemporaneous event, as in ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον (Mk. 6:45.

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 563.
[2] Ib., p. 200.
[3] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 235.

Note dependence on ἠνάγκασεν, like indirect discourse), or a lively proleptic future in terms of the present, as in ἕως ἔρχομαι πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει (1 Tim. 4:13) and in Jo. 21:22 f. It is possible to take Mk. 6:45 as this proleptic future.[1] Indeed some MSS. here give also ἀπολύσῃ and –ει. In Mt. 14:22 the reading (in the parallel passage) is ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ. Cf. the construction with the Latin *dum*. In Lu. 19:13 W. H. read ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι instead of ἕως ἔρχομαι. Instead of ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν (Jo. 9:4) W. H. have ὡς in the margin, though keeping ἕως in text (as does Nestle). If ἕως is genuine, it is clearly 'while,' not 'until.' In Jo. 12:35 f. W. H. read in the text an, not gun. We have, besides, ἕως ὅτου εἶ in Mt. 5:25. Most of the examples of ἕως deal with the future and have only the subj. after the classic idiom.[2] The future, being identical in form with the aorist subj., is possible in the cases of ἕως οὗ ἀναπέμψω (Ac. 25:21) and ἕως ὅτου σκάψω (Lu. 13:8), but the regular subj. is the probable idiom. In Lu. 13:35 some MSS. have ἕως ἥξει (see (b)), but W. H. reject ἥξει ὅτε. Both ἕως οὗ and ἕως ὅτου are used, but always without ἄν. So ἕως οὗ ἀνέλωσιν (Ac. 23:21) and ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ (Lu. 22:16). With simple gun it is more common to have ἄν. So ἕως ἂν ἀποδῷς (Mt. 5:26), but note ἕως ἔλθῃ (10:23). Ἄν is not essential in this construction. Cf. Lu. 12:59; 15:4; 22:34. In Mk. 14:32, ἕως προσεύξωμαι, the notion is rather 'while' than 'until.' Cf. Mt. 14:22; 26:36; Lu. 17:8. But the note of expectancy suits the subjunctive. In Mt. 18:30, ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακὴν ἕως ἀποδῷ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον, the subj. is retained after secondary tense of the indicative as in indirect discourse. Ἕως occurs after negative verbs also (cf. πρίν), as in Lu. 22:34. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 169) quotes Tb. 6 (ii/B.C.) ἕως μένωσιν, G. H. 38 (i/B.C.) ἕως καταβῇς. In the papyri ἄν, as in the N. T., is often absent from these conjunctions meaning 'until.' Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.,* p. 140) finds ἕως and the subj. common in the papyri, the inscrs. and the κοινή writers. Blass[3] thinks he sees a certain affinity with final sentences in the subj. with these conjunctions for the future indefinite. At any rate it is good Attic and should cause no trouble. The κοινή fully agrees with the ancient idiom. It is, of course, a matter of taste with the writer whether he will regard a future event as a present reality or a future uncertainty to be hoped for and attained.

Πρίν is a comparative form (cf. superlative πρῶ-τος) like the Latin

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 128. But the proper sense of the indic. is better as an expression of the fact. Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 140.

[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 235. [3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 219.

prius.[1] It is the neuter accusative singular. It is really the same in idea as **πρότερον**, 'before,' 'formerly.' Pindar uses it as a preposition with the ablative **πρὶν ὥρας=πρὸ ὥρας**. The original construction with **πρίν**, was the infinitive, though the subj. and the optative occur with it in Homer.[2] Homer has it 81 times with the infinitive, 6 with the subj., once with the opt. and not at all with the indicative.[3] The word developed so much importance in the later Greek that Goodwin in his *Moods and Tenses* gives it a separate extensive discussion (pp. 240-254). In the N. T. there are only fourteen examples of it and all of them in the Gospels and Acts. Eleven of the fourteen are with the infinitive (cf. Homer). Cf. **πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν** (Jo. 4:49), **πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι** (8:58). Six times we have **πρὶν ἤ**, as in Mt. 1:18. Luke alone uses the classic idiom of **πρίν** with the subj. or opt. after negative sentences. In both instances it is only relative future after secondary tenses, but in Lu. 2:26, **μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν** [**ἢ**] **ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν Χριστὸν κυρίου**, the subj. is retained according to the usual rule in indirect discourse in the **κοινή** (so often in the Attic). In Ac. 25:16, as already explained (p. 970), **πρὶν ἢ ἔχοι--λάβοι** after **ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν**, is changed from the subj. to the opt. as is possible in indirect discourse, a neat classic idiom found in Luke alone in the N. T. Some of the MSS. do not have ay in Lu. 2:26 and reads **ἕως ἂν** here. A few MSS. have **πρίν ἤ** in Lu. 22:34.[4] The papyri writers do not show the same consistency as Luke in the use of **πρίν**.[5] But note **μήτε διδότω—πρὶν αὐτῷ ἐπιστέλληται**., 0. P. 34 (ii/A.D.). For 'until' **ἕως** kept the field. Indeed in Lu. 22:34, **οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ**, we see **ἕως** where **πρίν** would usually come (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 164). Very early **πρὸ τοῦ** and inf. also began to displace **πρίν** (see Verbal Nouns). In the modern Greek **πρίν** holds its place (also **πρὶ νά, ὅσο, προτοῦ**) with ind. and subj. (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 193). The N. T. does not have **ἔστε**, but the papyri show it. Cf. **ἔστ' ἄν**, Amh. P. II, 81, 11 (iii/A.D.). See also Job 13:22 **א**.

(d) *Some Nominal and Prepositional Phrases*. We have already seen in the case of **ἄχρι, μέρι** and **ἕως** how they occur with relative pronouns as conjunctional phrases. The same thing occurs with a number of temporal phrases. Thus **ἀφ' οὗ**. In Lu. 13:7 **ἀφ' οὗ** is preceded by **τρία ἔτη** as the *terminus a quo*. It

[1] Cf. Sturm, Geschichtl. Entw. der Konstr. mit **πρίν**, 1882, p. 4; Frenzel, Die Entw. der Satze mit **πρίν**, 1896, p. 12.

[2] Sturm, ib., p. 145.

[3] Ib., p. 6.

[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 219.

[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 169 note.

means 'since.' Cf. **τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ** in Lu. 24:21. In Rev. 16:18 it is the simple equivalent of **ἀπὸ τούτου ὅτε** as in the Attic Greek and Herodotus. In these examples the indicative occurs, but in Lu. 13:25, **ἀφ' οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ**, the construction of **ἕως** is used for the uncertain future, the subj. with **ἄν**. The conception of **ἀπὸ τούτου ὅτε** has to be appealed to, 'from that moment when,' 'when once' the master arises. In like manner we see **ἀφ' ἧς** used for 'since' in Lu. 7:45; Ac. 24:11; 2 Pet. 3:4. In Col. 1:6, 9 we have the form **ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας**. **Ἐν ᾧ** is not always temporal. It may be merely local (Ro. 2:1), instrumental (Ro. 14:21) or causal (Ro. 8:3). The temporal use is much like **ἕως** in the sense of 'while,' as in Mk. 2:19 (Lu. 5:34) **ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν**. Cf. Jo. 5:7, **ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι** with **ἕως ἔρχομαι** in Jo. 21:22. In Lu. 19:13 the Text. Rec. has **ἕως ἔρχομαι**, but **ἐν ᾧ** is the true reading. In 1 Pet. 1:6 **ἐν ᾧ** has its antecedent expressed in the preceding sentence and means 'wherein.' In Mk. 2:19 we see **ὅσον χρόνον** for duration of time. In Mt. 9:15 the shorter **ἐφ' ὅσον** occurs, while in Heb. 10:37 note **ὅσον ὅσον** (a Hebraism from the LXX, though paralleled in the papyri). In Ro. 7:1 we read **ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον** the fullest form of all. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 169) cites C.P.R. 24, 25 (ii/A.D.) **ἐφ' ὃν ἢ χρόνον** (note absence of **ἄν**).

(e) *The Temporal Use of the Infinitive.* There are nine examples of **πρὸ τοῦ** and the infinitive. In the LXX there are 35 examples (Votaw, *The Infinitive in Bibl. Gk.,* p. 20). These examples all have the accusative with the infinitive, as in **πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν** (Mt. 6:8. Cf. Lu. 2:21; 22:15; Jo. 1:48 f.; 17:5; Ac. 23:15; Gal. 2:12; 3:23), except Jo. 13:19, **πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι**, but even here it is implied. The tense is aorist except a present in Jo. 17:5. The sense is quite like **πρίν** (see before). The inscriptions (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 214) show scattered examples of **πρὸ τοῦ** and inf. The use of **ἐν τῷ** as 'when' or 'while' is much more common. It occurs only 6 times in Thucydides, Plato 26 times, Xenophon 16 times.[1] But it is very common in the Septuagint as a translation of the Hebrew בְּ and the infinitive construct. Moulton[2] admits a Hebraism here in the sense of 'during,' a meaning not found in the vernacular **κοινή** so far. The construc-_ tion is, however, very common in Luke, the most literary of the N. T. writers, and in all parts of his Gospel. It is found both in the sense of 'while' and 'when.' Usually it is the present tense that has the notion of 'while' and the aorist that of 'when.' So

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 215. [2] Ib., p. 249.

in Lu. 1:8 note **ἐν τῷ ἱερατεύειν αὐτόν**, (2:27) **ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν.** The examples are numerous (55 in the N. T.), but the LXX shows 500 instances,[1] undoubted proof of the influence of the Hebrew there, where it is nearly as common as all other prepositions with the infinitive. This use of **ἐν τῷ** and the infinitive is not always temporal. In Lu. 12:15 it is rather the content than the time that is meant, In Lu. 1:21 it may be causal. **Μετὰ τό** and the infinitive we find fifteen times in the N. T. In the LXX the construction appears 108 times according to Votaw.[2] It has the resultant meaning of 'after' and always has the aorist infinitive except the perfect in Heb. 10:15. It is found in Luke, Paul, Matthew, Mark, Hebrews, and chiefly in Luke. A good example is found in **μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι** (Lu. 12:5). See also Ac. 7:4; 10:41. Mention should also be made of **ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν** in Ac. 8:40, as in the LXX (Judith 1:10; 11:19). It occurs 52 times in the 0. T. and 16 in the Apocrypha. But note **μέχρι τοῦ πλεῖν** , P. B. M. 854 (i/A.D.). On prepositions and inf. see Verbal Nouns.

(f) *Temporal Use of the Participle.* This subject will demand more extended treatment under the head of the Participle (Verbal Nouns). Here it may be noted that the participle does not of itself express time. We may in translation render the participle by a temporal clause with ‘as,’ ‘while,’ ‘since,’ ‘when,’ ‘after,’ etc., like the Latin *cum*.[3] As a rule the unadorned participle in English is enough to bring out the idea. The participle may be co-ordinated in translation with the principal verb by the use of 'and.' The present participle is merely descriptive and contemporaneous, as **ἀποθνήσκων** (Heb. 11:21). The aorist participle has either simultaneous action, as **ἀσπασάμενοι** (Ac. 25:13), or antecedent, as **ἐμβάντα** (Mt. 13:2). The wealth of participles gave the Greek a great advantage over the Latin in this matter. In the flourishing period of the language the temporal participle vied with the conjunctions in the expression of temporal relations. In the **κοινή** this use of the participle is still quite live, as almost any page of the N. T. shows, though it has manifestly in places shrunk before the analytic tendency to use conjunctions and finite verbs. This tendency to use conjunctions is still more noticeable in modern Greek.[4]

[1] Votaw, The Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20. [2] Ib.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 230. "We should not usually put a temporal clause to represent these, as it would overdo the emphasis."

[4] Jebb in V. and D.'s Handb., p. 333.

6. FINAL AND CONSECUTIVE CLAUSES.

(a) **Kinship**. It is a difficult matter to correlate properly these subordinate clauses. They nearly all have relative adverbs as conjunctions. Often the same conjunction is used indifferently in a number of different kinds of clauses. So ὡς in comparative, declarative, causal, temporal, final, consecutive, indirect interrogative, exclamatory. In like manner ὅπως has a varied use. Cf. the Latin *ut*, which is comparative, final, apprehensive, consecutive. The English *that* and German *dass* have a like history. Goodwin,[1] therefore, treats "final and object-clauses" together as pure final clauses, object-clauses with verbs of care and effort, clauses with verbs of fearing. He gives a separate discussion of consecutive clauses.[2] Burton[3] practically follows Goodwin. Viteau[4] blends them all into one. Winer practically ignores consecutive clauses. Jannaris[5] pointedly says that the popular speech "avoids the consecutive construction" and uses ὥστε and the infinitive for either final or consecutive (cf. Latin *ut* and English that) "thus confounding consecutive with final clauses." It was not quite that. As a matter of fact the various points of view shade off into one another very easily and sometimes quite imperceptibly. It is not always easy to distinguish purpose and result in the mind of the writer or speaker. The very word *finis* may be the end aimed at (purpose) or attained (result). My colleague, Prof. W. 0. Carver, D.D., has suggested grouping these ideas all under result, either contemplated, feared or attained. Some such idea is near the true analysis and synthesis. The later Greek showed a tendency to gather most of these ideas under ἵνα.[6]

(b) **Origin in Parataxis.** It seems clear that these final clauses had their origin in parataxis, not hypotaxis. The conjunctions, when used, were an after-development. The step from parataxis to hypotaxis has already been taken when we meet the Greek of Homer,[7] though the paratactic construction continued side by side in isolated instances. Examples like ἄφες ἐκβάλω (Lu. 6:42), βούλεσθε ἀπολύσω (Jo. 18:39), θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν (Mk. 14:12) are probably instances of this original idiom rather than of a mere ellipsis of ἵνα.[8] Cf. also the possible origin of **οὐ μή** as **οὔ· μή.** This

[1] M. and T., pp. 105-137.
[2] Ib., pp. 217-233.
[3] N. T. M. and T., pp. 83-100.
[4] Le Verbe, pp. 71-95.
[5] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 455.
[6] Ib., p. 458. Thus ὅπως and ὡς gradually disappear.
[7] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 555,
[8] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 109.

disconnected idiom was felt to be especially bare in the positive form, but the negative paratactic construction with **μή** with verbs of fearing is present in Homer.[1] Gildersleeve[2] quaintly says: "Parataxis, which used to be thrust into the background, has come forward and claimed its rights." This grammatical sage, barring the infinitive and participle, adds: "Nihil est in hypotaxi quod non prius fuerit in parataxi." The subjunctive, therefore, in final clauses is merely the volitive subj. of parataxis.[3] It was natural that the parataxis should be plainer in negative sentences, for alongside of **μή** (originally the mere negative in parataxis and the negative conjunction in hypotaxis) there came **ἵνα μή, ὅπως μή**.[4] The whole matter is carefully worked out by Weber[5] with careful discussion of each construction in the various writers during the long course of Greek linguistic history from Homer through the Attic writers.

(c) **Pure Final Clauses.** Here conscious purpose is expressed. This class constitutes the bulk of the examples and they are the easiest to understand. The Greek is rich in variety of construction for this idea. We can deal only with the idioms in the N. T. **Ὄφρα** is not in the N. T. or LXX, nor is the idiom of **ὅπως** with the future indicative after verbs of striving.

(a) **Ἵνα**. The etymology of **ἵνα** is not certain. A fragment[6] of Hesiod has **ἵν αὐτῷ**. Perhaps **ἵν-α** is derived from this form. But at any rate in Homer **ἵνα= ἐκεῖ** in *Iliad*, 10, 127. After Homer, especially in the poets, it has the meaning 'where,' 'in what place,' 'whither.'[7] The exact connection between this local demonstrative and relative sense and the final 'that' (*ut*) is not clear.[8] But we have a similar transition in the Latin *ut*, English *that*, German *dass*. Sophocles in his *Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* gives nineteen uses of **ἵνα** for the Greek of that era. They may all be whittled down to three, viz. the pure final, the object-clauses or sub-final, the consecutive. There is no doubt that **ἵνα** came to be used in all these ways in the Byzantine period. In the **κοινή** of the N. T. time the first two are abundantly shown. The ecbatic or consecutive use is debatable in the N. T. But each in its order. Curiously enough the Attic inscriptions make a very sparing use

[1] Ib., p. 108.
[2] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1883, p. 419.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 185.
[4] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 107.
[5] Entwickelungsgeschichte der Absichtsatze (1884, 1885).
[6] Dyroff, Gesch. des Pronomen reflexivum, 1892, p. 71.
[7] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 566.
[8] Ib.

of ἵνα, much preferring ὅπως and ὅπως ἄν.[1] So in epic and lyric poetry ἵνα is overshadowed by ὄφρα and in tragedy by ὡς, though Aristophanes uses it in three-fourths of his final sentences and Plato and the Attic orators use it almost exclusively (Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses,* p. 109). The original use of ἵνα, after the demonstrative and the relative, stage, was the pure final. It is so in Homer, though Monro admits one instance of the object-clause.[2] Only the subj. occurs with it in Homer in this construction. This is the natural mode for the expectant note in clauses of purpose.[3] But it must not be overlooked that ἵνα in no way controls the mode, for the idiom is at bottom paratactic in origin.[4] But the indicative had a use also as well as the optative, as will presently be shown. A word further is needed concerning the tremendous development in the use of ἵνα. Thucydides used ὅπως three times as often as ἵνα, and ὡς as a final particle only twice. Xenophon in the first three books of the *Anabasis* has ὅπως one and a half times as often as ἵνα, and ὡς nearly as often as ἵνα. But Polybius (books I–V) uses ἵνα exclusively, and the N. T. has ἵνα about twelve times as often as ὅπως and ὡς perhaps once. It is thus not simply that ἵνα displaced ὅπως and ὡς, but it gradually usurped the final use of the infinitive also. It comes to be almost the exclusive means of expressing purpose, and in the modern Greek vernacular every phase of the subj. and the old future ind. can be expressed by νά (ἵνα) and the subj.[5] **Ν**ά is used also with the ind. The intention in modern Greek is brought out a bit more sharply by γιὰ νά (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 197). But the distinction is sometimes faint. All in all it is one of the most remarkable developments in the Greek tongue. The eight and a half pages of examples in Moulton and Geden's *Concordance* bear eloquent testimony to the triumph of ἵνα in the N. T. Nearly a page and a half of these examples are in the Gospel of John. But we are now specifically concerned with the pure final use of ἵνα. Here ἵνα is in the accusative case of general reference. Thus in ἐλήλυθα ἵνα μάθω (cf. *veni ut discam,* 'I am come that I may learn') ἵνα is really a demonstrative. 'I am come as to this,' viz. 'I may learn.' The conjunction is supplied to avoid the asyndeton and is in apposition with μάθω. As already explained, the subj. is the predominant mode, as in τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ (Mt. 1:

[1] Meisterh.-Schw., p. 253 f. [2] Hom. Gr., p. 207.
[3] Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 479; Mutzbauer, Konj. and Opt., p. 76.
[4] Goodwin, M. and. T., p. 107; Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 211.
[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 416 f.; Jebb in V. and D., pp. 319-323.

22). Cf. Ph. 3:8. The negative with ἵνα is μή, as in ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε (Mt. 7:1). The aorist subj. is the normal tense, of course, as in ἵνα μεταδῶ (Ro. 1:11), though the present occurs to denote a continuous action, as in ἵνα πιστεύητε (Jo. 13:19). Cf. ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε (Jo. 10:38). The perfect subj. occurs in εἰδῶ, as ἵνα εἰδῇς (1 Tim. 3:15); ἵνα εἰδῶμεν (1 Cor. 2:12); ἵνα εἰδῆτε (1 Jo. 5:13). Cf. also Jo. 17:19, 23; 1 Cor. 1:10; ,2 Cor. 1:9 (ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες ὦμεν); ἵνα παρεσκευασμένοι ἦτε (2 Cor. 9:3). The subj. is regularly retained after a secondary tense of the indicative as in ἀνέβη ἵνα ἴδῃ (Lu. 19:4); ἐπετίμησεν ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν (Mt. 16:20). Cf. Mk. 8:6. There is no instance in the N. T. of the optative used with ἵνα after a secondary tense of the indicative. It is true that W. H. read ἵνα δῴη in the text of Eph. 1:17 (ἵνα δώῃ or δῷ in the margin), but this is after a primary tense, οὐ παύομαι. It is the volitive use of the optative and is not due to ἵνα. It is like the optative in a future wish.[1] This use of the opt. with ἵνα after a wish is not unknown to classic Greek.[2] It is the subj., not the opt., that is seen in ἵνα πληροῖς (Col. 4:17), ἵνα παραδοῖ (Mk. 14:10) and in the sub-final ἵνα ὀνοῖ (Mk. 9:30).[3] In Homer and the early writers generally the rule was to use the opt. with the final clauses after secondary tenses, but in the Attic orators the two modes (subj. and opt.) are on a par in such a construction, while Thucydides prefers the subj., though Xenophon is just the reverse.[4] In the N. T. the optative in final clauses after secondary tenses is non-existent. In 2 Tim. 2:25 μή ποτε δῴη is after a primary tense as in Eph. 1:17, and here again the text is uncertain (cf. δώῃ in margin and ἀναήψωσιν in text.) The Atticists (Arrian, Appian, Herodian, 4th Macc., Plutarch) made a point of the opt. with ἵνα as "the hall-mark of a pretty Attic style" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 197). The N. T. writers, more like Diodorus and Polybius, fail "to rival the *litterateurs* in the use of this resuscitated elegance." Moulton speaks also of "the

[1] Cf. W.-H., vol. II, App., p. 168. [2] W.-M., p. 363.

[3] On the sparing use of the opt. with final sentences in late Gk. see the tables in Diel, De enuntiatis finalibus apud Graecarum rerum scriptores posterioris aetatis, 1894, pp. 20 See also Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 132. Moulton (Prol., p. 197) notes how the Atticists revelled in the opt. with ἵνα, ὅπως, ὡς, Josephus has 32 per cent. opts., Plut. 49 (Lives), Arrian 82, Appian 87! Polyb. has only 7, Diodorus 5. These are true κοινή literati. Moulton finds only one pap. of this period with opt. with ἵνα, O.P. 237 (late ii/A.D.), ἵνα — δυνηθείην. In iii/A.D. he notes L.Pw., ἵν' –εἵηι in primary sequence. Tb. 1 (ii/B.C.) actually has ἠξίωσα χρηματισθήσοιτο.

[4] Weber, Entwickelungsgeschichte der Absichtsatze, p. 243.

riot of optatives" in the artificial Byzantine writers. On the whole subject of final clauses see Gildersleeve on "The Final Sentence in Greek," 1883, p. 419, *A. J. of Philol.,* IV, pp. 416 ff., VI, pp. 53 There is no trouble to find in the papyri, inscr. and κοινή writers generally abundant examples of ἵνα and the subj. in pure design (Radermacher, *N.T.Gr.*, p.138). But while the subj. is the normal construction, the indicative is also present. In classical Greek ἵνα was not used with the future ind.[1] It was not common even with ὅπως, ὡς and μή. The similarity in form and sense (not to mention itacism of –η and –ει) made the change very easy and, indeed, the text is not always certain as between the aorist subj. and the future ind. Thus in 1 Cor. 13:3 ἵνα καυχήσωμαι is supported by ℵAB, ἵνα καυθήσωμαι by CK and ἵνα καυθήσομαι by late documents.[2] In Gal. 2:4 the best documents have ἵνα καταδουλώσουσιν instead of —σωσιν. In Jo. 17:2 the MSS. vary between ἵνα δώσει and δώσῃ. So in Jo. 15:8 note ἵνα φέρητε καὶ γένησθε (γενήσεσθε in margin of W. H.); Eph. 6:3, ἵνα γένηται καὶ ἔσῃ. But the idiom is well established in the N. T., especially in the Apocalypse. Thus ἵνα θεωρήσουσιν (Jo. 7:3); ἵνα ξυρήσονται (Ac. 21:24); ἵνα ἐρεῖ (Lu. 14:10); ἵνα θήσω (1 Cor. 9:18); ἵνα δώσουσιν (Lu. 20:10); ἵνα κενώσει (1 Cor. 9:15); ἵνα κερδηθήσονται (1 Pet. 3:1); ἵνα σφάξουσιν (Rev. 6:4); ἵνα δώσει (8:3); ἵνα ἥξουσιν—γνῶσιν (3:9); ἵνα ἔσται καὶ εἰσέλθωσιν (22:14), etc. This last example may be non-final. In some of these examples the subj. and ind. future occur side by side. In Mk. 6:56 and Ac. 5:15 note ἵνα κἂν (only instances of ἄν with ἵνα in the N. T.). This is not modal ἄν, but κἄν as 'even' = καί (Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr.*, p. 165; Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 167). In Rev. 13:15 the MSS. vary between ἵνα ποιήσῃ and –ει, and in 16 between ἵνα δῶσιν and δώσει (ποιεῖ ἵνα sub-final). The usage is thus on a firm foundation in the N. T. It is in the LXX also. See ἵνα ἔσται in Lev. 10:6 and in other writers of the κοινή (Iren., 584 A, ἵνα ἔσῃ).[3] But ἵνα occurs also with the present ind. This is a rare construction in the N. T. and is not a classic idiom. It occurs only three times in the N. T. Thayer calls it "a solecism frequent in the eccl. and Byzantine writers." It is so common in late writers as not to surprise us in the N. T.[4] Thus 1 Cor. 4:6 ἵνα μὴ φυσιοῦσθε, Gal, 4:17 ἵνα ζηλοῦτε and 1 Jo. 5:20 ἵνα γινώσκομεν. The first two are possible subjunctives. W. H. read ἵνα μήτις δύναται in the margin of Rev. 13:17, and various

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 115.
[2] Approved by Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 212.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 35.
[4] W.-M., p. 362.

MSS. support the present ind. with ἵνα in Jo. 4:15; 5:20; 17: 3; Gal. 6:12; 1 Th. 4:13; Tit. 2:4; 2 Pet. 1:10; Rev. 12:6.[1] In the earlier Greek writers we do find ἵνα used with past tenses of the indicative.[2] The idea was to show that the purpose was dependent on an unfulfilled wish or unattained action. But this refinement does not appear in the N. T. except in two examples with **μή πως**. With all the wide extension of ἵνα in Western Hellenistic,[3] at the heart of it there is the pure telic idiom. **Ἵνα** with the imperative in 1 Cor. 1:31 is due, of course, to the quotation. **Ἵνα** is repeated three times in 2 Cor. 12:7. In Jo. 11:37, **ποιῆσαι ἵνα καὶ οὗτος μὴ ἀποθάνῃ**, one is reminded of the Latin *facere ut* (sub-final). Westcott (*Hebrews*, p. 342 f.) gives a list of all the examples of ἵνα in the Epistle (20). Only two of ὅπως.

(β) **Ὅπως**. It is compounded of the neuter accusative relative ὅ and the indefinite adverb πώς.[4] It occurs in indirect questions as in Lu. 24:20 in the sense of 'how,' the usual interrogative sense, and note article also as in **τὸ πῶς** (Lu. 22:2). **Ὅπως** in a sense is the connecting link between the various kinds of final sentences.[5] Thucydides and Xenophon preferred ὅπως to ἵνα, and Aristotle has ἵνα only a few times (W. Schmid, *Atticismus*, III, p. 87). Polybius does not use ὅπως at all in books I–V. The N. T. has ἵνα 493 times, ὅπως 52 (Jannaris, p. 417) as far as Colossians. Scott counts ἵνα 746 times in text of W. H. (not including 6 of ἵνα τί–) and 58 of ὅπως. Thumb does not give ὅπως as a final particle in modern Greek (*Handb*., p. 197). Even in later Greek ὅπως was a sign of literary affectation.[6] As already noted, in the fourth and fifth centuries B.C. ὅπως was quite the rule in the Attic inscriptions.[7] It is rare in Homer and never has **κέ** or ἄν in pure final clauses in the Homeric language.[8] This idiom with ἄν first appeat's in AEschylus. In the great Attic writers and the Attic inscriptions the subjunctive, the future indicative and the optative after secondary tenses, all are found. The future indicative occurred chiefly with verbs of striving, though sometimes in pure final clauses.[9] The negative with this future indicative was **μή (ὅπως μή),** though no example

[1] Cf. W.-H., App., pp. 167, 169, 171. See further Meyer on 1 Cor. 4 : 6.

[2] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 120. The Mod. Gk, has νά with past tenses of the ind. (Thumb, Handb., p. 198).

[3] Moulton, Pro1., pp. 41, 205, 211.

[4] Brug., Griech. Or., p. 565; Delbruck, Konj. and Opt., p. 61.

[5] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 348.

[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 417.

[7] Meisterh.-Schw., p. 253 f.

[8] Goodwin M. and T., p.

[9] Ib., p. 113 f.

occurs in the N. T. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 177 note) finds in the papyri a few survivals of ὅτως μή and the fut. ind., though mostly ousted by ἵνα μή. Cf. Hb. P. 45, 60, 168 (iii/B.C.), Tb. P. 414 (ii/A.D.). Stahl (*Syntax*, p. 360) calls ὅπως and fut. ind. Attic. In the N. T. the optative does not occur in this construction. In the Atticists it is revived as with ἵνα.[1] The fut. ind. with ὅπως in pure final clauses has practically vanished from the N. T. The one example in Ro. 3:4, ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς καὶ νικήσεις is a quotation from the LXX (Ps. 51:6), but changed from subj. there. But ὅπως θανατώσουσιν is a variant reading in Mt. 26:59, and the future ind. is possible in Mt. 2:8, ὅπως προσκυνήσω, though it is probably the aorist subj. Other variant readings where the future ind. is supported with ὅπως are 1 Cor. 1:29, καυχήσεται, and Mk. 5:23 ὅπως ζήσεται, (here W. H. read ἵνα ζήσῃ). But at any rate the use of the future ind. with ὅπως in pure final clauses is not quite dead in the N. T. period, though surely dying. Elsewhere the aorist subj. alone occurs save in Lu. 16:26 (*bis*), 28 and Mt. 6:4. **Ὅπως** no longer[2] has ἄν in final clauses save in the quotation from Ps. 51:6 (Ro. 3:4) and three passages in Luke's writings (Lu. 2:35 ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν Ac. 3:19 f. ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν--καὶ ἀποστείλῃ, 15:17 ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν from Amos (so A, but B without ἄν) 9:12). **Ἄν** is a variant reading in Mt. 6:5 and is found very often in the LXX. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 158) finds ὅπως ἄν in Diodorus XIV, 80, 8, Aristeas, § 239, inscr. of Halicarnassus (iii/B.C.), *Jahrb. d. Ost. Inst.* XI, 56. But it is rare and ὅπως steps into the background before ἵνα. The revival of ὅπως in the third and fourth cent. A.D. was Atticistic and did not affect, the vernacular. The inscriptions and the papyri for the first century A.D. show the prevalence of ἵνα over ὅπως (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 157 note). The negative is, of course, always μή, as in Ac. 20:16, ὅπως μὴ γένηται. The subj. is used indifferently after primary tenses (Mt. 6:2, ποιοῦσιν ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν) and secondary tenses (Ac. 9:24, παρετηροῦντο ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀνέλωσιν). Cf. Ro. 9:17. It is interesting to note that in the N. T. ὅπως is almost confined to Matthew and Luke's writings. The literary flavour of Luke explains his use of the idiom, but we do not look for literary ear-marks in Matthew. The one example in John (11:57) occurs side by side with ἵνα (ἵνα μηνύσῃ, ὅπως πιάσωσιν) and may be used for the sake of variety as in ἵνα γένηται ὅπως γένηται, (2 Cor. 8:14). Cf. also Lu. 16:28;

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 197; Jana., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 417.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 211.

1 Cor. 1:29; 2 Th. 1:12, though ἵνα—ἵνα appear in 1 Cor. 4:6; Gal. 4:5.[1] In 1 Cor. 1:17 note ἵνα μή and ὅπως μή 1: 29. But ἵνα has "invaded the territory of ὅπως, as with φροντίζειν and σπουδάζειν" (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 206). In modern Greek ὅπως has lost all telic force (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 198). Sometimes ὅπως represents the main purpose and the infinitive the subordinate purpose, a construction amply illustrated in the papyri.[2] So then, though ὅπως as a pure final conjunction is disappearing in the N. T., it yet occurs with the same concept on the whole.

(γ) Ὡς. It was not a favourite final particle with Thucydides (only twice), though Xenophon used it nearly as much as ἵνα. It is not surprising to find only one instance of it in the N. T. and that one not certain. ℵB read ὡς τελειώσω in Ac. 20:24 instead of ὡς τελειῶσαι (cf. Lu. 9:52). W. H. and Neste read τελειώσω, but Souter (Rev. V.) gives τελειῶσαι. It is the last leaf on the tree and a fluttering one at that. The form could be the future incl. or aorist subj. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 158) finds final ὡς merely a reminiscence in the κοινή, but it is needless to cite Mk. 4:26 f., ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ, since this is not final at all, but comparison. On ὡς ἄν in final sentences see Schmidt, Joseph. Bloc., p. 409, for statistics. Radermacher quotes F. P. 118 (110 A.D.), πορεύου--ἕως τὸν ἐκεῖ ἐλαιῶνα ποτίσῃς, where ἕως is used as final ὡς. *Per contra* in modern Greek, Moulton (*Prol*., p. 249) notes that ὡς takes the meaning of ἕως as well as its own.

(δ) **Μή, μή ποτε, μή πως**. Negative purpose is expressed by ἵνα **μή,** ὅπως **μή** also, but originally it was done merely by **μή** in a paratactic sentence.[3] In Homer and the early writers **μή** is far in excess of ἵνα **μή,** ὅπως **μή**, but in Aristophancs and Herodotus the reverse is true, while in Plato and Xenophon **μή** as a final conjunction has about gone. It is rare in the Attic historians and orators generally.[4] Originally a negative adverb (subjective negative) it came to be used also as a conjunction. Cf. Latin *ne*. The idioms **μὴ οὐ** appears in Homer in a few final clauses, and after Homer **μὴ οὐ** is used with verbs of fearing.[5] In the N. T. ἵνα **μή** (1 Cor. 1:17) and ὅπως **μή** (1:29) have the run over the conjunction **μή.** Only the subj. is used, though in Ac. 27:42 **μή τις διαφύγοι** is a variant reading, but **διαφύγῃ** is correct after the secondary tense of the incl. In Mk. 13:36, **μὴ εὕρῃ** a primary tense occurs in the principal verb. In Col. 2:4 W. H. read ἵνα **μηδεὶς**

[1] Ib. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 220.
[3] Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 107, 112.
[4] Ib., p. 112. [5] Ib., p. 107.

παραλογίζηται instead of μή τις (the variant reading). See also μή τις λογίσηται (2 Cor. 12:6). Both μή and μή πως are preserved as final conjunctions in the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 198). The use of μὴ ποτε and μή πως is practically the same. **Μή** πως appears with the subj. (Paul) after (secondaryand primary tenses. So ἔπεμψα μή πως καταισχυνθῶμεν (2 Cor. 9:3 f. Note also ἵνα μή in 9:3, 4) and μή πως γένωμαι (1 COr. 9:27). In Gal. 2:2 (μή πως ἔδραμον) and 1 Th. 3:5 (μή πως ἐπείρασεν) we have a difficult construction. One view is to take it as an indirect question. This is possible in Gal. 2:2, but not in 1 Th. 3:5. Even in Gal. 2:2 there would be an ellipsis of a participle like ζητῶν μαθεῖν. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 201) suggests that ἔδραμον as an "after-thought" in Gal. 2:2 has plenty of classical Parallels. Cf. Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses*, § 333. In 1 Th. 3:51 we have μή πως ἐπείρασεν καὶ γένηται side by side. It is better therefore to take τρέχω in Gal. 2:2 as subj. also. Thus in both examples we have the subj. and the aorist ind. This is in accord with the ancient idiom where in pure final sentences a past tense of the incl. was used if it is distinctly implied that the purpose was not attained.[1] That is precisely the case here. Paul did not run in vain. The tempter did not succeed with the Thessalonians. It is thus unfulfilled purpose that Paul neatly expresses in accord with the Attic diction. **Μή** ποτε loses the notion of time in ποτε and has rather the idea of contingency, 'but perchance' rather than 'lest at any time.' Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 158) thinks that ποτέ and πώς often distinguish deliberative (dubitative) from final μή. As a strictly final particle it occurs either with the subj. or the future ind., though the subj. is more common.[2] For the fut. ind. note Mt. 7:6 μή ποτε καταπατήσουσιν (correct text, though the aorist subj. has support), Mk. 14:2 μή ποτε ἔσται. In Lu. 12:58 note μή ποτε κατασύρῃ καὶ ἀποδώσει. Both subj. and fut. ind. likewise occur in Mt. 13:15 (Ac. 28:27) μή ποτε ἴδωσιν--καὶ ἰάσομαι (LXX, Is. 6:10). So also in Lu. 14:8 f., μή ποτε ᾖ κεκλημένος (note perfect subj.) καὶ ἐρεῖ (cf. ἵνα ἐρεῖ in verse 10). The normal subj. is seen in Lu. 14:12, μή ποτε ἀντικαλέσωσιν. The opt. in the N. T. is wanting in final sentences as in .Lses of repetition (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 131). W. H. read μή ποτε δῴη (opt.) in 2 Tim. 2:25. But even so, if true, it not a pure final clause but a kind of indirect question as in Lu. 3:15, only in 2 Tim. 2:25 the opt. occurs after a primary tense. It is hardly just to say

[1] Goodwin, M. and T. p. 120 f.
[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 86.

with Moulton[1] that here Paul "misused an obsolete idiom," since the opt. after primary tenses occurs occasionally with ἵνα in the papyri.[2] Cf. **μή ποτε αὐτῶν χρεία γένοιτο, εὐθέως αὐτοὺς ἐξέλασον**, P. Oxy. I, 118, 38. But it is more than likely, as Moulton argues, that in 2 Tim. 2:25 we should read subj. δώῃ, since ἀναήψωσιν undoubtedly is subj. The epic δώῃ is supported by ἐὰν γνώῃ, Clem., *Paed*., III, 1. (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 193.)

(ε) *Relative Clauses.* This construction in the earlier Greek, like the Latin, had either the subj. or the opt. The Attic added the future ind. which largely displaced the subj. and the opt.[3] The N. T. follows the Attic use of the fut. ind. Cf. **οἵτινες ἀποδώσουσιν** (Mt. 21:41); **οὓς καταστήσομεν** (Ac. 6:3). See 1 Cor. 4:17, **ὅς ἀναμνήσει**. Blass[4] explains the occasional return to the subj. as due to ἵνα. See **ὅπου φάγω** (Mk. 14:14); **παρ᾽ ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν** (Ac. 21:16); **ὅ προσενέγκῃ** (Heb. 8:3); **δι᾽ ἧς λατρεύωμεν** (12:28). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 138) quotes B. U. III, 822 (ii/A.D.) **εὗρον γεοργόν τίς** (=ὃς) **αὐτὰ ἐλύσῃ**, Diodorus, XIV, 8, 3, **δι᾽ ὧν ἐξέλωσι τὰ τείχη**. The N. T. hardly uses the relative clause of purpose as freely as the Attic Greek.

(ζ) *The Infinitive.* A brief statement is alone necessary here, since the infinitive receives full discussion in the next chapter. Suffice it to say that the infinitive is exceedingly common in the N. T. for the notion of pure purpose. Votaw[5] counts some 1,285 such instances of the simple infinitive of purpose in "biblical Greek." He gives the figures for the N. T. alone as 211. He notes that "this use of the infinitive is second only to that of general object in order of relative frequency of occurrence." Moulton (*Prol*., p. 205) notes that the inf. of purpose is more common in the N. T. than in Attic, and he agrees with Thumb (*Theol. Lit*., 1903, p. 421) in the theory that this frequency of the inf. of purpose in the **κοινή** is due to the Ionic dialect. It has survived in the Pontic dialect of modern Greek, though elsewhere displaced by νά and the subj. Cf. **ἑτοιμάσωμεν φαγεῖν** (Mt. 26:17) and **ἑτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς** (Mk. 14:12). The telic inf. is common in the **κοινή** writers generally (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.,* p. 152). Cf. Xenophon of Eph., 393, 28, **ἐληλύθει προσεύξασθαι**. It is commonest with verbs of movement (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 205), as in **ἐὰν ἀναβῶ κἀγὼ προσκυνῆσαι**, Par. P. 49 (ii/B.C.). This infinitive may be resolved easily into the original dative (or locative), as in Jo.

[1] Prol., p. 194.
[2] Ib., p. 197.
[3] Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 216
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 217.
[5] The Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 10.

21:3, ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν, 'I go a-fishing'; Mt. 2:2, ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι, we went up for worshipping.'[1] It is easy to see the purpose in the dative form of προσκυνῆσαι, but less clear in the locative ἁλιεύειν, (probably due to syncretism). Moulton[2] suggests that the locative was originally a sort of designed result and gradually the line of cleavage vanished between the two forms as was true of ἵνα (and *ut*). "The burden of making purpose clear is in all these cases thrown on the context; and it cannot be said that any difficulty results, except in a minimum of places." This idiom has a much wider range in Homer than in Attic writers and is again more prevalent in the N. T. than in the Attic.[3] A few examples must suffice: οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι (Mt. 5:17); ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη—πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου (4:1); οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους (Mk. 2:17); πάρεσμεν ἀκοῦσαι (Ac. 10:33). Cf. Lu. 18:10; Ac. 11:25; 12:13; 13:44, etc. Less frequent is the inf. with τοῦ for the idea of purpose. Votaw[4] notes but 34 such examples of direct purpose in the N. T., though the 0. T. shows 734. These 34 are almost confined to Matthew, Luke and Acts. Cf. τοῦ ἀπολέσαι (Mt. 2:13); τῷ σπεῖραι (Lu. 8:5); τοῦ αἰτεῖν (Ac. 3:2). See both together in Lu. 1:76 f., 79; 2:22, 24, παραστῆσαι—καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι. For a full discussion see "Articular Infinitive" (Verbal Nouns). Paul seems to avoid it as a rule. But see Ro. 6:6; Ph. 3:10. The use of ὥστε and the inf. for pure purpose is rare in the N. T., some half-dozen instances.[5] Only probable examples should be claimed (p. 1089). Thus ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν (Mt. 10:1). Cf. Mt. 15:33; 24:24; 27:1; Lu. 4:29; 20:20. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 160) cites P. Oxy. I, 52, 7 (325 A.D.), ἐποιστολέντος ὥστε τὴν διάθεσιν ἔγγραφον προσφωνῆσαι. For further examples of telic ὥστε in the inscriptions and writers of the κοινή see Koch, *Observationes grammaticae*, p. 20. It is more frequent in the LXX. Radermacher even cites a case of final ὥστε with the subj. in a late papyrus; B. G. U. III, 874, γεγράφηκα ὑμῖν ὥστε πέμψητε. There are two examples of ὡς in W. H., ὡς ἑτοιμάσαι (Lu. 9:52, other editors ὥστε) and ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν (Heb. 7:9). In Ac. 20:24 most editors have ὡς τελειῶσαι, but not W. H. The articular infinitive with prepositions is very common in the N. T. as in the LXX, about one-half of all the examples of the articular infinitives.[6] For a discussion of prepositions with the inf. see Verbal Nouns. Both εἰς τό and πρὸς τό occur with the inf. in the papyri, the latter

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 204.
[2] Ib., p. 207.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 223.
[4] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 21.
[5] Ib., p. 10.
[6] Ib., p. 19.

more frequently. They both seem "to carry the thought of a remoter purpose." (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 220.) Moulton cites B. U. 226 (i/A.D.) ὅπως εἰδῇ παρέσεσται (=θαι) — πρὸς τὸ τυχῖν, 0. P. 237 (ii/A.D.) ὅπως φροντίσῃς— πρὸς τὸ μὴ--ἐντυγχάνειν. The papyri have εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι as a "recurrent formula." Cf. P. Fi. 2 (iii/A.D.) 4 times. Moulton gives numerous papyri references for telic **εἰς τό**. The examples with **εἰς τό** are the most common of all in the N. T. (72 instances). As a rule these indicate purpose more or less strong, though not always. It is particularly common in Paul (50 exx., H. Scott). So εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι (Ro. 1:11), εἰς τὸ εἶναι (8:29). Cf. 4 Th. 3:5; Eph. 1: 12; Ph. 1:10). The instances of **πρὸς τό** are ew (12) and chiefly in Matt. and Paul. Cf. πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι (Mt. 6:1); πρὸς τὸ δυνάσθαι (Eph. 6:11).[1]

(η) *The Participle*. The future participle, so common in this construction in the Attic Greek, has nearly vanished from the N. T. as from the rest of the **κοινή**. A few remnants survive like ἔρχεται Ἠλείας σώσων (Mt. 27:49), ἀνέβην προσκυνήσων and ποιήσων, (Ac. 24:11, 17). Cf. Ac. 8:27. So also the present participle occasionally occurs where purpose is implied. Thus ἀπεστάλκαμεν ἀπαγγέλλοντας (Ac. 15:27). Cf. ἔπεμψαν ἀγγέλλοντας (Thuc. VII, 26, 9).[2] Cf. also Mk. 3:31. A good example is Ac. 3: 26, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν αὐτολοῦντα. See Participle (Verbal Nouns) and Tense for further remarks.

(d) **Sub-Final Clauses** (r*eally object or subject clauses like ὅτι clauses*). There are a considerable number of clauses which are not pure purpose and yet are not result. They are the bridge, in a sense, between the two extremes. They are found with verbs of striving, beseeching, commanding, fearing. In some instances the clause is hardly more than an object-clause. The same conjunctions are here used in general, and this shows that no hard and fast line was drawn in the matter. Various divisions are made of these verbs.[3] Burton[4] calls them object-clauses of exhorting, of striving, of fearing, of subject and predicate, of complementary and epexegetic clauses, of conceived result. But even so they overlap and run into one another.

(a) **Ἵνα**. Here again the main conjunction is ἵνα. All these varieties noted by Burton are seen with ἵνα save with verbs of

1 Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 161 f.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 198.
[3] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 122 ff.
[4] N. T. M. and T., p. 83.

fearing. As we have seen,[1] there were two tendencies in the κοινή. One was the spread of the Ionic use of the inf. of purpose, the other was the wide extension of ἵνα in Western Hellenistic. So the ἵνα in the non-final or sub-final sense, once rare,[2] now comes to be exceedingly common. The development came on soon after the close of the classical age.[3] But Thackeray (*Gr* ., pp. 24, 194) finds it rare in the LXX. It came to be used in almost any sense that the infinitive bore and finally displaced it. This weakened use of ba is one of the characteristics of the κοινή and is richly illustrated in the N. T., particularly in the writings of John. Thus in Mt. 5:29, συμφέρει ἵνα ἀπόληται, the ἵνα clause is the subject of συμφέρει and is a subject-clause in the nominative case. There is a great variety of phrases[4] which thus use ἵνα. So ἀρκετὸν ἵνα γένηται (Mt. 10:25; 18:6). Cf. 1 Pet. 4:3 (inf.). See also ἱκανὸς ἵνα (Mt. 8:8), though elsewhere inf.; ἄξιος ἵνα (Jo. 1:27), but inf. in 1 Cor. 16:4, as often; συνήθεια ὑμῖν ἵνα (Jo. 18:39); ἐλήλυθεν ὥρα ἵνα (Jo. 12:23); ἐμοὶ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα (1 Cor. 4:3); ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα (Jo. 4:34); λυσιτελεῖ---ἵνα (Lu. 17:2); τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ (Lu. 1:43); ζητεῖται ἵνα (1 Cor. 4:2); χαρὰν ἵνα (Ph. 2:2). Thus the ἵνα clause is seen to be either nom. or acc., simply, or in apposition with a substantive. In John[5] the appositional use is very frequent. So αὕτη ἵνα (Jo. 17:3); μείζονα ταύτης, ἵνα (15:13, ablative); ἐν τούτῳ ἵνα (15:8, locative); χάριν, ἵνα (3 John 4, accusative). Cf. Jo. 6:39; 1 Jo. 3:1, 11, 23; 4:21; 2 Jo. 6; 1 Cor. 9:18; Rev. 2:21. In Jo. 15:12 ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε (subj.) is in apposition with ἐντολή. Some of these are complementary or epexegetic clauses. In the subject and object (or appositive) clauses the subjunctive is usually found, though occasionally the fut. ind., as in ἐρρέθη ἵνα ἀδικήσουσιν (Rev. 9:4). See further examples of the fut. ind. in Rev. 3:9; 6:11; 13:12; 14:13 (especially common in the Apocalypse). In Rev. 9:5 we have ἐδόθη ἵνα μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα βασανισθήσονται. In Jo. 17:3 some MSS. read ἵνα γινώσκουσιν (read by Treg. and Tisch.). Object-clauses with ἵνα after verbs of striving, beseeching, etc., largely displace ὅπως. Many of these verbs use also the infinitive and a few retain ὅπως.[6] Blass[7] gives a careful list of the construction in the N,. T. with each of these verbs. See also

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 205.
[2] It is seen as early as Demosthenes (IV, 28).
[3] Jebb in V. and D.'s Handb., p. 320.
[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 228.
[5] W.-Th., p. 338 f.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 225 f.
[7] Tb.

Thayer under ἵνα (2). Cf. *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, 29, **πρόσευξαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ τέκνου μου, ἵνα ζήσεται**. With these verbs ἵνα gives the purport or object rather than the purpose. This use of ἵνα is very rare[1] in classic Greek, though in itself not out of harmony with the Greek genius. The parallel between ἵνα in this sense and ὅτι is seen in Jo. 11:50; 1 Jo. 5:3, 9, 11. *Per contra* see 1 Jo. 5: 13 for distinction. Cf. also ὅτι in. Mt. 13:13 with ἵνα in Lu. 8:10. It is worth repeating that in the modern Greek (except in the Pontic dialect) it is universal (νά) to the exclusion of the inf. and ὅπως. It is common after verbs of saying (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 189). The examples in the N. T. are too numerous to give a complete list. But note ἵνα after **ἀγγαρεύω** (Mt. 27: 32); **ἀγαλλιάομαι**, (Jo. 8:56); **ἀγωνίζομαι** (Jo. 18:36); **αἰτέομαι** (Col. 1:9); **ἀπαγγέλλω** (Mt. 28:10. So **παραγγέλλω**, Mk. 6:8); **ἀποστέλλω** (Ac. 16:36); **ἀφίημι**, (Mk. 11:16); **βουλεύομαι** (Jo. 12:10); and **συμβ.** (Mt. 26:4); **βλέπω** (1 Cor. 16:10); **γράφω** (Mk. 9:12); **διαστέλλομαι** (many MSS. in Mt. 16:20); **δέομαι** (Lu. 9:40); **δίδωμι** (Mk. 10:37); **ἐντολὴν δίδωμι** (**λαμβάνω**), as in Jo. 11:57 (13:34; 15:12); **ἐντέλλομαι** (Mk. 13:34); **ἐπιτιμάω** (Mt. 12:16; 16:20, W. H.); **ἐξορκίζω** (Mt. 26:63); **ἐρωτάω** (Mk. 7:26); **εἶπον** (Mt. 4: 3); and **λέγω** (Ac. 19:4); **θέλω** (Mk. 6:25); **ἔστιν θέλημα** (Mt. 18: 14); **ζηλόω** (1 Cor. 14:1); **ζητέω** (1 Cor. 4:2); **κηρύσσω** (Mk. 6:12); **μεριμνάω** (1 Cor. 7:34); **παρακαλέω** (Mt. 14:36); **πείθω** (Mt. 27: 20); **ποιέω** (Jo. 11:37); **προσεύχομαι** (Mk. 14:35); **συντίθεμαι** (Jo. 9:22 and inf.); **τίθημι** (Jo. 15:16); **φυλάσσομαι** (2 Pet. 3:17). This is a most interesting list. Kalker (*Questiones de elocutione Polybiana,* 1880. Cf. Moulton, *Prol*., p. 20) has shown how Polybius favours ἵνα with verbs of commanding like **αἰτέομαι**, **παραγγέλλω**), etc. No real distinction in sense can here be drawn between the inf. and ἵνα. The later **κοινή** (and so the N. T.) carried this use of ἵνα much further than did Polybius, who had more affinity with the old literary Greek. There is no need to appeal to Latin influence for this sub-final use of ἵνα, as Moulton (p. 208) abundantly shows from the papyri. So 0. P. 744 (i/B.c.) **ἐρωτῶ σε ἵνα μὴ ἀγωνιάσῃς**, N. P. 7 (i/A.D.) **ἔγραψα ἵνα σοι φυλαχθῶσι**, B. U. 531 (ii/A.D.) **παρακαλῶ σε ἵνα κατάσχῃς**, 0. P. 121 (iii/A.D.) **εἶπά σοι εἵνα δώσωσιν**. Moulton (*Prol*., pp. 177, 208) recalls the old jussive subj. as sufficient explanation of this use of ἵνα. Radermacher (*Rh. M*., LVI, 203) and Thumb (*Hellen*., p. 159) support Moulton against the Latin influence theory. Per contra see Goetzeler, *De Polybii El*., pp. 17 ff.; Kalker, *Quest*.; Viereck, *Sermo Grae-*

[1] It is found in Hom. Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 128.

cus, p. 67. Moulton scores his point and observes also that the inf. was not driven out by ἵνα in the papyri, see (ε). Cf. A. P. 135 (ii/A.D.), ἐρωτῶ σε μὴ ἀμελεῖν μου. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 155 f.) gives numerous other examples of non-final ἵνα in papyri and inscriptions. The subj. is the usual mode employed even after secondary tenses. Thus ἐβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν (Jo. 12:10). In Mk. 9:30, οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ, we have still the subj., not the opt. As already noted, ἵνα δῴη in Eph. 1:17 is an optative of wish after a primary tense. It is here also the subfinal ἵνα. Cf. Phil. 14; Col. 4:12. Moulton[1] points out how closely akin are προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε (Mk. 14:38) and ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε (Lu. 12:15). The paratactic origin of the ἵνα construction is thus well illustrated. "An innovation in Hellenistic is ἵνα c. subj. in commands, which takes the place of the classic ὅπως c. fut. indic."[2] Moulton cites a moderate number of examples of this abrupt use of ἵνα in the papyri. So F. P. 112 (99 A.D.) ἐπέχον (=ων) Ζωλίλωι καὶ εἶνα αὐτὸν μὴ δυσωπήσῃς, letter of Cicero (*Att*. 6:5) ταῦτα οὖν πρῶτον μέν, ἵνα πάντα σῴζηται· δεύτερον δέ, ἵνα μηδὲ τῶν τόκων ὀλιγωρήσῃς, B. U. 48 (ii/iii A.D.). ἵνα ὁμόσε γενώμεθα. There is a doubtful ex. of this sense of ἵνα in Soph., *Oed*. C. 155, though ὅπως was so used.[3] It appears in Arrian and Epictetus. In the modern Greek the νά clause sometimes "approaches the nature of a principal sentence" (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 198). But this elliptical imperative is undoubted in the N. T. Cf. Mk. 5:23, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς. So also Mt. 20:32; 1 Cor. 7: 29; 2 Cor. 8:7; Eph. 4:29; 5:33. With this construction compare the asyndeton without ἵνα in Mk. 10:36, τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν. As already explained (p. 430), this may be parataxis (two questions). Cf. ἵνα in Mk. 10:35 and Gal. 5:17.[4]

(β) **Ὅπως**. It is much rarer in the N. T. in these constructions. It no longer occurs with the future ind. after verbs of striving. The papyri show ὅπως occasionally in this sense also. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 208) cites B. M. 21 (ii/n.c.) ἠξίωσά σε ὅπως ἀποδοθῇ, while "ἀξιῶ c. infin. occurs in the same, papyrus." Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 141 f.) quotes *Theoph. ad Autolycum*, 2, 34 ἔστω σοι ἐρευνᾶν τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ὅπως δυνήσει, inscr. from Magn., 90, 12 (ii/B.C.) ἐφρόντισεν ὅπως—ἀποκαταστῶσιν. The few examples in the N. T. are all in the subj. Burton notes only three (Mt. 12 14; 22:15; Mk. 3:6), and all three after συμβούλιον ἔλαβον (ἐδίδουν). The clause thus thus partakes of the nature of an indirect deliberative

[1] Prol., p. 178. [2] Ib. [3] W.-M., p. 396.
[4] See art. by Jann., Expositor, ser. V, vol. IX, p. 296.

question (cf. Mk. 11:18, πῶς). They are all after secondary tenses. There are some instances in the N. T. of ὅπως after verbs of beseeching, though many verbs that in Attic had this idiom no longer have it. Thus ὅπως and the subj. occur with δέομαι. (Mt. 9:38), αἰτέομαι (Ac. 25:3), ἐρωτάω (Lu. 7:3), παρακαλέω (Mt. 8: 34), προσεύχομαι (Ac. 8:15).

(γ) **Μή, μή πως, μή ποτε**. The usual construction in the negative sub-final clauses is **ἵνα μή,** but a small list of verbs commonly have **μή** as the conjunction. This is true of verbs meaning 'to take heed,' to care for, 'fear.'[1] It is a much narrower range than the sub-final use of ἵνα. In the N. T. the subj. always occurs with **μή** except in Col. 2:8 **βλέπετε μή τις ἔσται**. Thus **βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ** (Mt. 24:4). Treg. and Tisch. read the fut. ind. in 2 Cor. 12:21, but W. H. and Nestle rightly have **ταπεινώσῃ** (cf. verse 20). The pres. subj. occurs in Heb. 12:15 **ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἐνοχλῇ**. Elsewhere we have only the aor. subj. Thus after βλέπω (Mk. 13:5); ὁράω (Mt. 18:10); σκοπέω (Gal. 6:1); **φοβέομαι**, (Ac. 27:17). In Ac. 23:10 some MSS. have **εὐλαβέομαι**, but **φοβέομαι** is correct. This construction with **φοβέομαι** is rare in the N. T. (Luke, Paul and Hebrews) and is apparently a literary touch. Cf. Ac. 27:29. In Ac. 5:26, **ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαὸν μὴ λιθασθῶσιν** (note subj. after secondary tense), there is a prolepsis of **τὸν λαόν.**[2] **Μή πως** is found after βλέπω with the aor. subj. (1 Cor. 8:9) and **φοβέομαι** (2 Cor. 11:3; 12:20). Cf. Gal. 2:2 in 6, (c),

(δ) Pure Final Clauses. If the fear is about an object in the present or past, the ind. is used. Cf. p. 1045. Thus in Lu. 11:35, **σκόπει μὴ --ἐστίν,** and in Gal. 4:11, **φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς μή πως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς**. This is in strict accord with Attic idiom.[3] The papyri show it also (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 193). So Par. P. 49 (ii/B.c.) **ἀγωνιῶ μή ποτε ἀρρωστεῖ**, N. P. 17 (iii/A.D.) **ὑφωροῦμε μὴ ἄρα ἐνθρώσκων ἔλαθεν ὕδατι**. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 141) adds examples of fut. ind., as Enoch 6:3, **φοβοῦμαι μὴ οὐ θελήσετε**; Dio Chrys., xxxiv, 44, **οὐ γὰρ ἔστι κίνδυνος, μὴ Μαλλωτῶν ἐσομένων ἀσθενέστεροι δόξετε**. The negative in such a clause is **οὐ**. Thus **φοβοῦμαι μή πως οὐχ οἵους θέλω εὕρω** (2 Cor. 12:20). This is to show contrast to Cf. Col. 2:8, **μή τις ἔσται--καὶ οὐ**. Sometimes a verb of fearing is implied, though not expressed (cf. elliptical use of ἵνα and ἵνα μή). Thus Ac. 5:39, **μή ποτε εὑρεθῆτε**. This is a possible explanation of **μή ποτε οὐ μὴ ἀρκέσῃ** (or **μή ποτε οὐκ**) in Mt. 25:9

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., pp. 88, 951f.
[2] Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 95.
[3] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 133.

(note negatives) and **μή ποτε δῴη** (2 Tim. 2:25). **Μή ποτε** is used with the aorist subj. after **προσέχω** (Lu. 21:34; Heb. 2:1), with a present subj. after **φοβέομαι** (Heb. 4:1), with a pres. opt. after **διαλογίζομαι** (Lu. 3:15, ind. question), with a fut. ind. after **βλέπω** (Heb. 3:12). These clauses are of paratactic origin.[1] This paratactic construction survives in the use of **ὅρα** with the imperative (Mt. 9:30; 24:6), but even so the clause may be dependent in actual use as in Mt. 18:10; 1 Th. 5:15. Some doubt[2] arises concerning the clauses with **βλέπω** which have a paratactic origin, but are practically dependent. Those in the third person are clearly so (Mk. 13:5; Ac. 13:40, etc.). This argues for a like usage in Lu. 21:8; Gal. 5:15; Heb. 12:25.

(δ) *The Relative Clause*. It is a classic idiom for complementary relative clauses to be used in a sub-final sense.[3] As examples of this idiom in the N. T. note **ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ** (Lu. 7:4); **οὐκ ἔχω ὃ παραθήσω** (11:6); **οὐδένα ἔχω ὅστις μεριμνήσει** (Ph. 2:20). Cf. **σχῶ τί γράψω** (Ac. 25:26) and **τὶ γράψαι οὐκ ἔχω** (ib.). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 138) quotes from Achilles Tatius, IV, 16, 3, **ἀπογεύσομαι τοσοῦτον ὅσον κἀκείνη λάβῃ.**

(ε) *The Infinitive*. With verbs of exhorting, beseeching, etc., the infinitive was the normal idiom in the ancient Greek. In the N. T. it still occurs twice as often as **ἵνα** and **ὅπως** together.[4] Some of these verbs have only the inf. in the N. T., as **αἰσχύνομαι, ἀξιόω, ἀσκέω, βούλομαι, δοκέω, ἐάω, ἐπιθυμέω, ἐπιποθέω, ἐπιτρέπω, ἐπιχειρέω, κελεύω, ὀκνέω, παραινέω, πειράω, σπουδάζω, τάσσω** and compounds, **φροντίζω, φοβέομαι** in the sense of 'to be afraid to do' (Mt. 2:22). Many of the verbs that use sub-final **ἵνα** may have the inf. also. Thus **ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι** (Mk. 1:17). So also **βουλεύομαι, αἰτέομαι, προσεύχομαι, λέγω** etc. Cf. **ἄξιος λῦσαι** (Ac. 13:25) and **ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω** (Jo. 1:27). In 2 Cor. 9:5 the inf. is used after the **ἵνα** clause to express an epexegetic or complementary purpose (**ταύτην ἑτοίμην εἶναι**), a rather common usage. Cf. in 1 Cor. 9:15 both **ἵνα** and the inf. in a broken sentence. Moulton[5] argues that in Paul the majority of cases of **τοῦ** with the inf. are epexegetic (Ro. 1:24; 7:3; 8:12; 1 Cor. 10:13) or adnominal (Ro. 15:23; 1 Cor. 9:10; 16:4; 2 Cor. 8:11; Ph. 3:21) or the ablative construction (Ro. 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:8). Certainly **τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν** in Lu. 17:1 is not purpose, nor **τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν** in Ac. 10:25. Cf. also Mt. 21:32, **τοῦ πιστεῦσαι**. Luke uses **τοῦ** and the inf. more than

[1] Moulton, Prol., pp. 185, 248.
[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 89.
[3] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 217.
[4] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 87.
[5] Prol., p. 218 f.

any other N. T. writer. The papyri show this non-final use of **τοῦ** and the inf. (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 219 f.). So B. U. 1031 (ii/A.D.) **φρόνησον τοῦ ποιῆσαι**, B. U. 164 (ii/iii A.D.) **πεῖσαι αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐλθεῖν**, B. M. 23 (ii/B.C.) **προσδεομένου μου τοῦ περιποιῆσαι**. In Lu. 18:1, **πρὸς τὸ δεῖν**, is not final. **Εἰς τό** and the inf a we find chiefly in Paul (44 examples, Moulton, *Prol*., p. 218. Mr. H. Scott makes 50 by counting the verbs instead of the preposition). The construction is always final in the other N. T. writers. But Paul has non-final uses, as in 1 Th. 2:12; 4:9.

(ζ) **Εἰ** *and* **ὅτι**. In Lu. 17:2 we have **λυσιτελεῖ εἰ ἔρριπται ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ**, where **εἰ** and **ἵνα** introduce subject-clauses. Cf. also **εἰ**= **ὅτι** in Mk. 9:42. In Lu. 19:21, **ἐφοβούμην σε ὅτι ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρὸς εἶ**, the rare use of **ὅτι** with **φοβέομαι** may be causal. It is made easier by the proleptic use of **σε**. The usual object-clause with **ὅτι** belongs to indirect discourse.

(e) Consecutive Clauses.

(a) **Ἵνα**. It is debatable whether **ἵνα** has ecbatic use in the N. T. There is in itself no reason why it should not have it, since undoubtedly it was so used in the later Greek.[1] It occurs also in modern Greek, as **εἶναι νὰ χάσῃ κανεὶς τὸ μυαλό του**, 'that is for one to lose his reason' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 197). The parallel of the Latin *ut* may have had some influence on this late Greek. The development, however, was in the vernacular, and out of the sub-final use of **ἵνα**, and the Latin influence was not needed. There is not space to follow the long debate in the grammars and commentaries on this subject. Kuhner[2] held that **ἵνα** had the ecbatic sense, but Thayer[3] boldly accepts the verdict of Fritzsche and Winer who "have clearly shown that in all the passages adduced from the N. T. to prove the usage the telic (or final) force prevails." W. F. Moulton[4] agreed with Winer as against Fritzsche in the admission of the sub-final use of **ἵνα**, but he balked at the consecutive idea. "But it does not follow that the weakened **ἵνα** is generally equivalent to **ὥστε**: this use of **ἵνα** is rather, as we can still perceive in most cases, an extension of *eo eonsilio ut*." Yes, in most cases, beyond a doubt. I once had just this feeling and stood against[5] the admission of the consecutive force of **ἵνα**. J. H. Moulton[6] confesses to a similar development of opinion on this subject. He had once[7] committed himself against the ec-

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 455.
[2] Gr., § 555, 2, Anm. 3.
[3] Lexicon, p. 304. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 114, holds to the strict use of **ἵνα**.
[4] W.-M., p. 421.
[5] Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., pp. 153, 155.
[6] Prol., p. 206.
[7] Intr. to N. T. Gr., p. 217.

batic ἵνα, but now he confesses himself "troubled with unsettling doubts." He boldly advocates[1] the freedom of commentators to interpret ἵνα as the context demands (final, sub-final, consecutive). Ellicott[2] had defended just this principle, and he is the most severely grammatical of commentators. The commentator must have grammar, but he needs the grammar of the author on whose work he is making comments. So, also Sanday and Headlam on Ro. 11:11 (**μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν**) pointedly interpret it thus: ἵνα expresses the contemplated result." They appeal to Ellicott, Lightfoot and Evans in support of this laxer use of ἵνα as against Winer and the Germans. They also (p. 143) quote Chrysostom's exposition of ἵνα in Ro. 5:20: **τὸ δὲ ἵνα ἐνταῦθα οὐκ αἰτιολαγίας πάλιν ἀλλ' ἐκβάσεώς ἐστιν**. Lightfoot admits the consecutive force of ἵνα in Gal. 5:17; 1 Th. 15:4. He is correct in both instances. See also Lu. 1:43. In Jo. 16:2, **ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα δόξῃ** it is almost temporal. It is argued that, where ἵνα seems to be used in a consecutive clause, it is the divine purpose that is to be considered. But certainly no such explanation is possible in Ro. 11:11. There is such a thing as the divine purpose and it is seen[3] in Lu. 9:45, **ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ αἴσθωνται αὐτό**. Cf. also Mt. 1:22, **ἵνα πληρωθῇ**. But surely no such purpose[4] appears in Jo. 6:7 **οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχὺ λάβῃ.** Here we have contemplated result, it is true, but it is result just the same. It is probably just out of this idiom (conceived result) that the use of ἵνα for actual result came. Burton[5] admits this conceived result as in Heb. 10:36, and seeks to explain Jo. 9:2, **τίς ἥμαρτεν—ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ**; But the effort is not successful. He denies that there is a certain, "scarcely a probable, instance in the N. T. of a clause denoting actual result conceived as such."[6] He considers[7] Rev. 13:13, **ποιεῖ σημεῖα μεγάλα, ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιῇ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν**, as the most probable instance of ἵνα denoting actual result. But there are others just as plain, if not clearer. Thus 1 Jo. 1:9, **πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῇ τὰ ἁμαρτίας**. Blass[8] places this beside **ἄδικος ἐπιλαθέσθαι** (Heb. 6:10) and thinks that the consecutive use of ἵνα grew out of the infinitive in that sense. With this Moulton[9] agrees. Cf. also Rev. 9:20, **οὐ μετενόησαν, ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν**, with **οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν**

[1] Prol., p. 209.
[2] On Epli. 1 : 17.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 210.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 228.
[5] N. T. M. and T., p. 92 f.
[6] Ib., p. 04.
[7] Ib.
[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224.
[9] Prol., p. 210.

in 16:9. Note in particular 1 Jo. 3:1, where the clause **καί ἐσμεν** accents the ecbatic force of **ἵνα**. This use is possible also in Jo. 9:36; Mk. 11:28. In Mk. 4:22, **ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ**, we have **ἵνα** (cf. **ἀλλ' ἵνα**) used like **ὥστε** and the inf. (cf. Blass, *Gr. of N. T.* Gk., p. 218). In Mk. 2:10 **ἵνα** we have real purpose. The consecutive **ἵνα** appears outside of the N. T. as in Arrian (*Diss. Epict*., II, 2, 16) **οὕτω μωρὸς ἦν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ.** Sophocles in his *Lexicon* gives a quite extensive list of passages in the **κοινή** writers where **ἵνα** has the consecutive sense. He has probably claimed too many, but some of them are real instance. Even Josephus has **ἵνα** in the sense of conceived result.[1] Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 156) cites Epictetus, IV, 3, 9, **ἐλεύθερος γάρ εἰμι καὶ φίλος τοῦ θεοῦ ἵν' ἐκὼν πείθωμαι αὐτῷ**. Several other examples occur in Epictetus. So, then, we conclude that **ἵνα** has in the N. T. all three uses (final, sub-final, consecutive), and thus runs a close parallel with the infinitive which it finally displaced.[2] Sophocles cites several examples of consecutive **ἵνα** from the LXX. One of these is certainly pertinent, Wisdom of Sol. 13:9, for **ἵνα δύνωνται** follows **τοσοῦτον** and **ἵνα** has the force of **ὥστε**.

(β) **Ὥστε**. This conjunction is merely **ὡς** and **τέ**= 'and so.' In Homer **ὡς** is both a demonstrative and a relative. Either idea may appear in **ὥστε**. It is really a comparative particle.[3] In the early writers the inf. was more common than the ind. with **ὥστε**. Thus in Euripides the inf. occurs 130 times to 20 indicatives. In Thucydides it is 144 to 82, but in Plato it is 253 to 240. The consecutive sentence began with the inf. and was extended to the finite verb.[4] In late Greek it returned to the inf. construction. Cf. Green, *Diodorus and the Peloponnesian War*, 1899, p. 21. Of the 95 instances[5] of **ὥστε** in the N. T. probably 30 do not come up for discussion under either final or consecutive clauses. The word in these examples is merely an introductory inferential particle like all. The structure is wholly paratactic. In this sense of 'therefore' the particle occurs with the ind. nineteen times. Cf. Mt. 12:12, **ὥστε ἔξεστιν**. Once the subj. appears, 1 Cor. 5: 8, **ὥστε ἑορτάζωμεν**. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 161) even quotes P. Oxy. IV, 743, 27 (ii/B.C.) **ὥστ' ἂν τοῦτο σε θέλω γινώσκειν,** and there are other instances like it. The other eleven instances have the

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 210.

[3] Cf. Gildersl., The Consec. Sent. in Gk., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1886, p. 167.

[4] Cf. Berdolt, Der Konsekutivsatz in der illtern griech. Litteratur, 1896, pp. 21-27.

[5] Mr. H. Scott makes 95 times by counting the verbs, Geden 83.

imper. (pres.). Cf. ὥστε βλεπέτω (1 Cor. 10:12). See 1 Cor. 3:21; 11:33, etc. Of the hypotactic examples 62 have the infinitive and only two the indicative. In the Attic Greek actual result was expressed by ὥστε and the indicative, while ὥστε and the inf. ('so as to') denoted a result naturally or necessarily following the preceding cause.[1] In the N. T. there are only two instances of the ind. with ὥστε (as a hypotactic conjunction). They are Jo. 3:16, **ὅτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν**, and Gal. 2:13, **καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει**. Here the actual result is distinctly accented. Blass[2] on the flimsiest grounds seeks to oust ὥστε in Jo. 3:16 by ὅτι and to put the inf. in Gal. 2:13, so as to get rid of this construction entirely in the N. T. Moulton[3] rightly shows small patience with such "summary" methods in textual criticism. The construction with the ind. is not quite obsolete in the vernacular **κοινή**, but in the LXX it is almost absent. This classic idiom stands, therefore, in the N. T., but only to make the contrast sharper. Of the 62 instances of ὥστε with the inf. in the N. T. they are nearly all consecutive, not final nor even sub-final. Even in the classical Greek the inf. with ὥστε in the sense of actual result was displacing[4] the ind. and in the vernacular it grew rapidly. Cf. **ὥστε—ἀπολελύσθαι**, B. G. U. 27 (ii/A.D.). This is a distinct encroachment on the old idiom and has a wider range than in Attic.[5] In Ac. 14:1 note **οὕτως ὥστε**. See Mt. 13:32 **ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκηνοῖν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ**, (Mk. 4:37) **ὥστε ἤδη γενίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον**, (Ac. 15:39) **ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων**. Tatian took ὥστε consecutive in Lu. 4:29 (Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 249). Consecutive ὥστε and inf. is too common in the inscriptions and papyri for Radermacher to mention (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 160). We do not have ὥστε after a comparative (ἢ ὥστε) in the N. T. There is no example of ὥστε nor of ἐφ' ᾧτε in the sense of 'on condition that.' In Gal. 2:9 ἵνα has practically that idea.

(γ) Ὡς. Thayer considers that in Heb. 3:11 and 4:3 we have the consecutive use of ὡς. It is a quotation from the LXX (Ps. 94:11) and is possible, though the simple 'as' is sufficient.[6] But

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 223 ff.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224.
[3] Prol., p. 209.
[4] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 99.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224.
[6] In Xen. Ws rather than ὥστε occurs both with the inf. and the modes. Cf. Wehmann, De ὥστε particulae usu Heroditeo Thucydideo Xenophonteo, 1891, p. 40.

(in has kept its place as a consecutive particle in the **κοινή** (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 160).

(δ) **Ὅτι**. There is no doubt about the consecutive use of OT in the later Greek.[1] We find it in the LXX, as in Ex. 3:11, **τίς εἰμι ἐγὼ ὅτι πορεύσομαι πρὸς Φαραώ**; Cf. also 2 Ki. 8:13. The instances in the N. T. are not numerous, but they are very clear. Thus Mk. 4:1, **τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑποακούει αὐτῷ**; In Mt. 8:27 note **ποταπὸς ὅτι** (cf. **οὕτως ὥστε**). See also Heb. 2:6 (Ps. 8:5); Lu. 4:36. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 160) quotes *Acta Christophori,* 68, 18, **τοιοῦτοι γάρ εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ ὑμῶν ὅτι ὑπὸ γυναικός ἐκινήθησαν**. Moulton (Prol., p. 249) gives **τί διδοῖς τοῖς ἀμνοῖς σου, ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχουσιν**; Pelagia, 20. It occurs in Theocritus 25 **μέγας—τοσοῦτον ὅτι—διέκοψα**, x, 14 **ἐς τοσοῦτον ὅτι**. C. Abbott (*Joh. Gr*., p. 534) takes **ὅτι** as consecutive in Jo. 14:22, **τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν**; Abbott finds no instance of consecutive **ὅτι** in the Egyptian papyri. The idiom is common in the late Greek. Akin to it is the modern Greek use of **ποῦ** as consecutive (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 197). The same idea is found in Jo. 7:35.

(ε) *The Relative*. This is a common classic idiom. The mode is the ind. and the negative **οὐ**.[2] In Latin the subj. is the mode with *qui*. The tense is usually the fut. ind., though the construction is rare[3] in the **κοινή**. But one may note in the N. T., Mt. 10:26 and in particular 24:2, **οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται**. See also Lu. 8:17; 1 Cor. 6:5; Ro. 8:32. In Jo. 5:7, **ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα βάλῃ**, we see **ἵνα** usurping this province of the relative. Cf. Rev. 19:15. See "Relative" under Sub-final.

(ζ) *The Infinitive*. The inf. with **ὥστε** has been discussed, but we have left the simple inf., the articular (**τοῦ**) inf., **εἰς τό** and the inf. There are apparently examples of each construction in the N. T. Thus the simple inf. of result is seen in Lu. 1:54, **ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ μνησθῆναι ἐλέους**; at any rate it is used here very freely. Blass[4] considers the infinitives in Lu. 1:72 used "quite incoherently." But in Ac. 5:3 **ψεύσασθαι** has a consecutive idea, as has **ἐπιλαθέσθαι** in Heb. 6:10. See also **ἀνοῖξαι** in Rev. 5:5 and **δοῦναι** in 16:9. Cf. Lu. 1:76, 78 f. It is probable that originally the Dative **–αι** in the inf., **δόμεναι** as opposed to **δόμεν**,

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 455; Moulton, Prol., p. 249. Cf. Compernass, § 38. See Sophocles' Lexicon.

[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 218 f.

[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 468.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224.

expressed "designed result" (Moulton, *Prol*., pp. 204, 207), but this idea shrank into the background. This idiom is found in the papyri,[1] as in 0. P. 526 (ii/A.D.), **οὐκ ἤμην ἀπαθὴς ἀλόγως σε ἀπολείπειν**. Meyer on Ro. 7:3, **τοῦ μὴ εἶναι**, argues that **τοῦ** and the inf. never expresses result, a position which I once held.[2] But the evidence is too strong to resist. See Infinitive for distinction between actual and hypothetical result. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 154) quotes *Acta Barnabae*, 10, **μὴ βιάσῃ Βαρνάβαν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι**, as consecutive. The idiom is not common in the papyri as is true of **τοῦ** and inf. (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 220). It belongs chiefly to the LXX and Byzantine writers, and Moulton puts it in "the higher stratum of education in the main." The epexegetic use occurs, as in C. P. R. 156 **ἐξουσίαν—τοῦ--θέσθαι**, 0. P. 275 **τοῦ ἀποσπασθῆναι ἐπίτειμον**. This construction (**τοῦ** and the inf.) had a very wide development in the N. T. in opposition to the encroachments of **ἵνα**. See Lu. 17:1 and Ac. 10:25, where **τοῦ** and the inf. is practically the subject of the verb (cf. original dative and locative cases). Luke has two-thirds of the examples of **τοῦ** and the inf. in the N. T. Only half of these (in Gospel and Acts) seem clearly final according to Moulton.[3] He holds that of the 13 examples in Paul none are unmistakably final, though Ro. 6:6 and Ph. 3:10 are probably so. In both instances **τοῦ** and the inf. is epexegetic of a **ἵνα** clause (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 218). In Paul 'so as to' will usually express his idea with **τοῦ** and the inf. A clear instance in Luke is seen in Ac. 7: 19, **ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατέρας τοῦ ποιεῖν**='so as to make.' Blass[4] cites a parallel from the LXX (1 Ki. 17:20), **σὺ ἐκάκωσας τοῦ θανατῶσαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς**. Other LXX instances are Gen. 3:22; 19:21; Is. 5:14. Cf. Ro. 7:3 (epex., consec., p. 1067), **τοῦ μὴ εἶναι**. It is probable in Lu. 9:51; Ac. 18:10; 20:3; 27:1; Ro. 1:24. Cf. **τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαι** and **ὅπως καταγάγῃς** in Ac. 23:20. So with **εἰς τό** and the inf. Its most natural signification is aim or purpose, but, just as with **ἵνα**, so here result is sometimes the idea. Meyer in his note on Ro. 1:20, **εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους**, insists that the meaning of **εἰς τὸ** is always purpose. In this particular instance divine purpose may be the idea, though result is the probable conception. See Sanday and Headlam *in loco*. Ellicott on 1 Th. 2:12, **εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν** (after **παρακαλοῦντες κτλ.**), admits the sub-final use of **εἰς τό** (cf. **ἵνα**) after verbs of exhorting (cf. 1 Th. 3:10), though denying the ecbatic use. But it is only a step to go on and that

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 210.
[2] Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 156.
[3] Prol., p. 217.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.

the N. T. writers took. See the epexegetic use of **εἰς τό** in 1 Th. 4 9. Winer[1] admitted the consecutive use of **εἰς τό** and the inf. as in 2 Cor. 8:6, as **εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον**, 'so that we besought Titus.' This idiom is not present in the Johannine writings, though it is very frequent in Paul's writings especially Ro. and 1 Th.) and Hebrews. Notice **ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι** (Jas. 1:19). In Heb. 11:3, **εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι**, we have a clear example of result. Note the perfect tense with notion of permanence.[2] See also **φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν** (Ro. 12:3), where purpose is impossible. Cf. Gal. 3:17. As to **πρὸς τό** and the inf. the point is not clear. Purpose is undoubtedly present as in Mt. 6:1; Eph. 6:11, and there is total absence of purpose in Lu. 18:1, **πρὸς τὸ δεῖν**. It is not certain, in spite of Blass' comment,[3] that in the N. T. **πρὸς τό** expresses result. In Mt. 5:28, **πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι**, either purpose or result is possible. W. F. Moulton[4] denies that the idiom ever conveys mere result, but admits that it may have subjective purpose as in 1 Th. 2:9. J. H. Moulton[5] holds that this is the idea in all the four examples in Paul's writings. See further 2 Th. 3:8; 2 Cor. 3:13.

7. WISHES. The use of the optative for a future wish like **ἁγιάσαι** (1 Th. 5:23), **μὴ γένοιτο** (Gal. 6:14), is not a hypotactic construction. This is pure parataxis and has already been discussed under the Optative.[6] See Optative Mode. The only hypotactic sentence for the expression of a wish in the N. T. is that with **ὀφείλω**, which comes in the late Greek to be used as a particle. Even here it is possible to regard the construction as paratactic, but note **εἰ γάρ** and **εἴθε**. It is the second aorist ind. of **ὀφείλω** without the augment. **Ὄφελον**, with the inf. occurs in Herodotus, and the form is thus probably Ionic.[7] For **κοινή** parallels see "Impossible Wishes" under Indicative Mode. Cf. **ὤφειλον συνίστασθαι** in 2 Cor. 12:11. It is found in the LXX[8] as a conjunction, as in Ex. 16:3, **ὄφελον ἀπεθάνομεν**. Cf. Num. 14:2; 20:3. Moulton[9] suggests that its application to the second and

[1] W.-M., p. 413 f.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 219.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.
[4] W.-M., p. 414 note.
[5] Prol., p. 218. See further Ogden, De infinitivi finalis vel consecutivi constructione apud priscos poetas Graecos, 1913.
See ch. on " Wishes " in my Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 157.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 201.
[8] In W.-Sch., p. 29, reference is made to **εἰ ὄφελον ἐφύλαξας** in Job 14: 13 and **εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον δυναίμην** in Job 30:24. Evidently **ὄφελον** was not felt to be sufficient alone.
[9] Prol., p. 201.

third persons is due to the meaning 'I would' rather than 'thou shouldst.' As a matter of fact its use in the N. T. is very limited, though **εἴθε** and **εἰ γάρ** are wanting as particles of wishing. For a wish about the past we have the aorist ind. So **ὄφελόν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε** (1 Cor. 4:8). Cf. Ps. 118 (119):5. For a wish about the present we have the imperfect ind. So 2 Cor. 11:1, **ὄφελον ἀνείχεσθε**, and Rev. 3:15, **ὄφελον ἦς**. The Text. Rec. here has **ὄφελον εἴης**, but it is baseless. However, we do find the fut. ind. for a future wish. So Gal. 5:12, **ὄφελον ἀποκόψονται**. Wishes as a separate idiom are vanishing in the N. T. But **ὄφελον** appears in Lucian, Athenagoras, Greg. Naz., Socrates. Cf. Sophocles' *Lexicon*. To compensate for this loss we have the strong asseverations with **οὐ μή** (Mt. 13:14), the use of **εἰ** like the Hebrew **אִם** (Mk. 8:12; Heb. 4:3), **εἰ μήν** (Heb. 6:14), the use of the participle like the Hebrew inf. absolute (Mt. 13:14). The distinction between wish and supposition with **εἰ** was sometimes hard to make in Homer.[1] The relation between wishes and conditions is not clear.

8. CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

(a) **Two Types**. No hypotactic clause is more important than this. For some reason the Greek conditional sentence has been very difficult for students to understand. In truth the doctors have disagreed themselves and the rest have not known how to go. The theory of Hermann, followed by most Germans (Winer,[2] Blass[3]), is the one that I learned from Broadus and have expounded in my *Short Grammar*.[4] It is also that of Gildersleeve.[5] This theory in brief is that there are four classes of conditions which fall into two groups or types. The two types are the determined and the undetermined. The point in "determined" is that the premise or condition is assumed to be true (or untrue). A positive statement is made in either case and the conclusion follows logically from this premise. The indicative is the one used for this type (the first and second class conditions, real and unreal, or fulfilled and unfulfilled). The other type is the undetermined condition. Naturally the indicative is not allowed here. The element of uncertainty calls for the subj. or the optative. The difference therefore between the third and fourth class conditions is just that between the subj. and the opt. They are both modes of doubtful, hesitating affirmation, but the optative

[1] Monro, Horn. Gr., p. 227. Cf. Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1909, p. 14.
[2] W.-M., pp. 363 ff.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 213 f.
[4] Pp. 161
[5] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, pp. 435 ff.

is more remote than the subj. In this type the premise is not assumed to be either true or untrue. The point is in the air and the cloud gathers round it. But there is less mist over the subj. than the opt. In broad outline this is the classification of the conditional sentences which I hold to be true. Thompson[1] is surely right in saying that no division can claim any higher right than that of convenience and intelligibility, except that I should like to add that the exposition should be in harmony with the facts of the historical development of the Greek language. There is no nobler achievement in syntax than the Greek conditional sentence before it broke down from the loss of the optative and the future indicative. In the modern Greek it is therefore a wreck, and there is corresponding obscurity between the various classes of conditions, as in English, in spite of special developments to make atonement for the loss.[2] In broad outline these four classes of conditions may be termed Reality, Unreality, Probability, Possibility. The word Probability is, however, too strong a term for the third-class condition (ἐάν and the subj.). La Roche[3] prefers "objektive Moglichkeit" for the third class and "subjektive Moglichkeit" for the fourth class (εἰ and the opt.). This is also the language of Winer,[4] "objective possibility" and "subjective possibility." Farrar[5] prefers the words Possibility, Impossibility, Slight Probability, Uncertainty. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 142) calls εἰ with ind. "objektiv," ἐάν with subj. "an sich objektiv," εἰ with opt. "subjektiv," εἰ with past tenses of ind. "Irrealitat." So it goes. Radermacher thinks also that, to understand the Greek conditions, we must distinguish sharply between the vernacular and the κοινή ("so mussen wir Scharf scheiden zwischen Volkssprache and der Koine"), a mistaken view in my judgment. It is best to use κοινή for both the vernacular and literary language. This brings us face to face with the other theory, the one adopted by Farrar. It was expounded by Goodwin[6] and has had quite a vogue in America and England.[7] This theory calls for "particular" and "general" suppositions as a fundamental element. This is a false step in itself. As

[1] Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 296.

[2] Jebb, V. and D.'s Handb., pp. 330 ff.; Thumb, Handb., p. 194 f.

[3] Beitr. zur griech. Gr., 1893, pp. 14, 18. He uses "Wirklichkeit" and "Irrealitat" (pp. 8, 28) for the others.

[4] W.-M., p. 364.

[5] Gk. Synt., p. 156 f.

[6] See Proc. of the Am. Acad., vol. VI; Jour. of Philol., V, pp. 186-205, VIII, pp. 13-38; M. and T., pp. 145 ff.

[7] Adopted by Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 296.

Gildersleeve[1] shows, each of the four classes of conditions may be particular or general. That point has no bearing on the quality of the condition. Goodwin's past general supposition, where alone a show of distinct structure is made, is a mixed condition (see later under fourth class condition): But the point on which I wish to attack Goodwin's scheme is chiefly in his definition of the first and second class conditions. That involves the third also, as will be seen. Goodwin confuses the "fact" with the "statement" of the fact. He describes the first condition thus: "When the protasis *simply states* a present or past particular supposition, implying nothing as to the fulfilment of the condition, it takes a present or past tense of the indicative with εἰ." The words to which I object, besides "particular," are "implying nothing as to the fulfilment of the condition." This condition *pointedly* implies the fulfilment of the condition. It is the condition of actuality, reality, *Wirklichkeit,* and not mere "possibility" as Farrar has it (see above) *a la* Goodwin. This is the *crux* of the whole matter. Once see that the first class condition with the ind. implies the reality of the premise, all else follows naturally. In the discussion of the second class condition Goodwin[2] properly says: "When the protasis states a present or past supposition, implying that the condition *is not* or *was not* fulfilled, etc." This is the condition of *unreality* as the other is that of *reality* and the indicative is, of course, used with both. Hence the subj. and the opt. conditions fall apart to themselves as undetermined. The point about all the four classes to note is that the form of the condition has to do only with the *statement*, not with the absolute truth or certainty of the matter. Examples will be given directly to show that the second class condition is sometimes used where the fact is just the opposite. The same thing is true of the first class condition. We must distinguish always therefore between the fact and the *statement* of the fact. The conditional sentence deals only with the statement. This point is clearly seen in Kuhner-Gerth, II, p. 465, except that the third class is lost sight of and merged with the first. Burton[3] follows Goodwin through all his

[1] Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, pp. 435 ff. Gildersl. still objects to the distinction of "particular" and "general" suppositions which Goodwin brought into fashion. That merely depends on the character of the apodosis. Cf. Am. Jour. of Philol., 1909, p. 10. [2] M. and T., p. 147.

[3] N. T. M. and T., pp. 100 ff. Farnell (Gk. Conditional and Rel. Sent., 1892) also follows Goodwin, as does R. H. Smith (The Theory of Cond. Sent. in Gk. and Lat., 1894).

ramifications. A word further is demanded by way of warning. One must not try to explain the Greek condition by the English or German translation. The English is often hopelessly ambiguous, while the Greek is perspicuous if one will only give it a chance to speak for itself. The true explanation is only possible by the approach from the Greek standpoint. And that is by the mode, not by εἰ or ἐάν. Ἐάν is nothing but εἰ ἄν. The ἄν is not essential to either protasis or apodosis. Homer[1] used εἰ with the subj. with or without κέ or ἄν. The Attic Greek[2] sometimes has εἰ ἄν with the opt. and Demosthenes used εἰ ἄν with the past ind. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 127) quotes Joh. Philop. *De aeternitate* 430, 28 (iii/A.D.) εἰ—ἠδύνατο ἄν. He gives also (p. 163) κἂν — βοηθοίη, Diod. XI, 37, 3; ἐὰν μὴ— ῥύσαιτο, Diod. I, 77, 3. The modern Greek uses ἄν (for ἐάν) with any tense of the ind. (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 194). There is no principle involved in ἄν, simply custom. In modern Greek the subj. is used, of course, more freely since the fut. ind. and the opt. have vanished.[3] Jolly holds that the ind. was a later development with conditional sentences in Greek and that the first attempt was made with the subj. and the opt. He thinks that the use of the ind. was the result of a clearer conception of the logical possibilities of the conditional clause. The subj. was more common in the Zend and the Sanskrit (and Latin) than in the Greek.[4] Here as always ἄν is difficult to explain. "Now it has a definite reference, now it is indefinite. Sometimes the reference is supplied by the context, sometimes by the opposite."[5] See The Use of ἄν in Relative Sentences in this chapter. We shall first examine the standard forms of the conditional sentence and then note the variations and modifications.

(b) **Four Classes.**

(a) *Determined as Fulfilled.* This class of condition assumes the condition to be a reality and the conclusion follows logically and naturally from that assumption. Gildersleeve (*Am. Jour. of Philol.*, 1882, p. 435) observes that this is the favourite condition: "It is the favourite condition when one wishes to be or seem fair, the favourite condition when one is sure of the premiss." The construction is εἰ (sometimes ἐάν)[6] and any tense of the in-

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 210 f. [2] Baumlein, Unters., pp. 352ff.
[3] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 463; Thumb, Handb., p. 194 f.
[4] Cf. Jolly, Ein Kapitel vergl. Synt., 1872, p. 122 f.
[5] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, p. 449.
[6] The origin of εἰ is uncertain. Εἰ is the same as al in Homer (and Doric).

dicative in the protasis. The apodosis varies very greatly. It all depends on what one is after, whether mere statement, prediction, command, prohibition, suggestion, question. Hence the apodosis may be in the indicative (any tense) or the subjunctive or the imperative. There is no necessary correspondence in tense between protasis and apodosis. The variation in the mode of the apodosis has no essential bearing on the force of the condition. This condition, therefore, taken at its face value, assumes the condition to be true. The context or other light must determine the actual situation. The apodosis is the principal clause, but since the protasis is the premise, the protasis usually precedes the apodosis. The apodosis may be declarative or interrogatory, positive or negative. This condition is so frequent in the N. T. that no exhaustive list can be given, but representative examples must suffice. Thus in Mt. 12:27, **εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεεζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν**; This is a good example (cf. also Gal. 5:11) to begin with, since the assumption is untrue in fact, though assumed to be true by Jesus for the sake of argument. The question is a *reductio ad absurdum.* In verse 26, **εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τὸν Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη**, there is the additional point of change of tense in the apodosis. He was already divided against himself, in that case, before he casts himself out. But the tense may be merely due to a quick change of view-point as accomplished (timeless aorist in reality). This point comes out well in verse 28, **εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία**. Note ἄρα with the aorist. For the past ind. in both clauses see Ac. 11:17 (**εἰ ἔδωκεν, τίς ἤμην**); 1 Cor. 15:2; Rev. 20:15 (**εἴ τις οὐχ εὑρέθη, ἐβλήθη**). For the present ind. in both clauses note Mt. 19:10 (**εἰ οὕτως ἐστίν — οὐ συμφέρει**); Ro. 8:9; Jo. 15:18; 1 Cor. 15:12. The presence of the perfect in protasis (15:14, 17, 19) or apodosis (15:13, 16) does not vary the point. In 2 Cor. 2:5, the perfect is followed by the perfect. The fut. ind. may, though rarely in the N. T., occur in both clauses, as in Mt. 26:33 (**εἰ σκανδαλισθήσονται, σκανδαλισθήσομαι**). Cf. Mk. 14:29; Lu. 19:40; 1 Cor. 3:15; 2 Tim. 2:12; 1 Cor. 3:14 f. But such little niceties cut no figure in this construction. There is perfect liberty to mix the tenses *ad libitum*. So past and present (Lu. 19:8 f.; 11:18; 2 Cor. 7:8, 14; Ro.

Lange (Der horn. Gebr. der Partikel **Εἰ**) makes it exclamatory. But Hale (The Orig. of Subj. and Opt. Cond. in Gk., Harv. Stu. in Class. Philol., 1901) treats it as a demonstrative in the locative case, meaning 'in that case.' This is more probable.

4:2; 15:27; 1 Jo. 4:11), past and future (Jo. 3:12; 15:20; Lu. 16:11), present and future (Mt. 17:4; Jo. 5:47; 11:12; Ac. 5:39; 19:39; Ro. 8:11). In 1 Cor. 9:11 **εἰ ἐσπείραμεν** and **εἰ θερίσομεν** occur side by side. Examples of the imperative in the apodosis occur as in Mk. 4:23 **εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω**. Cf. Mt. 5:29; 8:31; Lu. 4:3; Ac. 16:15; Jo. 7:4; 18:23. In Lu. 4:3, **εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰπέ**, we have a good example of the first class condition. The devil would not, of course, use the second class (assumed to be untrue), for that would be an affront to Christ. The third and fourth classes would throw doubt on the point. The temptation, to have force, must be assumed as true. The devil knew it to be true. He accepts that fact as a working hypothesis in the temptation. He is anxious to get Jesus to prove it, as if it needed proof for Christ's own satisfaction and for his reception. If the devil used Aramaic, then we have Christ's own translation of it or that of the Evangelist. In Jo. 18:23 (**εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα, μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ**), however, the assumption is not a fact, though Christ treats it as such for argument's sake. Cf. Lu. 23:35, 37. In Jo. 20:15 note the aorist ind. (**εἰ ἐβάστασς**) and the imper. (**εἰπέ**). Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 215) takes **εἰ θέλεις** in the late **κοινή** to be like the French *s'il vous plait.* Cf. Mt. 17:4. For the subj. in the apodosis note Gal. 5:25, **εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν**. The use of **ἐάν** with the ind. is rather more frequent in the late **κοιή**. Finally **εἰ** came to be "a mere literary alternative."[1] In the **κοινή** in Pisidia and Phrygia **ἐάν** occurs with the aorist ind., the pres. ind. and the future ind. as well as with the subj.[2] The papyri examples are unmistakable, as **ἐὰν δεῖ** in Tb. P. 58 (ii/B.C.), **ἐὰν οἶδεν** B. U. 546 (Byz.), **ἐὰν φαίνεται**, A. P. 93 (ii/A.D.), **ἐὰν δ' εἰσίν** 0. P. (ii/A.D.), **ἐὰν κελεύεις** 0. P. 1150, 2 f. (vi/A.D.), **ἐὰν μαχοῦσιν** Par. P. 18, **ἐάνπερ ἐκπληρώσουσιν** Par. P. 62 (ii/B.c.).[3] Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, pp. 83, 163) cites others from the papyri and inscriptions. So Heberdey-Wilhelm, *Reisen*, p. 137, **ἐὰν δέ τις θήσει;** Eum. Hippiatr., p. 244, 30, **ἐάνπερ ἐνόρχης ἐστίν**. Perhaps examples like **ἐὰν ἦν** are not to be counted as instances, since **ἦν** for **ᾖ** is sometimes subj.[4] In general, the difference between **εἰ** and **ἐάν** is considerably lessened in the **κοινή**, though it must be

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 420.

[2] Compernass, De Sermone, p. 35 f. [3] Moulton, Prol., p. 168.

[4] Ib., pp. 49, 168, 187; Cl. Rev., XVIII, p. 108. For the usage of the LXX see Sterenberg, The Use of Cond. Sent. in the Alex. Version of the Pentateuch, 1908.

remembered that ἐάν was never confined to the subj. nor εἰ to the ind. and opt. Ἐὰν ἦσθα occurs in Job 22:3, and Moulton[1] quotes it from Hb. P. 78 (iii/B.c.) as "certainly subj." Cf. also ἐὰν ἦσαν Tb. P. 333 (iii/A.D.), and a number of undoubted examples of ἐάν with past, present and future tenses of the ind. from κοινή writers are given in Sophocles' *Lexicon* under ἐάν. Thayer calls it "a somewhat negligent use, met with from the time of Aristotle on." It was just a normal development in the κοινή till in the modern Greek ἄν, is used indifferently with either ind. or subj. So ἂν τό ʼκανες, 'if you did so,' ἂν διψάσῃς, 'if you thirst' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 194 f.). Theophylact in his Proem to Luke has ἐὰν μὴ ἐθάρρει, In the N. T. we note ἐὰν οἴδαμεν (1 Jo. 5:15); ἐὰν στήκετε (1 Th. 3:8), where the distinction is clear between the two modes (ind. and subj.). In 1 Th. 3:8 אD have στήκητε, but in Lu. 6:34 there is considerable support for ἐὰν δανείζετε, as there is for ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκομεν in Ro. 14: 8. In Gal. 1:8 a few MSS. read ἐὰν εὐαγγελίζεται. It is possible to treat ἐὰν μαρτυρῶ as pres. ind., Jo. 5: 31; 8:14. There is undue scepticism on Blass' part[2] concerning ἐάν and the fut. ind. It is true that the MSS. are generally divided, but there is no real room for doubt about following אBCE in Ac. 8:31, ἐὰν ὁδηγήσει, except for possible itacism with –η. That is possible also in Rev. 2:5 where W. H. read ἐὰν μετανοήσῃς. But there is no room for itacism in Mt. 18:19 ἐὰν συμφωνήσουσιν, supported by אBDELΔ 33, although rejected by W. H. and Nestle (FGKM have –ωσιν), nor in Lu. 19:40 ἐὰν σιωπήσουσιν, nor in Rev. 2:22 ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσουσιν. In Mt. 18:19 the editors seem unwilling to follow the MS. evidence for the fut. ind. It is mere tradition to feel that ἐάν has to have the subj. Besides, we have ἐὰν ἔσῃ and ἐὰν μηκέτι προσθήσω Hermas, *Mand*. V, 1. 2 and *Mand*. IV, 3. 7. In Lev. 22:9 we find ἐὰν βεβηλώσουσιν. There is at any rate no great difference in the resultant sense between the fut. ind. and the aor. subj. and it was a very natural development. Cf. Homer's use of κέ with both. But, when all is said, as a matter of fact, in the N. T. as in the κοινή generally, the rule is for εἰ to appear with the incl. and ἐάν with the subj. In 1 Cor. 7:5 we have εἰ μήτι ἄν (bracketed by W. H.) without a verb. It is matched by the papyri.[3] Thus B. U. 326 εἴ τι ἐὰν — καταλίπω, 0. P. 105 (ii/A.D.) εἴ τι ἄλλο αἰὰν (ἔ)χω, B. M. 233 (iv/A.D.) εἴ τι ἂν—ἀναλώσῃς, Tb. P. 28 (ii/B.C.) εἰ κἂν δύναται. In these the modal ἄν (ἐάν) is separated from εἰ and used as if with ὅς, ὅπου. Rader-

[1] Prol., p. 168.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 215.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 169.

macher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 162) cites also Joh. Philop., *De aetern*., p. 85, 19, **εἰ οὐκ ἂν –ὑπάρχῃ**. Deissman[1] sees no analysis of **ἐὰν μή τι** in this, though Moulton contends for this explanation. The use of **εἰ περίκειται** in Mk. 9:42 in the sense of **ὅτι** Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk*., p. 215) calls "quite incorrect." He means it is not "classic." Note the irony in 1 Cor. 14:38, **εἴ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοείται**.

The negative of the protasis in the first class condition is practically always **οὐ** in the N. T. We have **εἰ οὐ** as a rule, not **εἰ μή**. In the classic Greek the rule was to use **εἰ μή**, and **εἰ οὐ** appeared only where the **οὐ** coalesced with a single word (the verb generally) or for sharp antithesis or emphasis.[2] But in the N. T., as in the **κοινή** generally and occasionally in the Attic,[3] we meet **εἰ οὐ** in the condition of the first class. Jannaris[4] notes 34 examples of **εἰ οὐ** in the N. T., but Moulton[5] finds only 31 of this class of condition. There are only two in the second, so that there is a slight discrepancy. In truth **εἰ μή** occurs only five times with the simple logical condition, and the examples are not quite normal except the one in Mk. 6:5, **οὐκ ἐδύνατο εἰ μὴ ἐθεράπευσεν** (a simple past condition), and in 1 Tim. 6:3, **εἴ τις—μὴ προσέρχεται**. (Blass calls this an "abnormal" instance from the literary style and unlike the N. T. idiom). But see 1 Cor. 15:2 **ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε**, 2 Cor. 13:5 **εἰ μήτι ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε,** Gal. 1:7 **εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν**. Elsewhere the negative is **οὐ**. This is in harmony with the meaning of **οὐ** and the ind. mode. The definite negative goes with the definite mode. This is the condition of supposed reality and **εἰ οὐ** is the natural combination. In general Blass[6] is correct in saying that **οὐ** is the negative of the ind. and of the other modes including the inf. and part. This, of course, was not the Attic standard, but that was hopelessly gone even for the Atticists.[7] In the modern Greek δέν, (from **οὐδέν**) supplants **οὐ** with the ind. and **μή(ν)** goes with the subj. That is the goal, as Moulton observes,[8] which is not yet reached in the N. T., for **μή** occurs in questions of doubt with the ind. and **εἰ μή** still holds on. Even in the modern Greek, Thumb (*Handb*., p. 195) gives δέν, with subj. or ind. in conditions as ἂ δὲν πιστεύῃς and ἂ δὲν πήγαινα. Rader-

[1] B. S., p. 204.
[2] W.-Th., p. 477.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 429.
[4] Ib.
[5] Prol., T.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 170. Cf. Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1880, first copy.
[8] Prol., p. 170. Cf. P. Thouvenin, Les Negations dans le Nouveau Testament, Revue de Philol., 1894, p. 229,

macher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 172) cites Pap. Wess. xxvi, **εἰ οὐ δίδοταί**. But the point to get clear is that in the first class condition the normal negative in the **κοινή** is **εἰ οὐ**. Moulton counts the idiom 6 times in Luke, 3 in John, 16 in Paul, 2 in James, and one each in Matthew, Hebrews, 2 Peter and Revelation. As examples take Lu. 18:4 **εἰ καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐντρέπομαι** and Jo. 1:25 **εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστός**. In the latter case the negative is very emphatic. So in Jo. 5:47 **εἰ οὐ πιστεύετε**. Cf. further Lu. 12:26; 16:11, 31; Jo. 3:12; Ro. 11:21; 1 Cor. 15:13, 15-17; 2 Th. 3:10. Sometimes **οὐ** practically coalesces with the verb, as in Lu. 14:26; 1 Cor. 7:9; 11:6; 16:22; 1 Tim. 5:8; Rev. 20:15. The notion of contrast is seen in Jo. 10:37 **εἰ οὐ ποιῶ, εἰ δὲ ποιῶ.** Note also **κἂν μὴ πιστεύητε**. So in 5:46 **εἰ πιστεύετε, εἰ δὲ--οὐ πιστεύετε**. See further Lu. 11:8; Jas. 2:11; 2 Pet. 2:4. In Mt. 26:42 note **εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ πίω**. In Ro. 11:21, **εἰ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται**, it is hardly possible to translate **εἰ οὐ** by 'unless.' The same thing is true in 1 Cor. 9:2 and 15:29. Cf. **ἐὰν μή** in 9:16.

(β) *Determined as Unfulfilled*. In this somewhat difficult condition only past tenses of the ind. occur. The premise is assumed to be contrary to fact. The thing in itself may be true, but it is *treated* as untrue. Here again the condition has only to do with the *statement*, not with the actual fact. A good illustration is found in Lu. 7:39 **οὗτος εἰ ἦν ὁ προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν.** The Pharisee here assumes that Jesus is not a prophet because he allowed the sinful woman to wash his feet. Jesus is therefore bound to be ignorant of her true character. The form of the condition reveals the state of mind of the Pharisee, not the truth about Jesus' nature and powers. As a matter of fact it is the Pharisee who is ignorant. For this reason I cannot agree with Moulton's statement[1] that the ind. is not suited to the expression of contingencies, wishes, commands or other subjective conceptions. On p. 201 Moulton recovers himself by saying that "these sentences of unfulfilled condition state nothing necessarily unreal in their apodosis," and "the sentence itself only makes it untrue under the circumstances." I should add " as conceived by the speaker or writer." Surely the ind. is the mode for positive and negative statements, for directness of statement and clarity of expression. But one must emphasize the words "statement" and "expression." The ind. does not go behind the face value of the record. Most untruths are told in the ind. mode. The

[1] Prol., p. 199. Goodwin, M. and T. (p. 147), sees clearly on this point.

statement of unreality here from the standpoint of the speaker or writer, is as clear cut and positive as that of reality in the first class condition. The term "unreal" as applied to this use of the ind. properly belongs only to the standpoint of the user. To him the case is impossible and he makes a positive statement to that effect with the ind. By the ind. mode the condition is determined. Whether it is fulfilled or unfulfilled is a more difficult matter. This idea has to be conveyed by suggestion. It is not a question of positive or negative, but of definite assumption of unreality. The "unreality" does not come from the ind. That in its origin is a matter wholly of the context. Take Mk. 6:5, for instance, **οὐκ ἐδύνατο εἰ μὴ ἐθεράπευσεν**. In the abstract it is not possible to tell which class of condition we have here. Its is either first or second, we know. If the writer is talking about the present time in terms of past time, then it is a second class condition determined as unfulfilled. The Greek fell upon the use of the past tenses of the ind. as a device to help in this matter. An unfulfilled condition about present time was expressed in terms of the imperfect ind. An unfulfilled condition about past time was expressed in terms of the aorist or the past perfect ind. There is the analogy of wishes to justify it, if, indeed, wishes did not come out of this construction (**εἴθε, εἰ γάρ**). The origin of this precise point is obscure.[1] In the context one must seek for light and help. In Mk. 6:5 (**οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν**) it is clear that a definite past event is chronicled. So it is a condition of the first class, determined as fulfilled. But in Jo. 15:22 (and 24) **εἰ μὴ ἦλθον καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχοσαν**, how is it? Is it a simple historical narrative about a past situation? Is it a hypothesis about the present time in terms of past time to suggest its unreality? Fortunately here the context shows. The very next words are **νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν** (Cf. also **νῦν δέ** in verse 24). The contrast with the present and actual situation is made in plain terms. In Jo. 9:41 we have **νῦν δέ** even after **ἄν**. This is not always clone in the context and one is either left to his wits or **ἄν** is added to the apodosis. In verse 19 of John 15 we have **εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει**. "The addition of **ἄν** to an indicative hypothesis produced much the same effect as we can express in writing by italicising 'if' "[2] or by add-

[1] Cf. Wilhelmus, De Modo Irreali qui Vocatur, 1881, p. 3. Mod. Gk. no longer has this idiom. It uses **ἄν** with the past ind. and **θά** in the apodosis for **ἄν**.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 200.

ing to the apodosis 'in that case.' This is the definite use of ἄν. But it is a mistake to say, as some writers[1] do, that ἄν in the apodosis is essential to the second class condition. Even Moulton[2] says: "The dropping of ἄν in the apodosis of unfulfilled conditions was classical with phrases like ἔδει, ἐχρῆν, καλὸν ἦν." The absence was so undoubtedly, but was ἄν ever really necessary with these verbs? When ἄν was used with them, there was a slight change of meaning. The N. T. is in perfect accord with ancient idiom when it has καλὸν ἦν εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη (Mt. 26:24); ἐδύνατο εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο (Ac. 26:32); εἰ μὴ ἦν, οὐκ ἐδύνατο (Jo. 9:33), not to mention the apodosis alone in Mt. 25:27; Lu. 19:23; Ac. 22:22; 27: 21; 2 Cor. 2:2 ; 12:11; 2 Pet. 2:21. In Ac. 24:19, as οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς ἐμέ it is a mixed cond. (protasis in fourth class) and the apodosis is itself a relative clause. But the idiom goes further than these verbs of propriety and possibility and obligation, as is seen in Gal. 4:15, εἰ δυνατόν, ἐδώκατέ μοι; Jo. 15:22, 24; 19:11, οὐκ εἴχεις, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον Ro. 7:7, οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου and οὐκ ᾔδειν εἰ μὴ ἔλεγεν. In 1 Cor. 5:10, ἐπεὶ ὠφείλετε, we have the apodosis of this condition. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 200 note) cites 0. P. 526 (ii/A.D.) εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀνέβενε ἐγὼ οὐ παρέβενον; 0. P (ii /A.D.) εἰ—παρέκειτο, ἀπεστάλκειν Rein. P. 7 (ii/B.C.) οὐκ ἀπέστηι, εἰ μὴ ἠνάγκασε. But in most cases the ἄν regularly appears in the apodosis, though not as the first word. Thus εἰ ἐγενοντο, πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν (Mt. 11:21). In Ac. 18:14 f. we have the second and first class conditions side by side, εἰ μὲν ἦν ἀδίκημά τι ἢ ῥᾳδιούργημα πονηρόν, ὦ Ἰουδαῖοι, κατὰ λόγον ἂν ἀνεσχόμην ὑμῶν, εἰ δὲ ζητήματά ἐστιν περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ὄψεσθε αυτοί. Here Gallio neatly justifies his own impatience by the first condition (second class) and shows his own opinion by the second condition (first class). Sometimes ἄν is repeated with two verbs as in εἰ ᾔδει, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴασεν (Mt. 24:43), but it is not repeated in the parallel passage in Lu. 12:39 εἰ ᾔδει, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν, though W. H. have one verb in the margin. Ἄν is repeated also in Jo. 4:10.

The simplest form of this condition is when the imperfect occurs in both clauses or the aorist in both. In the former case present time is generally meant, as in Lu. 7:39 εἰ ἦν, ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν , Jo. 5:46 εἰ επιστεύετε, ἐπιστεύετε ἄν. So also Jo. 8:42; 9:41; 15:19;

[1] Bamberg, Hauptregeln der griech. Synt., 1890, p. 45.; Conditional Clauses in Gk., p. 2, Anonymous Pamphlet in Bodleian Library.

[2] Prol., p. 200.

18:36; 1 Cor. 11:31; Gal. 1:10; Heb. 8:4, 7.[1] In Jo. 8:19, **εἰ ᾔδειτε--ἂν ᾔδειτε**, we have the same construction, for this past perfect has the sense of the imperfect. In Heb. 11:15, **εἰ ἐμνημόνευον—εἶχον ἄν**, however, the reference is to past time as the context makes clear. It is descriptive of an unreal hypothesis in the.past of a continuous nature. 'If they had *kept on* remembering, 'they would have kept on having.' This is a classical idiom, though uncommon. Another example is seen in Mt. 23:30, **εἰ ἤμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τ�ων πατέρων ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἂν ἤμεθα**. Only the context can help one tell the kind of condition in 1 Cor. 12:19 and Heb. 7:11, for the apodosis appears in the form of a question without **ἄν** and the verb. The other normal condition of this class is where the aorist ind. occurs in both clauses, as in Mt. 11: 21 **εἰ ἐγένοντο, πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν**, Mk. 13:20 **εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη**. This refers to past time. Cf. Mt. 25:27; 1 Cor. 2: 8; Jo. 14:2; Heb. 10:2 (only apodosis). Sometimes one tense occurs in one clause, another in the other. The standpoint is shifted. Thus in Jo. 14:28 **εἰ ἠγαπᾶτε, ἐχάρητε ἄν**, Gal. 3:21 **εἰ ἐδόθη, ἂν ἦν**, Heb. 4:8 **εἰ κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐλάλει**. Cf. also Jo. 15:22, 24. It is not always certain that the present reference of **ἦν** can be insisted on, since there was no separate aorist form of **εἰμί**. Sometimes **ἦν** is aorist. So as to Jo. 11:21, 32, **εἰ ἦς, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν**. But the point of difference is certainly made in Jo. 18: 30, **εἰ μὴ ἦν ποιῶν, οὐκ ἂν παρεδώκαμεν**. Cf. Ac. 18:14; Mt. 26:24. In Jo. 4:10, **εἰ ᾔδεις, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας**, we have the same thing. Cf. also Mt. 24:43. In Ac. 18:14 note in the next verse **εἰ δέ ἐστιν, ὄψεσθε** (first class). In 1 Jo. 2:19 we have the past perfect in the apodosis **εἰ ἦσαν, μεμενήκεισαν ἄν** the solitary example.[2] But the past perfect occurs in the protasis as in Ac. 26:32, **ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο, ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο Καίσαρα**. Cf. also **εἰ ἐγνώκειτε, οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε** (Mt. 12:7), though Westcott[3] takes this as a "real imperfect" like **ᾔδειν** above. The periphrastic past perfect we find in Jo. 19:11 **οὐκ εἶχες, εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον**. Moulton[4] has given a list of the times that **ἄν** appears in the apodosis in the N. T. with the ind. imperf. (17 times), the ind. aor. (24) and the past perfect (1). In Lu. 17: 6 we have the pres. ind. and the imperf. combined, **εἰ ἔχετε, ἐλέγετε ἄν**. This is really a mixed condition (first and second classes). Cf. Jo. 8:39, **εἰ**

[1] Cf. Westcott on Heb., pp. 111 ff., for an excellent summary of the second class conditions.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 201.

[3] On Heb., p. 113.

[4] Prol., p. 166.

ἐστέ, ἐποιεῖτε (the margin of W. H.). Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 163) quotes P. Oxy. IV, 729 (137 A.D.) ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐκώλυσεν Ζεύς ἔζησεν ἄν, where note ἐάν with aorist ind. like the modern Greek ἂν τὸ ἤξευρα (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 195).

The negative of the second class condition is in the N. T. always μή except twice, Mt. 26:24 (Mk. 14:21) καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη. Here the οὐ is very emphatic. Elsewhere we have εἰ μή as in Mt. 24:22 (note μή in protasis, οὐ in apodosis); Jo. 9:33; 15:22, 24; 18:30; 19:11; Ac. 26:32; Ro. 7:7. In itself εἰ μή is three times as common in the N. T. as εἰ οὐ, but outside of the five examples of εἰ μή in the first class conditions above and one in the third class (Lu. 9:13) εἰ μή is confined to the second class condition and to the elliptical use like πλήν in the sense of 'except' or the phrase εἰ δὲ μή meaning 'otherwise' without a verb (cf. εἰ μή thus in Mt. 12:4; Lu. 4:26; εἰ δὲ μή in Jo. 14:11).[1] See a bit later on this point. As already noted, modern Greek uses ἂν δέν in this condition (Thumb, *Handb.*, p. 195).

(γ) *Undetermined, but with Prospect of Determination.* This class uses in the condition clause the mode of expectation (*Erwartung*), the subj. It is not determined as is true of the first and second class conditions. But the subj. mode brings the expectation within the horizon of a lively hope in spite of the cloud of hovering doubt. W. G. Hale[2] considers that the subj. in this condition is due "to a fusion of volitive subj. and the anticipatory subj." Monro[3] thinks it is the quasi-imperative sense (volitive subj.). He argues that the use of μή with the subj. (cf. prohibitions) proves this. But Moulton[4] replies that "the negative μή, originally excluded from this division of the subjunctive, has trespassed here from the earliest times." So he urges that the subj. with ἐάν (as with ὅταν) is the futuristic, not the volitive, use. The futuristic subj. in Homer may have οὐ, but usually μή with the subj. in conditions, and yet some cases of εἰ οὐ with the subj. occur in Homer when a coalesces with the verb as εἰ οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν, *Iliad* 3. 289, εἰ οὐκ εἰῶσιν, 20. 139. In Jer. 6:8 we still have ἥτις οὐ κατοικισθῇ in B. The truth probably is that in some instances this subj. is futuristic, in others volitive or deliberative. The point is a fine one as one can readily see. Gildersleeve[5] finds the

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 254; Moulton, Prol., p. 171.

[2] The Origin of Subj. and Opt. Conditions in Gk. and Lat., Harv. Stu. in Class. Philol., 1901, p. 115.

[3] Hom. Gr., p. 230. Stahl, Ciriech. histor. Synt., p. 390, makes it futuristic.

[4] Prol., p. 185. [5] AM. Jour. of Philol., 1909, p. 11.

prevalence of the subj. in conditional (as in temporal) clauses due to the-greater exactness of the subj. here. It enables one, since it has a "tendency to realization" (*Tendenz zur Wirklichkeit*),[1] to make a difference between the indicative and the optative conditions, though it has more affinity with the optative, except in the case of some future indicative conditions which come very close to the subj. idea. The kinship in origin and sense[2] of the aorist subj. and fut. ind. makes the line a rather fine one between **εἰ** and the fut. ind. and **ἐάν** and the subj. indeed, as we sometimes have **ἐαν** and the fut. ind. in the first class condition, so we occasionally meet **εἰ** and the subj. in the third class condition. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 162) notes **εἰ** and subj. at first as a "vulgarism," but surely the classic usage answers that. The inscriptions have usually only **ἐάν** and aorist subj. he finds. But he finds also abundant instances of **εἰ** and subj. in **κοινή** and late writers. So Epictetus, II, 18, 11 **εἰ μή τις ἐξαλείψῃ**, Vettins, 274, 11 **ἐι δέ τις λογίσηται**, Hippiatr., 177, 2 **εἰ προσσχῇς**, Demetrius, *De eloc*. 21, 11 **εἰ γένηται**, Pausanias, II, 35, 3 **εἰ — ὑδρεύωνται**. So in Lu. 9:13 **εἰ μήτι ἀγοράσωμεν**, 1 Cor. 14:5 **ἐκτὸς εἰ μή δειρμηνεύῃ** Ph. 3:12 **εἰ καταλάβω** (possibly also **εἴ πως καταντήσω** in verse 11), Rev. 11:5 **εἴ τις θελήσῃ** (text of W. H., but margin **θέλει** or **θελήσει**). In Ro. 11:14, **εἴ πως παραζηλώσω καὶ σώσω**, we may also have the aorist subj. In 1 Th. 5:10 we have **εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν εἴτε καθεύδωμεν**. It is in the midst of a final sentence with **ἵνα**. In 1 Cor. 9:11 some MSS. read **εἰ θερίσωμεν**. This construction occurs occasionally in classical Greek. It was frequent in Homer and in the Attic poets, but is rare in our normalized texts of Attic prose, though a few examples occur in Time., Plato, Xenophon.[3] This "laxity" increased till finally **εἰ**, like **ὅτε**, vanishes before **ἐάν** (**ἄν**) which is used indiscriminately with ind. or subj., while **εἰ** is a mere "literary alternative." In modern Greek **ἄν** has driven **εἰ** out of the vernacular. In Deut. 8:5 AF have **εἴ τις παιδεύσῃ**. Cf. Judg. 11:9. Moulton[4] finds the same construction in the papyri as does Deissmann,[5]

[1] Griech. Modi, p. 177.

[2] Gildersl. (Am. Jour. of XXXIII, 4, p. 490) complains that in Germany no standing is given to his distinction between the "minatory and monitary" use of **εἰ** with the. future indicative. He first promulgated it in 1876.

[3] Jann., Mist. Gk. Gr., pp. 420, 464.

[4] Prol., p. 187. Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 167.

[5] B. S., p. 118.

though it is rare in the early papyri.[1] Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 187) cites 0. P. 496 (ii/A.D.) εἰ δὲ ἦν (=ᾖ), though he[2] seems curiously unwilling to admit the examples in the N. T. As to ἐκτὸς εἰ μή in 1 Cor. 15:2, we have the ind. with this combination. Deissmann (*B. S.*, p. 118) cites inscr. ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἐὰν--θελήσῃ. It is true that in the N. T as a rule εἰ goes with the ind. and ἐάν with the subj. It is mainly in the future conditions that the line is breaking down. In Mt. 12:29 we have ἐὰν μὴ δήσῃ and then διαρπάσει, but W. H. break the sentence into two. Besides the normal ἐάν and the occasional εἰ in this condition we have also ἄν (shortened form of ἐάν, not the modal ἄν). Thus Jo. 12: 32 ἂν ὑψωθῶ, 13:20 ἂν τινα πέμψω, 16:23 ἄν τι αἰτήσητε. It occurs in the N. T. only six times (cf. ἂν μή in Jo. 5:19) and all in John. Cf. Ac. 9:2 א. But note Lu. 12:38, κἂν—κἂν ἔλθῃ καὶ εὕρῃ (contraction of καὶ + ἐάν). Cf. Mt. 21:21; Lu. 13:9. It is absent from the Attic inscriptions, but supplants ἐάν in modern Greek. It is not clear why ἐάν disappeared thus in odern Greek. The Ionic form is ἤν.[3] The future conditions are na urally the most frequent of all.

Just as the second class condition was debarred from the future, so the third class condition is confined to the future (from the standpoint of the speaker or writer). The first class condition covers past, present and future. In I Cor. 10:27 note εἴ τις καλεῖ and ἐάν τις εἴπη. In Ac. 5:38, ἐὰν ᾖ and εἰ—ἐστίν, a real distinction is preserved. Gamaliel gives the benefit of the doubt to Christianity. He assumes that Christianity is of God and puts the alternative that it is often in the third class. This does not, of course, show that Gamaliel was a Christian or an inquirer. He was merely willing to score a point against the situation, but ἐάν and the subj. ontemplate the future result Sadducees. Here, indeed, the su position is about a present (turn out to be). So ἐάν ἔχητε in 1 Cor. 4:15; ἐὰν ᾖ in Mt. 6:22. Ἐαν θέλῃς in Mt. 8:2 is future in conception. In Jo. 5:31, ἐὰν μαρτυρῶ (possibly pres. ind.), the idea would be 'if perchance I bear witness.' Cf. also 8:14. I such instances the matter may be looked at as a present realty (so εἰ σκανδαλίζει. Mt. 5:29)

[1] The Phrygian inser. show similar exx. Cf. Ramsay, Cities and Bish. of Phrygia, II, 292. Burton (N. T. M. and I ., p. 105) admits that it is an over-refinement to rule out εἰ and the subj. C . Moulton, Prol., p. 240.

[2] Prol., p. 187.

[3] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 43; Meisterh.-S p. 225 f. In Jo. 5:19 we have both uses of ἄν (conditional and modal). In Mk. 5:28 note ἐὰν ἅψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων, not a repetition of modal ἄν, but a particle κἄν= 'even.'

or a future possibility (so **ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ**, Mk. 9:43). Cf. also **ἐὰν ἀγαπήσητε** in Mt. 5:46 with **εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε** in Lu. 6:32 (in verse 33, **ἐὰν ἀγαθορποιῆτε**).[1] In Jo. 13:17 note **εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά.** Here we have the first and third class conditions happily combined with clear distinction. Jesus assumes the knowledge as a fact, but the performance is doubtful.

The tense is usually the aorist, though sometimes the pres. subj. occurs. Thus **ἐὰν ἀκούσῃ** (Mt. 18:15); **ἐὰν διψᾷ** (Jo. 7:37). In 2 Tim. 2:5 note **ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἀθλῇ τις, οὐ στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ νομίμως ἀθλήσῃ**, where the distinction is drawn between the two tenses. I doubt the propriety, however, of reading a future perfect sense *a la* Latin into this aorist subj. as Moulton[2] does. He cites Mt. 5:47, **ἐὰν ἀσπάσησθε,** but surely the simple aorist conception is sufficient. John's fondness (see Tenses) for the pres. subj. with **ἐάν** has been discussed.[3] In Jo. 3:27 we have the periphrastic perfect; **ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον**. Cf. also Jas. 5:15, **κἂν ᾖ πεποιηκώς**. The conclusion of this condition is naturally most frequently the future ind. Thus Mt. 9:21 **ἐὰν ἅψωμαι, σωθήσομαι**; Jo. 16:7 **ἐὰν πορευθῶ, πέμψω**; Ac. 5:38 **ἐὰν ᾖ, καταλυθήσεται** Mt. 5:13; 28:14; Jo. 7:17; 12:26; 14:15; Ro. 2:26. But this normal apodosis is by no means universal. Thus note **οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ** in Jo. 16:7 after **ἐὰν μὴ ἀπέλθω**. See also Jo. 8:51. Cf. Ac. 13:41. In Mk. 14:31 note **οὐ μὴ ἀπαρνήσομαι**. The imperative may occur in the apodosis as in Mt. 18:15, **ἐὰν ἁμαρτήσῃ, ὕπαγε ἔλεξον**. So Mt. 10:13; 18:17; 26:42; Ro. 12:20; 13:4; Ph. 2:1. But ofttimes the conclusion is stated in terms of the present either as a present hope or a vivid projection into the future (futuristic present). So in 2 Cor. 5:1, **ἐὰν καταλυθῇ, ἔχομεν**. The condition is future in conception, but the conclusion is a present reality, so confident is Paul of the bliss of heaven. Cf. Mt. 18:13. In 18: 12 both the fut. and the pres. ind. appear in the apodosis. A lively sense of present need is seen in Mt. 8:2. A practical turn is given by the pointed question in Mt. 5:47. In Ro. 14:8 note **ἐάν τε—ἐάν τε**. A maxim often has the pres. ind. in the apodosis. Thus **οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς—ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον δήσῃ** (Mk. 3:27). Cf. Jo. 8:16, 54; 11:9; 12:24; 1 Cor. 7:39, 40; 2 Tim. 2:5. The pres. perf. is likewise so used, as in Ro. 14:23, **ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγῃ κατακέκριται**. So Jo. 20:23; Ro. 2:25; 7:2. More difficult seems the aorist ind. in the apodosis. The aor. ind. is sometimes timeless as is always true of the other modes (see chapter on

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 215.
[2] Prol., p. 186. [3] Cf. Abbott, Joh. G p. 371.

Tenses where papyri parallels are given). That may be the explanation here. It is possible also to explain it as a change of standpoint. The protasis looks to the future, while the apodosis turns back to the past. Such vivid changes in language are due to the swift revolution in thought. See Mt. 18:15, **ἐὰν ἀκούσῃ**, **ἐκέρδησας**; Jo. 15:6, **ἐὰν μή τις μένῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω καὶ ἐξηράνθη** (cf. **ἐδοξάσθη ἵνα φέρητε** also of the future); 1 Cor. 7:28, **ἐὰν καὶ γαμήσῃς, οὐχ ἥμαρτες· καὶ ἐὰν γήμῃ ἡ παρθένος, οὐχ ἥμαρτεν**. For a similar idiom see Ignatius, Ep. to Romans 8:3; to Polycarp 5:2. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 247) cites Epict., **ἂν μὲν στρατεύσωμαι, ἀπηλλάγην**. See also Abbott, *Joh. Gr.*, p. 586. In Mk. 10:30, **ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ**, we have **ἐὰν μή** almost in the sense of **ὃς μή.** Cf. also **ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα** in Mk. 4:22. The use of **εἰ οὐ** and **ἐὰν μή** side by side is seen in Mt. 26: 42, **εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο παρελθεῖν ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πίω**. Cf. also Jo. 10: 37, **εἰ οὐ ποιῶ** and **κἂν μὴ πιστεύητε**.

(δ) *Remote Prospect of Determination.* Hale[1] attributes "the Greek optative assumption to a fusion of the true opt. and the potential opt." The use of the opt. in the protasis of this condition is probably volitive, since the negative[2] is **μή.** That is certainly true of the optative in wishes with **εἰ** or **εἰ γάρ (εἴθε)**.[3] But the deliberative use occurs a few times with **εἰ** in indirect questions. The potential opt. in the apodosis with **ἄν** is more difficult to explain. It is certainly not volitive any more, not more than mere fancy (*Vorstellung*), the optative of opinion,[4] and apparently futuristic. This fourth class condition is undetermined with less likelihood of determination than is true of the third class with the subj. The difference between the third and fourth classes is well illustrated in 1 Pet. 3:13 f. So Jesus draws a distinction in Lu. 22:67. The use of the opt. in both apodosis and protasis accents the remoteness of the hypothesis. And yet it is not in the category of unreality as in the second class. It floats in a mirage, but does not slip quite away. It is thus suitable not merely for real doubt, but it also fits well the polite temper of courteous address. It is evident that this condition will be comparatively infrequent. It is an ornament of the cultured class and was little used by the masses save in a few set phrases (or wishes). It is not strange, therefore, that no complete example of this fourth class condition appears in the LXX, the N. T. or the papyri so far as examined.[5] Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, pp.

[1] Origin of Subj. and Opt. Cond., Harv. Stu. in Class. Philol., 1901, p. 115.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 196.
[3] Cf. Monro, Horn. Gr., p. 227.
[4] Gildersl., Am. J. of Philol., 1909, p. 7.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 196.

133, 143) with all his diligence produces no example of the opt. in both condition and conclusion in the current **κοινή**. In the modern Greek it has disappeared completely. In the N. T., as in the LXX, the instances of the protasis are very few. Moulton[1] notes only 13 in the LXX apart from the Atticistic 4 Maccabees. Of these he observes that 2 are wishes, 5 are cases of **ὥσ(περ) εἴ τις** and 2 are indirect questions. There are in the N. T. only 11 examples. Some of these are indirect questions. Thus in **ἔλεγον εἰ βούλοιτο πορεύεσθαι** (Ac. 25:20) we have the opt. of ind. discourse. The direct was **εἰ βούλῃ**. The same thing is true of 27:39, **ἐβουλεύοντο εἰ δύναιτο ἐκσῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον**. There is implied indirect discourse or purpose (cf. the classic use of **εἰ** for purpose).[2] So we see aim in Ac. 17:27, **ζητεῖν εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὕροιεν**, and 20:16, **ἔσπευδεν εἰ δυνατὸν εἴη**. In 27:12, **πῶς δύναιντο**, we have both purpose and implied indirect discourse. In 24:19, **εἴ τι ἔχοιεν**, the protasis is more nearly that of the proper fourth class condition, but even so it is a mixed condition, since the apodosis **ἔδει** belongs to the second class. Blass[3] ventures to suggest **εἴ τι ἔχουσιν** as more correct. But it is needless to change the text. These examples are all in Acts, one of the more literary books of the N. T. Paul has only the stereotyped phrase **εἰ τύχοι**. (1 Cor. 14:10; 15:37), which is a, true example of this protasis, "if it should happen." The two other examples are in 1 Pet. 3:14 **εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι**, and 3:17 **κρεῖττον ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν**. The idiom is a mere torso, as is evident. In 0. P. 1106, 7 (vi/A.D.), **εἰ γὰρ ἐπιμένοιεν, πλῆθος ἐπιστήσεται στρατιωτικόν**, we have a mixed condition.

The apodosis with **ἄν** (the less definite **ἄν**) is more frequent and occurs both in direct and indirect discourse. Since the potential opt. in the N. T. never occurs in connection with the protasis, the matter was discussed sufficiently under The Optative Mode in Independent Sentences (see this chapter, III, 3, (b)). This potential opt. is practically the apodosis of an unexpressed protasis. But the exx. occur in questions save one (Ac. 26:29). Twice the questions are direct (Ac. 8:31; 17:18). The rest are indirect (opt. preserved as in the direct). Cf. Lu. 1:62 **τί ἂν θέλοι**, Ac. 5:24 **τί ἂν γένοιτο**. So Lu. 6:11. The deliberative element in some of these questions is well illustrated in Lu. 9:46; Ac. 10: 17. The MSS. vary in some cases about the presence of **ἄν** as

[1] Ib.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 228 f.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 221.

in Lu. 18:36. The examples are all in Luke's writings. In Ac. 8:31 we do indeed have a protasis, but not of the fourth class. It is a mixed condition. The disappearance of this opt. condition led to the enlarged use of the first and third classes. In Ro. 3:6 and 1 Cor. 15:35 the fut. ind. is used where the potential opt. would have suited the Attic idiom.[1]

(c) Special Points.

(a) *Mixed Conditions.* The human mind does not always work in stereotyped forms, however excellent they are. Grammatical construction is merely the expression of the mental conception. Freedom must be acknowledged without any apology. I say these somewhat commonplace things because of the bill of "exceptions" which meet us in so many grammars at this point. It would have been a miracle if the four classes of conditions were never "mixed," that is, if the protasis did not belong to one class, while the apodosis fell in another. In P. Goodsp. 4 (ii/B.C.), **εἰ ἔρρωσαι, εἴη ἄν**, we have the protasis of the first class and the apodosis of the fourth. Radermacher *(N. T. Gr.*, p. 132) quotes Pastor Hermae, Sim. IX, 12, 4 **οὐδεὶς εἰσελεύσεται εἰ μὴ λάβοι**, Theoph. *Ad Autolycum* **εἰ μὰρ βάβοι—ἐκκαύσει**. Thus in Lu. 17:6, **εἰ ἔχετε, ἐλέγετε ἄν**, we have a protasis of the first class (determined as fulfilled) and the apodosis of the second (determined as unfulfilled). The same thing is true of the marginal reading in the text of W. H. in Jo. 8:39, **εἰ ἐστέ, ἐποιεῖτε**. In Ac. 24:19, **οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρὸς ἐμέ**, we find a protasis of the fourth class with an apodosis of the second class. Then again in Ac. 8:31, **πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσει με;** we have a protasis of the first class (barring. itacism) and an apodosis of the fourth. The examples like 1 Cor. 7:28 do not amount to mixed condition, since it is merely a question of the standpoint in time of the apodosis, though this apodosis does more naturally go with the first class condition. There may be two protases, as in 1 Cor. 9:11, and both of the same class, or the two may belong to different classes, as in Jo. 13:17.

(β) *Implied Conditions*. Sometimes the apodosis is expressed, while the protasis is merely implied by a participle, an imperative or a question. In such examples one must not think that the participle, for instance, *means* 'if.' Thus in Ro. 2:27 **τελοῦσα** with **κρινεῖ** suggests a condition of either the first or the third class according as one conceives it. The condition is hinted at, not stated. The same thing is true of **λαμβανόμενον** in 1 Tim.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 220.

4:4 and **μετατιθεμένης** in Heb. 7:12. Cf. also Heb. 2:3; 1 Cor. 11:29; Gal. 6:9. This use of the participle is still very frequent[1] in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have **ἐὰν κερδήσῃ**, while in Lu. 9:25 note **κερδήσας**. In Lu. 19:23, **κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν αὐτὸ ἔπραξα**, the apodosis calls for a condition of the second class (context). The imperative is used where a protasis might have been employed. Thus in Mk. 1:17, **δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω**. The adverb **δεῦτε** has the force of an imperative. There is an implied condition here. So also 11:24 **πιστεύετε καὶ ἔσται**. Cf. Mt. 7:7; 11:28; 19:21; Lu. 7:7; Jo. 2:19; 14:16; Jas. 4:7. The imp. may be (Jas. 1:5) the apodosis of an expressed condition and the implied protasis of another conclusion.[2] In Eph. 4:26; **ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε**, two imperatives together practically answer as protasis and apodosis. In Mt. 7:10, **ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσει—μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ**; the two questions do the same thing in a rough sort of way (anacoluthon), not technically so. In Mt. 26:15, **τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι κἀγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν**, the question takes the place of the protasis. Here **καί** joins the two parts of the sentence, but in Jas. 5:13 we have question and imperative in separate sentences. Cf. also 1 Cor. 7:21. These devices are all found in the classic idiom.[3]

(γ) *Elliptical Conditions*. An incomplete condition is really a species of ellipsis or aposiopesis and is common to all languages.[4] Ellipsis of the copula in the apodosis (1 Cor. 12:19) or the protasis (Ro. 8:17) is not the point. That is, of course, common. So Ro. 4:14; 8:17; 11:16; 1 Cor. 7:5; 1 Pet. 3:14; 2 Cor. 11:16. There may be the absence of either protasis or apodosis. The apodosis is wanting in some instances. The suppression of the apodosis in Lu. 13:9, **κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον--** amounts to aposiopesis.[5] See also 19:42, **εἰ ἔγνως καὶ σύ.** Cf. further Mk. 7:11; Jo. 6:62; Ac. 23:9. In Lu. 22:42 the aposiopesis disappears from the text of W. H. (**παρένεγκε**, not **παρενεγκειν**). In 2 Th. 2:3, **ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ**, we have a mere anacoluthon as in Ph. 1:22. These protases belong to either the first, second or third classes. The lonely protases of the fourth class discussed above (cf. 1 Pet. 3:14, 17) come in here also. We have a species of anacoluthon. The structure of the sentence is changed so that the corresponding apodosis does not follow. In the same

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 230.
[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 110.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 461.
[4] Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 166.
[5] W.-Th., p. 600.

way (suppression of apodosis) is to be explained the use of εἰ like אִם in the sense of 'not,' in solemn oaths or questions. The apodosis is wanting. So εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεῇ ταύτῃ σημεῖον (Mk. 8:12). So Heb. 3:11 (4:3, 5) εἰ ἐλεύσονται (Ps. 94-95:11). This is aposiopesis. The full expression is seen in Gen. 14:23; Num. 14:30; 1 Sam. 14:45. It is an apparent imitation of the Hebrew idiom, though not un-Greek in itself. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 184) treats this idiom in Mk. 8:12 as due to translation from the Hebrew (Aramaic). Analogous to this is εἰ μήν, in Heb. 6:14, if εἰ is not really ἦ changed by itacism (cf. Ezek. 33:27; 34:8). Hort[1] holds to the difference between εἰ μήν and ἦ μήν and would take εἰ in Heb. 6:14 as the true εἰ. But Moulton[2] makes out a good case from the papyri and the inscriptions for taking it as merely a variation of ἦ μήν. He finds eleven papyri examples of εἶ μήν from ii/B.C. to i/A.D. Particularly clear is the Messenian Mysteries inscr., Michel 694, εἶ μὰν ἔξειν. If so, it does not come in here. But the use of εἰ in questions is pertinent. Thus εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι; (Lu. 13:23). Cf. Mt. 12:10; Lu. 12:26; 22:49; Ac. 17:27; 19:2. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 136) takes εἰ in questions=ἦ as in Lu. 22:49. This is possible on grounds of itacism, but it does not entitle Radermacher to say "werden muss." The use of the condition in the sense of 'to see if' borders on this elliptical construction. Something has to be supplied before the protasis in order to make the idea clear. The apodosis is virtually contained in the protasis. It is a classic[3] idiom and reappears in the papyri.[4] So 0. P. 743, ὅλος διαπονοῦμαι εἰ Ἔ. χαλκοῦς ἀπόλεσεν. The protasis here may conform to the first class condition as in εἰ ἔχει (Lu. 14:28); εἴ πως ἤδη ποτὲ εὐοδωθήσομαι (Ro. 1:10). So Mk. 11:13; Ac. 8:22. In Ph. 3:12, εἰ καὶ καταλάβω, we have the third class and possibly also in Ro. 11:14. But in Ac. 27:12 it is the fourth class, εἴ πως δύναιντο. The use of εἰ in the indirect question, as in Mk. 3:2, εἰ θεραπεύσει, corresponds closely with the preceding. Cf. also 11:13. The same thing is true of εἰ in the sense of ὅτι, as in Ac. 26:23. This is also true of εἰ with verbs of wonder, as in Mk. 15:44; Ac. 26:8.

The protasis itself is sometimes abbreviated almost to the vanishing point, as in εἰ μή without a verb, in the sense of 'except' (Mt. 5:13). Here εἰ and μή seem to coalesce into one word like πλήν. Cf. 11:27, οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. This is very common as in classic Greek. Sometimes we have εἰ μὴ μόνον as in

[1] App., p. 151.
[2] Prol., p. 46.
[3] Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 180
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 194.

Mt. 21 : 19. The origin of this use of **εἰ μή** was the fact that the verb was identical with the preceding one in the apodosis and so was not repeated. From this ellipsis the usage spread to mere exceptions to the previous statement, a limitation simply. **Εἰ μή** may make exception to a preceding negative as in Gal. 1:19, **ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφόν**. The effect here is to make **εἰ μή** seem adversative instead of exceptive. Cf. Mt. 12:4. For **ἐὰν μή** in this construction see Gal. 2:16. In 1 Cor. 7:17 **εἰ μή** has the sense of 'only' and is not to be construed with **περιπατείτω**. The use of **εἰ μή** occurs in questions expetting a negative answer, as in Mk. 2:7, **τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μή εἷς ὁ θεός**; In 1 Cor. 7:5, **εἰ μήτι** [**ἄν**], we have **τι** (cf. **εἴ τι** in Mt. 18:28) added and possibly also **ἄν**. B here omits **ἄν**, possibly to "case a difficulty" as Moulton[1] suggests. If genuine, it would be a sort of analysis of **ἐάν** into **εἰ ἄν**, that occurs in the illiterate papyri. For examples see under 8, (b), (a). For **εἰ μήτι** with the ind. pres. see 2 Cor. 13:5 and the subj. aorist. See Lu. 9:13. The use of **ἐκτὸς εἰ μή** probably comes by analogy from **ἐκτὸς εἰ** (cf. Latin *nisi*), but it occurs in the N. T. without verbs only in 1 Tim. 5:19. Elliptical also are **εἰ μὴ ἵνα** (Jo. 10:10); **εἰ μὴ ὅτι** (2 Cor. 12:13); **εἰ μὴ ὅταν**, (Mk. 9:9). In Jo. 14:11 note **εἰ δὲ μή** in the sense of 'but if not,' otherwise.' Cf. Mk. 2: 21; Rev. 2:5, 16. For **εἰ δὲ μήγε** see Lu. 5:36. Other forms of **εἰ** used elliptically are **εἴ περ** (Ro. 3:30); **ὡσεί** (Mt. 3:16); **ὡσπερεί** (1 Cor. 15:8). **Εἰ δὲ μή** and **εἰ δὲ μή γε** became such fixed phrases[2] that they occur even when the preceding sentence is negative (Mt. 9:17) or where **ἐὰν μή** would be more natural (Lu. 10:6, where the phrase answers to **ἐὰν ᾖ**. Cf. Lu. 13:9. In Jo. 14:2, **εἰ δὲ μή εἶπον ἄν**, the conclusion is expressed.

In 2 Cor. 10:9 we have **ὡς ἄν** without a verb= 'as if.' It is common to have **εἴτε--εἴτε** (1 Cor. 8:5) without the verb. The use of **κἄν** without the verb is also found in the sense of 'if only,' 'at least.' So in Mk. 5:28; 6:56. In 2 Cor. 11:16 we have both **εἰ δέ μή γε** and **κἄν** (**δέξησθε** to be supplied). In Lu. 12:38 note **κἄν —κἄν.** The suppression of the protasis occurs in all the examples of the potential opt. already discussed, as in Ac. 26:29. Even in the deliberative questions of the opt. with Ccv the same thing is true. Cf. Ac. 17:18 (direct); Lu. 1:62 (indirect). The protasis is also suppressed sometimes with **ἐπεί**. Cf. 1 Cor. 15 29, **ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν**; Here a protasis of the first or (more probably) of the third class must be supplied. So in Ro. 3:6; 11:6,

[1] Prol., p. 169. [2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 111.

22. In 1 Cor. 14:16, ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογῇς πῶς ἐρεῖ, the ellipsis still occurs in spite of ἐάν. In Heb. 9:26, ἐπεὶ ἔδει, and 10:2, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο, the protasis would belong to the second class, as is true also of ἐπεὶ ὠφείλετε ἄρα in 1 Cor. 5:10. In 7:14, ἐπεὶ ἄρα ἐστίν, the protasis would be of the first class.

(δ) *Concessive Clauses*. These are really just conditional[1] clauses with the addition of καί. In καὶ εἰ and καὶ ἐάν (κἄν) the sense is 'even if' and is climacteric. Burton[2] seeks to draw quite a distinction between concessive and conditional clauses. He cites Mt. 26:33, εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι, as an instance of the concessive idea without καί. It is possible that we may read the idea into this passage because in the parallel passage in Mk. 14:29 we read εἰ καί — ἀλλ' ἐγώ. Cf. also κἂν δέῃ in Mt. 26:35 with ἐὰν δέῃ in Mk. 14: 31. The use of εἰ (ἐάν) in the sense of 'though' shows that there is at bottom no essential difference. The structure is precisely the same as the conditional sentence. They are, to repeat, nothing but conditional sentences of a special tone or emphasis. The use of καί was to sharpen this emphasis either up or down.

With καὶ εἰ the supposition is considered improbable.[3] With καὶ εἰ the truth of the principal sentence is stoutly affirmed in the face of this one objection. It is rhetorically an extreme case. In 1 Cor. 8:5, καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰσὶν — [ἀλλ] ἡμῖν εἷς θεός, we have an instance. In Mk. 14:29 the true text is εἰ καί, not καὶ εἰ. In 1 Pet. 3:1 W. H. read simply εἰ. In late Greek καὶ εἰ vanishes before καὶ ἄν (ἐάν).[4] So in the N. T. we have καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω (Jo. 8:16). So also Gal. 1:8. For κἄν see Jo. 8:14, κἂν μαρτυρῶ. So Mt. 21:21; 26:35. See Jo. 10:38, εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ πιστεύητε. The clauses with ἐάν and the subj. are, of course, third class conditions. Sometimes[5] καὶ εἰ and κἄν can hardly[6] be considered as strong as 'even if.' They may be resolved into 'and if.' So Mt. 11:14; Lu. 6:32; Mk. 16:18; Jo. 8:55; Rev. 11:5.

Much more common is εἰ καί. This phrase means 'if also.' Here the protasis is treated as a matter of indifference. If there is a conflict, it makes no real difficulty. There is sometimes a tone of contempt in εἰ καί. The matter is belittled. There is often some particle in the conclusion in this construction as in Lu. 18:4, εἰ καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐντρέπομαι, διά γε τὸ παρέχειν, κτλ. Note γε as in 11:8. Cf. Col. 2:5, εἰ καί — ἀλλά.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 215.
[2] N. T. M. and T., p. 112.
[3] Paley, Gk. Part., p. 31.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 465.
[5] Thayer's Lexicon.
[6] Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 114.

There is considerable variety with εἰ καί. Thus in 2 Cor. 7:8 we have a condition of the first class (so Lu. 11:8; 18:4, etc.), while in 1 Pet. 3:14, εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε, we have one instance of the fourth class. With ἐὰν καί and the subj. we find, of course, the third class. So Gal. 6:1, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ. Cf. 2 Tim. 2:5. In 1 Cor. 7:28, ἐὰν καὶ γαμήσῃς, the notion is 'if even' rather than 'also' (cf. καὶ ἐὰν γήμῃ). In Mt. 18:17 note ἐὰν παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, and ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ. There is nothing peculiar about Ro. 14:8, ἐάν τε ζῶμεν—ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν (Cf. Ex. 19:13.) Cf. εἴτε--εἴτε with the ind. (1 Cor. 3:22) or the subj. (1 Th. 5:10). The use of the participle for concession (see καίπερ ὤν, Heb. 5:8) will be treated under the Participle. For the use of κἄν even after ἐάν see Mk. 5:28.

(ε) *Other Particles with* εἰ *and* ἐάν. These have no effect on the condition as a distinct class, though they modify the precise idea in various ways. This point will be treated more exactly under Particles. But note εἰ ἄρα (Mk. 11:13; Ac. 8:22); εἴ γε (Eph. 4:21); εἰ ἄρα γε (Ac. 17:27 opt.); εἴ γε καί (2 Cor. 5:3); εἰ δὲ μήγε (Lu. 5:36); εἰ οὖν (Mt. 6:23; Heb. 7:11); εἴπερ (Ro. 3: 30); ἐάνπερ (Heb. 3:14; 6:3); εἴ πως (Ro. 1:10, the fut. ind.; Ac. 27:12, the opt.). In Mk. 8:23 εἴ τι is in direct question.

9. INDIRECT DISCOURSE (*Oratio Obliqua*).

(a) **Recitative Ὅτε in Oratio Recta**. Direct quotation is more frequent in primitive language, in the vernacular, and in all vivid picturesque narrative. It is the dramatic method of reporting speech. It is natural in Homer, in the Old Testament and in the Gospels, in Aristophanes and in Shakespeare, and in Uncle Remus. The prolonged indirect discourse in Thucydides and in Livy, in Xenophon and Caesar, is more or less artificial. In the LXX little use is made of indirect discourse. The direct quotation may not be as verbally exact as the indirect,[1] but it is more lively and interesting. As a rule the direct discourse is simply introduced with a word of saying or thinking. The ancients had no quotation-marks nor our modern colon. But sometimes tin was used before the direct quotation merely to indicate that the words are quoted. We find this idiom occasionally with ὅτι, more seldom with ὡς, in the Attic writers.[2] It is very rare[3] in the LXX, since the Hebrew so frequently has a special participle like 'saying.' But see Gen. 28: 16. In the N. T. Jannaris[4] counts 120 instances of recitative ὅτι.

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 130. [2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 285.

[3] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 50; but see on the other hand Con. and Stock, Sel., p. 114. [4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 472.

The idiom appears chiefly in the historical books. See Mt. 7:23, **ὁμολογήσω ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς**. This particular instance can be looked upon as indirect discourse, since the person is the same in both clauses and the tense and mode are unaffected. It is probable that indirect declarative clauses grew out of constructions of this nature.[1] But in Mt. 27:43, **εἶπεν ὅτι θεοῦ εἰμὶ υἱός**, there is no doubt at all. See 26:74, **ὀμνύειν ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον**, and 26:75, **εἰρηκότος ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με**. So Mk. 1:37; 2:12, 16; 4:21; 8:28; Jo. 10:36; Ac. 25:8; Ro. 4:17. In Mt. 16:7 we have (W. H., but R. V. marg. has causal) recitative **ὅτι** (**ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν**); while in verse 8 the indirect (probably causal) use, **ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;** In Mk. 6:23 (W. H. marg.) we have a direct quotation with **ὅτι**, in Mt. 14:7 the same thing appears as indirect discourse without **ὅτι**. In Jo. 10:34, **ἀπεκρίθη—οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπα θεοί ἐστε**, note a treble direct quotation, once with **ὅτι** and twice without. In Jo. 1:50 the first **ὅτι** is causal, the second is indirect discourse. The **ὅτι** in the beginning of Jo. 20:29 is causal. In Jo. 20:18 **ὅτι** is recitative, causal in 3:18, declar. in 3:19. It is doubtful whether first **ὅτι** is recitative or causal in Jo. 21:17. In Ro. 3:8, **ὅτι ποιήσωμεν** (hortatory subj.), **ὅτι** is also recitative. So in 2 Th. 3:10 **ὅτι** is merely recitative. The instances of direct quotation without **ὅτι** are very numerous. Cf. Mt. 8:3; 26:25. Sometimes the same thing is reported with **ὅτι** (Mt. 19:9) or without **ὅτι** (Mk. 10:11). For single words quoted without agreement with the word with which they are in apposition note **ὁ διδάσκαλος** and **ὁ κύριος** in Jo. 13:13. W. H. seek to indicate the presence of recitative **ὅτι** by beginning the quotation with a capital letter as in all their quotations. Cf. Jo. 9:9. This redundant **ὅτι** may occur before direct questions as in Mk. 4:21; 8:4. It continues common in the **κοινή** and the modern Greek uses **πῶς** in this idiom.[2]

(b) **Change of Person in Indirect Discourse.** Sometimes this was not necessary, as in Jo. 18:8. So in Mt. 16:18, **κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος**, there is no change in the second person. Cf. also Jo. 11:27; Gal. 2:14. But in Mt. 20:10, **ενόμισαν ὅτι πλεῖον λήμψονται**, the direct discourse would have **λημψόμεθα**. So Lu. 24:23. Compare **ἐλάβομεν** in Mt. 16:7 with **ἔχετε** in v. 8. Note **τί φάγωμεν** (direct) in Mt. 6:31, but **τί φάγητε** (indirect) in 6:25. In Mk. 9:6, **οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ**, the direct would be **τί ἀποκριθῶ**;

[1] Schmitt, Uber den Urs pr. des Substantivsatzes, 1889, p. 66.

[2] Thumb, Handb., p. 192. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 472. **Καὶ τότες εἶπε πῶς Δέ σου τό᾽λεγα ἐγώ**; then he said, Didn't I tell you so?'

The person may be both ways in the same sentence, as in Ac. 1: 4, **παρήγγειλεν—περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου**. See further under Mixture.

(c) **Change of Tense in Indirect Discourse**. Mr. H. Scott objects to the wide scope here given to the term "inqirect discourse" to cover "object clauses" after **ὁράω, κτλ**., but I conceive the principle to be the same. After primary tenses there is, of course, no change in mode or tense. Note Mt. 16:18 above. See also Mk. 11:24, **πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν.** It is only after secondary tenses that any change occurs. Usually even then there is no change of tense in Greek. Thus **ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἔστιν** (Mk. 6: 55). So with **ἀκούσας ὅτι βασιλεύει—ἐφοβήθη** (Mt. 2:22). So **ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν** (Lu. 24:21). See also Mt. 21:45; Mk. 6:49, Lu. 1:22; Jo. 2:17; 6:24. Cf. Gal. 2:14, **εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν**. So Jo. 11:13. In Jo. 21:19 the future ind. is retained after **εἶπεν σημαίνων**. Cf. Mt. 20:10. So in Lu. 5:19 the aorist subj. occurs. In Mk. 2:16 we have **ὅτι ἐσ-ίει** twice, the first in ind. discourse and the second with interrogative **ὅτι**. But sometimes the ancient Greek, even the Attic,[1] used a past tense of the indicative in ind. discourse where the direct had the tenses of present time. The N. T. shows occasionally the same construction. In a case like Jo. 1:50, **εἶπόν σοι ὅτι εἶδόν σε**, the aorist tense belonged to the direct. Cf. 9:30, 32, 35. So as to the imperfect **ἦν** and aorist **ἀνέβλεψεν** in Jo. 9:18. Cf. also Lu. 13:2. In Mt. 27:18, **ᾔδει ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν**, the aorist is used for antecedent action. Cf. **παραδεδώκεισαν** in Mk. 15:10. See also Mt. 16:12, **ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν**. But in Jo. 2:25, **αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ**, the direct form[2] would have **ἐστιν**, not **ἦν**. So with **ᾔδει τί ἔμελλεν ποιεῖν** (6:6); **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν** (8:27). Cf. also 11:51; 12:16, 33; 18:32. In Ac. 19:32, **οὐκ ἤδεισαν τίνος ἕνεκα συνεληλύθεισαν**, the past perfect stands when the direct would have the present perfect. In Ac. 16:3, **ᾔδεισαν ὅτι Ἕλλην ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ὑπῆρχεν**, the imperfect may indicate that Timotheus' father was no longer living, though it is not the necessary meaning, as we have just seen. Cf. Mk. 11:32; Jo. 6:22-24; 16:19; Ac. 22: 2; 1 Pet. 1:12. In Ac. 22:29, **ἐφοβήθη ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸν ἦν δεδεκώς**, we see both constructions combined. In

[1] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.

[2] Cf. Robertson, Short Gr., p. 1S1. As a matter of fact, the primitive method in *oratio obliqua* was probably this very change of tense as in Eng. We have it more frequently in Hom. than the change of mode or the graphic retention of tense. Cf. Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p,. 402.

Jo. 11:40, **οὐκ εἶπόν σοι ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὄψῃ** the subj. and the fut. ind. are retained after secondary tense, unless **ὅτι** is recitative. This preservation of the original tense appears in clauses not strictly in indirect discourse. In Lu. 9:33, **εἶπεν—μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει**, the present tense is retained in the relative clause **ὃ λέγει**, as it is in the causal clause in 9:49, **ἐκωλύομεν αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν**. In Jo. 21:25, **χωρήσειν**, the future inf. stands for the future ind. in the direct, as **τεθνηκέναι** does in Ac. 14:19 for the perfect ind. In Lu. 20:6 **εἶναι** really represents the imperfect indicative of the direct.

(d) **Change of Mode in Indirect Discourse**. The rule with the Greek was not to change the tense. The mode after past tenses, with more freedom, was either retained[1] or changed to the corresponding tense of the optative mode. The optative, as the most remote in standpoint of the modes, suited this idiom very well. The imperfect and past perfect indicative were, however, retained, though even here the optative sometimes appeared.[2] When the aorist optative represented an aorist indicative of the direct discourse the opt. represented past time.[3] Usually the optative and subjunctive are future as to time. We have the optative in the N. T. in indirect discourse only in Luke. It was in the **κοινή** a mark of literary care, almost Atticism, quite beyond the usual vernacular. And with Luke the idiom is almost confined to indirect questions. Luke never has the opt. after **ὅτι** or **ὡς**. Once (Ac. 25:16) in a subordinate temporal clause the optative occurs where the subj. with (cf. Lu. 2:26) or without all would be in the direct, **πρὶν ἢ ἔχοι--τε λάβοι**. And even here **οὐκ ἔστιν**, after **ὅτι** comes just before. This change in the subordinate clause was also optional in the ancient idiom.[4] If **ἄν** was used with the subj. in the direct it was, of course, dropped with the change to the optative in the indirect. Similar to this is the use of **εἰ** and the optative with dependent single clause either as protasis with implied apodosis or purpose like **εἰ ψηλαφήσειαν** (Ac..17: 27); **εἰ δυνατὸν εἴη** (20:16); **εἴ πως δύναιντο** (27:12). Here after primary tenses we should have **ἐάν** and the subj. or **εἰ** and the future ind. Cf. Ph. 3:12; no. 1:10. Cf. **τί γράψω** in Ac. 25:26. As already explained also, the indirect questions with **εἰ** and the

[1] In archaic Lat. the incl. was used in indirect discourse as in Gk. Cf. Draeger, Hist. Synt., Bd. II, p. 460.

[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 263.

[3] Madvig, Bemerk. Uber einige Punkte der griech. Worthig. 1848, p. 23.

[4] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 273.

optative (Ac. 25:20; 27:39) are instances where the indicative would be used in the direct. Even in indirect questions Luke usually keeps the mode of the direct. So the indicative as in **τὸ τίς—δοκεῖ** (Lu. 22:24), the subjunctive as in **τὸ πῶς—ἀποδῷ** (22:4) or the optative as in **τὸ τί ἂν θέλο** (1:62). The indicative is never changed to a subjunctive as in Latin. When the subj. in Greek occurs in an indirect question it does so because it was the subj. in the direct. Thus **οὐ γὰρ ἤδει τί ἀποκριθῇ** (Mk. 9:6). Cf. Mt. 6:25, 31, **τί φάγητε, τί φάγωμεν**. So Lu. 22:2, 4; Ac. 4:21. Cf. subj. with **ἵνα** after secondary tenses (Ro. 1:13; 1 Pet. 4:6). The use of the optative (as distinct from subj.) in indir. discourse was a Greek development. We see the beginning of it in Homer. The optative, however, does occur in Lu. (18:36, W. H. text, margin **ἄν**) in an indirect question where the direct had the indicative. Cf. **ποταπὸς εἴη** in 1:29. So 8:9, **ἐπηρώτων τίς εἴη**. In Ac. 21.33, **ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη καὶ τί ἐστιν πεποιηκώς**, both constructions occur side by side. The variation here in the mode (retention of the ind.) gives a certain vividness to this part of the question. See Optative in Paratactic Sentences where the **κοινή** parallels are given. In **γίνοιτο κρατεῖν πάσης ἧς ἂν αἱρῆσθε χώρας**, P. Par. 26 (B.C. 163), there is no sequence of mode. The subj. is with the indefinite relative and the opt. is a wish. It has been already (under Optative) shown that **ἄν**, and the opt. in an indirect question is there because it was in the direct (cf. Ac. 17: 18, **τί ἂν θέλοι**; with Lu. 1:62, **τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι**). Sometimes, one must admit, the difference between the two is reduced to a minimum, as in the papyri occasionally.[1] So in Lu. 9:46, **τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη** (cf. **τὸ τίς εἴη**) in Lu. 22:23). See also Lu. 15:26; Ac. 10:17. But there is always a shade of difference. The manuscripts reflect this haziness in the variations between ind. and opt. as in Lu. 22:23; Ac. 2:12, et cet. In Lu. 3:15, **μή ποτε εἴη,** we also have the opt. in an indir. question. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 165) quotes Diod. I, 75, 5, **ἐπειδὰν—πρόσθοιτο**. The Atticists used it often.

(e) **The Limits of Indirect Discourse.** It is not always easy to draw the line between indirect discourse and other constructions. Thus Jannaris[2] uses it only for declarative clauses with **ὅτι** or **ὡς.** Burton[3] confines it to indirect assertions and indirect questions, but admits that it also covers indirect commands and promises. Take Mt. 14:7, **ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσηται**. The in-

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 198. [2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 471 f.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 131. So most of the grammars.

finitive δοῦναι is the direct object of the verb and does not seem to be in indir. discourse, for in Mk. 6:23 the direct form has δώσω. But, after all, it is practical indir. discourse, though the analogy of tense construction breaks down in this instance. But note fut. infinitive with ὤμοσεν in Heb. 3:18, according to the principle of indirect discourse. On the whole it is best to consider three classes or kinds of indirect discourse: declarative clauses, indirect questions, indirect commands.

(f) **Declarative Clauses** (*Indirect Assertions)*.

(a) **Ὅτι** *and the Indicative*. There is no clear instance of ὡς in this sense in the N. T. It was common in the ancient Greek.[1] Just as final ὅπως retreated before ἵνα, so declarative ὡς did before ὅτι.[2] In late Greek ἵνα monopolized the field as a final particle and divided it with ὅτι as a declarative conjunction. We do have ὡς in indirect questions a few times as will be shown. This is more likely the meaning even in Ac. 10:28, ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτον. Reeb[3] points out that Demosthenes uses ὡς for what is false and ὅτι for what is true. The German *wie* is used like ὡς with verbs of reading, narrating, testifying. With these verbs ὡς is more than just on ('that'). Ὅτι expresses the thing itself and ὡς the mode or quality of the thing (Thayer). With this explanation it is possible to consider it as declarative, though really meaning 'how.' Cf. Lu. 24:6, μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν. So in Lu. 8:47 with ἀπαγγέλλω, 23:55 after θεάομαι, Ac. 10:38 after οἶδα, Ac. 20:20 with ἐπίσταμαι, Ro. 1:9 with μάρτυς (so Ph. 1:8; 1 Th. 2:10). The manuscripts vary in some passages between ὡς and ὅτι and πῶς. W. H. bracket do in Lu. 6:4 and read πῶς in Mk. 12:26 and ὅτι in Jude 5, though ὡς is retained in 7.[4] In all these passages it is possible to regard ὡς as the 'how' of indirect question rather than declarative. The encroachment of πῶς on ὅτι is to be noticed also. Cf. Mt. 12:4 after ἀναγινώσκω (and Mk. 12: 26), Mk. 12:41 after θεωρέω, Mk. 5:16 after διηγέομαι, Lu. 14: 7 after ἐπέχων, Ac. 11:13 after ἀπαγγέλλω (so 1 Th. 1:9). In the later Greek πῶς comes gradually to be equivalent to ὅτι.[5] Gradually πῶς gained the ascendency over ὅτι till in the modern Greek it became the regular declarative particle. See Thumb, *Handb*., p. 190. In Ro. 10:15; 11:33, ὡς is exclamatory. The κοινή writers and the papyri show this same retreat of ὡς before

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 258. [2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 571.
[3] De Particulorum ὅτι et ὡς apud Demosthenum Usu, 1890, p. 38.
[4] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 230 f.
[5] Hatz., Einl., p. 19.

ὅτι and the inroad of **πῶς** on **ὅτι** (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 159). Cf. B. U., I, 37 (51 A.D.), **οἶδας πῶς—χρήζωι** Epictetus often after **ὁράω**. There is, however, no doubt of the use of **ὡς ὅτι** in the declarative sense= 'that.' It is an unclassical combination, but it appears in the LXX (Esther 4:14) and in the **κοινή** writers.[1] It is like the Latin *quasi* in the Vulgate. The late papyri (fourth cent. A.D.) show that **ὡς ὅτι** came in the vernacular to mean simply 'that.'[2] Moulton cites also two Attic inscriptions from the first century B.C. which have **ὡς ὅτι** in the sense of **ὡς** or **ὅτι** alone. The editors have removed **ὅτι** from **ὡς ὅτι** in Xenophon's *Hellen*. III, ii, 14, **εἰπὼν ὡς ὅτι ὀκνοίη**. Moulton agrees to Blass' stigma of "unclassical" on **ὡς ὅτι**, but Paul has **κοινή** support for his use of it in 2 Cor. 5:19; 11:21; 2 Th. 2:2. But **ὅτι** has won its place in the N. T. not only over **ὡς**, but also over the infinitive. The use of the inf. in indir. discourse[3] takes quite a subordinate place in the N. T. Luke alone uses it to any extent. The periphrasis with **ὅτι** has superseded it in nearly all the N. T. writers.[4] The use of **ὅτι** is the common way of making a declaration in indirect discourse in the N. T. There arose also **διότι** in the declarative sense[5] (cf. late Latin *quia=quod*), but no example occurs in N. T. The classic causal sense of **διότι** prevailed. It is sometimes doubtful whether **ὅτι** is causal or declarative as in Ac. 22:29. The context must decide. Finally, as noted, **πῶς** came to be the normal declarative conjunction in the vernacular over the inf. as over **ὡς** and **ὅτι**) as the infinitive disappeared from indir. discourse.[6] The only mode used with **ὅτι** in the N. T. is the ind. In Ro. 3:8 (subj.) **ὅτι** is recitative. At bottom **ὅτι** is just **ὅ τι**, and Homer sometimes used **ὅ τε** in the declarative sense (and 6). Cf. **ὅτι ὅτε** together in 1 Cor. 12

The verbs after which **ὅτι** is used in the N. T. cover a wide range. Indeed, **ὅτι** comes also after substantives like **ἀγγελία** (1 Jo. 1:5); **κρίσις** (Jo. 3:19); **λόγος** (Jo. 15:25); **μαρτυρία** (1 Jo. 5: 11); **μάρτυς** (2 Cor. 1:23); **παρρησία** (1 Jo. 5:14), causal in Ac. 22: 14; **φάσις** (Ac. 21:31). It is in apposition also with **ἐν ὀνόματι** (Mk. 9:41). We see also **ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι** (1 Jo. 3:16). Some-

[1] See Sophocles' Lexicon under **ὡς**. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 413. Moulton (Prol., p. 212) gives C.P.R. 19 (iv/A.D.) **πρώην βιβλία ἐπιδέδωκα τῇ σῇ ἐπιμελείᾳ ὡς ὅτι ἐβουλήθην**

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 212.

[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 231.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 211.

[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 413.

[6] Mitsotakis, Praktische Gr. der neugriechischen Schrift- and Umgangssprache, 1891, p. 235.

times ὅτι itself seems to imply ἐν τούτῳ (Ro. 5:8) or περὶ τούτου (Mk. 1:34) or εἰς ἐκεῖνο (Jo. 2:18). Cf. τοῦτο ὅτι (Rev. 2:6). Another irregularity of construction is the prolepsis of the substantive before ὅτι (and change of case) as in 1 Cor. 16:15. This idiom is sometimes called the epexegetic use of ὅτι. Cf. further Ac. 9:20. It is a rather common idiom. Cf. Mt. 25:24. See especially Jo. 8:54. In Ro. 9:6 note **οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι.** In 1 Cor. 15:27 δῆλον ὅτι is almost adverbial, but that is not true of πρόδηλον ὅτι in Heb. 7:14. The elliptical τί ὅτι (Lu. 2:49) may be compared with τί γέγονεν ὅτι, in Jo. 14:22. The elliptical οὐχ ὅτι (cf. Jo. 6:46) is like the corresponding English "not that." The ὅτι clause may be in the nominative (subject clause) as in Mk: 4:38, **οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα**; More usually it is, of course, in the accusative (object clause) as in Jo. 11:27, πεπίστευκα ὅτι. The ὅτι clause may also be in apposition with the locative as in Mk. 9:41. In Gal. 1:20, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον θεοῦ ὅτι, we have a solemn oath as in ἀλήθεια ὅτι (2 Cor. 11:10); πιστὸς ὅτι (1:18); πάρτυς ὅτι (2 Cor. 1:23); ὀμηύω ὅτι (Rev. 10:6); ζῶ ἐγώ, ὅτι (Ro. 14:11, LXX). Rarely the personal construction occurs with ὅτι as in 1 Cor. 15:12, **Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι**. In Jas. 1:13 we either have recitative ὅτι or *oratio variata*. In Jo. 4:1 we have one ὅτι clause dependent on another. Ὅτι may be repeated in parallel clauses as in Jo. 6:22; Ac. 17:3; 22:29; 1 Cor. 15:3 ff. In 1 Jo. 5:9 we have two examples of ὅτι, but one is causal. In Jo. 1: 15 ff. the three are all causal. In Jo. 11:50 we have ὅτι and ἵνα in much the same sense. Not so 1 Jo. 5:13. Cf. ἵνα in 1 Jo. 5: 3 with ὅτι in 5:11.

The verbs that use declarative ὅτι in the N. T. are very numerous. A few have only ὅτι. Thus Mk. 11:32, ἅπαντες εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάνην ὅτι προφήτης ἦν (note ἦν). Blass[1] calls this use of ἔχω a Latinism like *habeo*. Cf. also ὑπολαμβάνω ὅτι (Lu. 7:43), a classical construction. So also λαλέω (Heb. 11:18); συμβιβάζω (Ac. 16:10); σφραγίζω (Jo. 3:33); γνωρίζω (1 Cor. 12:3); ἐμφανίζω (Heb. 11:14); ἐξομολογέω (Ph. 2:11); κατηχέω (Ac. 21: 21); κηρύσσω (1 Cor. 15:12); ἀποδείκνυμι (2 Th. 2:4); μηνύω (Lu. 20:37); ὑποδείκνυμι (Ac. 20:35); φανερόομαι (2 Cor. 3:3); ἀποκαλύπτω (1 Pet. 1:12); παραδίδωμι (1 Cor. 15:3); παρατίθημι (Ac. 17:3); προφητεύω (Jo. 11:51). The great mass of the verbs of perceiving, showing (contrary to Attic), knowing, believing, hoping, thinking, saying, declaring, replying, testifying, etc., use either the declarative ὅτι or the infinitive. In Lu.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 231,

9:18 f. with λέγω we have the inf. and ὅτι side by side. So also in Ac. 14:22 with παρακαλέω. Outside of the verbs λέγω, ἐπιμαρτυρέω, κατακρίνω and παρακαλέω the infinitive in indir. discourse in the N. T. is confined to the writings of Luke and Paul and Hebrews according to Viteau,[1] "comme vestige de la langue littóraire." But even with Luke and Paul the rule is to use ὅτι. Blass[2] has a careful list of the uses of these verbs. In margin of W. H. in Jo. 5:15 we have ἀναγγέλλω with ὅτι, but the text has εἶπον. But see ὅτι also in Ro. 2:4 (ἀγνοέω), Mt. 12:5 (ἀναγινώσκω), Lu. 18:37 (ἀπαγγέλλω), Ac. 25:16 (ἀποκρίνομαι), 1 Jo. 2:22 (ἀρνέομαι), Ac. 17:6 (βοάω), 1 Pet. 2:3 (γεύομαι), Ro. 10:5 (γράφω), Mt. 16:21 (δεικνύω), 1 Cor. 1:11 (δηλόω), Ac. 10:42 (διαμαρτύρομαι), Ac. 17:3 (διανοίγω), Mk. 8:31 (διδάσκω), Mt. 6:7 (δοκέω), Ac. 9:27 (διηγέομαι), Lu. 24:21 (ἐλπίζω), Mt. 6:26 (ἐμβλέπω), 1 Cor. 11:2 (διηγέομαι), Ac. 13:32 (εὐαγγελίζομαι), Lu. 18:11 (εὐχαριστέω), Rev. 2:4 (ἔχω κατά τινος), Lu. 11:38 (θαυμάζω), Jo. 6:5 (θεάομαι), Ac. 4: 13 (καταλαμβάνομαι), Lu. 12:24 (κατανόεω), 2 Cor. 5:14 (κρίνω), 2 Pet. 3:5 (λανθάνω), Mt. 3:9 (λέγω), Ac. 23:27 (μανθάνω), 2 Cor. 1: 23 (μάρτυρα τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι), Heb. 7:8 (μαρτυρέω), Ac. 20:26 (μαρτύρομαι), Mt. 27:63 (μιμνήσκω), Mt. 5:17 (νομίζω), Mt. 15:17 (νοέω), Mt. 26:74 (ὀμνύω), Jas. 1:7 (οἴομαι), Ro. 9:1 (οὐ ψεύδομαι), 1 Cor. 15:3 (παραδίδωμι), Heb. 13:18 (πείθομαι), Jo. 6:69 (πιστεύω), Ro. 4:21 (πληροφορέω), 2 Cor. 13:2 (προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω, cf. Gal. 5:21), Ac. 23:34 (πυνθάνομαι), Lu. 15:6, 9 (συγχαίρω), Jo. 18:14 (συμβουλεύω), Ro. 8:16 (συμμαρτυρέω), Mt. 16:12 (συνίημι), Ju. 5 (ὑπομιμνήσκω) 1 Cor. 10:19 (φημί), Lu. 10:20 (χαίρω), 1 Tim. 1:12 (χάριν ἔχω τινί). I cannot claim that this is a complete list, but it is the best I can do with the help of H. Scott, Blass, Thayer, Moulton and Geden, and Viteau's list. At any rate it gives one a fairly clear idea of the advances made by ὅτι on the classic infinitive idiom. Some verbs still share the participle with ὅτι, but not verbs of showing. These no longer appear in the N. T. with the participle.[3] So with ὅτι note βλέπω (Heb. 3:19); θεωρέω (Mk. 16:4). Cf. Ac. 19:26, θεωρέω and ἀκούω. So also ἐπιγινώσκω (Lu. 7:37); ἐπίσταμαι (Ac. 15:7); εὑρίσκω (Ro. 7:21); μνημονεύω (Ac. 20: 31); ὁράω (Mk. 2:16). Besides some verbs appear with either ὅτι, the infinitive or the participle. Thus ἀκούω (Mt. 5:21; Jo. 12:18; Lu. 4:23); γινώσκω (Mt. 21:45; Heb. 10:34; Lu. 8:46); λογίζομαι (Ro. 8 : 18; 2 Cor. 10 : 2 both inf. and part.); οἶδα (Ac. 16 : 3; Lu. 4:41; 2 Cor. 12:2); ὁμολογέω (Mt. 7:23 unless recitative ὅτι;

[1] Le Verbe, p. 51.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 231 f.
[3] Ib., p. 233.

Tit. 1:16; 2 Jo. 7). In Ac. 27:10 we find used with the infinitive "quite irregularly" Blass[1] calls it. But it is just the classic mingling of two constructions seen in the more usual form in Ac. 14:22, where a change is made from the inf. to **ὅτι** and **δεῖ**. Different verbs had varying histories in the matter of **ὅτι**. It was not a mere alternative with many. With **ἀκούω**, for instance, **ὅτι** is the usual idiom. The same thing is true with **γινώσκω, οἶδα, λέγω, νομίζω, πιστεύω**. But with **φημί**, in classical Greek almost always with the infinitive (Ro. 3:8), we twice have **ὅτι** (1 Cor. 10:19; 15:50). For **ὅτι** and then the inf. see Mk. 8:28 f. The substantive nature of the **ὅτι** clause is well shown in 1 Th. 3:6. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 159) cites **ὅτι-ὑπάρχειν** from Proklus' *In rem publ.*, II, 225, 22. The **ὅτι** clause is often called an object clause and may be in the nominative or in the accusative.

(β) *The Infinitive.* With some verbs we have only single instances of the infinitive of indir. discourse in the N. T. So with **βοάω** (Ac. 25:24); **γινώσκω** (Heb. 10:34); **καταλαμβάνομαι** (Ac. 25:25); **ἡγέομαι** (Ph. 3:8); **νοέω** (Heb. 11:3). **Ἀποκρίνομαι** has it only thrice (Lu. 20:7; Ac. 25:4). See also **ἀπαγγέλλω** (Ac. 12:14); **ἀπαρνέομαι** (Lu. 22:34); **διισχυρίζομαι** (Ac. 12:15); **δηλόω** (Heb. 9:8); **ἐπαγγέλλομαι** (Mk. 14:11; Ac. 7:5); **ἐπιμαρτύρομαι** (1 Pet. 5:12); **κατακρίνω** (Mk. 14:64); **μαρτυρέω** (Ac. 10:43); **προαιτιάομαι** (Ro. 3:9); **προκαταγγέλλω** (Ac. 3:18); **σημαίνω** (Ac. 11:28); **χρηματίζω** (Lu. 2:26). Some of these are words that are not used with any construction very often, some occur only with the infinitive, like **ἐπιδεικνύω** (Ac. 18:28); **προσδοκάω** (Ac. 3:5; 28 6); **ὑποκρίνομαι** (Lu. 20:20); **ὑπονοέω** (Ac. 13:25; 27:27). There is, besides, the inf. with **βούλομαι, θέλω, κελεύω**, etc., more exactly the simple object inf. Other verbs that have occasionally the inf. are in the list given under (a), those with either **ὅτι** or the inf. like **ἀρνέομαι**, (Heb. 11:24); **γράφω** (Ac. 18:27); **δεικνύω** (Ac. 10:28); **διδάσκω** (Lu. 11:1); **διαμαρτύρομαι** (Ac. 18:5); **διανοίγω** (Ac. 16:14. Cf. **τοῦ** in Lu. 24:45); **εὐαγγελίζομαι** (Ac. 14:15), **συμβουλεύω** (Rev. 3:18). In Luke and Paul the inf. of indir. discourse is fairly common with **λέγω** (Lu. 9:18, 20, etc. Cf. Mt. 12:24; Mk. 3:28) and with **νομίζω** (Lu. 2:44; Ac. 7:25, etc.).

In the old Greek the inf. was the favourite construction in indirect discourse.[2] The Latin had it in all its glory, but the gradual disappearance of the inf. from late Greek made it wither away. Indeed, it was a comparatively late development in Greek

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 233.
[2] Cf. Goodwin, M, and T., p. 267.

anyhow and is rare in Homer.[1] It is not easy to draw the line between **βούλομαι** and **κελεύω** with the inf. on the one hand and **λέγω** and **νομίζω** with the inf. on the other.[2] At bottom the construction is the same. The question of the case of the substantive or adjective used with this inf. is not vital to the idiom. It is really a misnomer to call it "the accusative and infinitive." That is, in fact, more frequently the case found with this inf., but it is so, not because the idiom calls for it *per se,* but simply because the infinitive can have no subject, not being a finite verb (cf. the participle). Hence when a noun (not the object) occurs with the inf. in indir. discourse it is put in the accusative of general reference, if there is no word in the sentence in another case for it naturally to agree with by apposition. This matter was discussed under Cases, but will bear some repetition at this point since it is so often misunderstood. Clyde[3] correctly sees that, since the inf. itself is in a case and is non-finite, it cannot have a subject. Monro[4] thinks that the accusative was a late development to assist the "virtual" predication of the later inf. Sometimes this acc. itself is the direct object of the principal verb (so verbs of asking, ad.). Gildersleeve has a pertinent word: "I look with amazement at the retention [by Cauer in his *Grammatica Militans*] of Curtius' utterly unsatisfactory, utterly inorganic explanation of the acc. c. inf. in *oratio obliqua*, against which I protested years ago (*A. J. P.*, XVII, 1890, 517): **ἤγγειλαν ὅτι ὁ Κῦρος ἐνίκησε** becomes **ἔγγειλαν τὸν Κῦρον ὅτι ἐνίκησεν**, but **ὅτι ἐνίκησεν=νικῆσαι**" (*A. J. P.*, XXXIII, 4, p. 489). To go no further, Gildersleeve shows that the **ὅτι** construction is *later* than the acc. c. inf. But the grammarians went astray and called this accusative the "subject" of the inf., and, when some other case appears with the inf., it is an "exception" to the rules of the grammarians, though in perfect harmony with the genius of the Greek inf. Even Moulton[5] says: "In classical Greek, as any fifth-form boy forgets at his peril, the nominative is used regularly instead of the accusative as subject to the infinitive when the subject of the main verb is the same." Now, there is no doubt about the presence of the nominative in such an instance. But why say "instead of the accusative"? The nominative is normal and natural in such a construction. This construction probably, almost certainly, antedated the accusative with the inf.[6] We still

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 162.
[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 269.
[3] Gk. Synt., p. 139.
[4] Hom. Gr., p. 162.
[5] Prol., p. 212.
[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 162.

meet it in the N. T. The oldest idiom was to have no noun with the inf., as in Lu. 24:23, ἦλθαν λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι. The context makes it perfectly clear that the word ὀπτασίαν is the object of ἑωρακέναι and the rest is matter of easy inference. Cf. Ac. 26:9 (with δεῖν); Jas. 2:14; 1 Jo. 2:6, 9; Tit. 1:16. In the majority of cases in the N. T. the noun is not repeated or referred to in the predicate. So in Lu. 20:7 we have ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι, but in Ac. 25:4 **Φῆστος** ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν **Παῦλον** εἰς **Καισαρίαν,** ἑαυτὸν δὲ μέλλειν. It is easy to see why **Παῦλον** has to be in the acc. if expressed at all. We could have had αὐτός rather than ἑαυτόν which probably is just co-ordinated with **Παῦλον**. Cf. κριτὴς εἶναι in Ac. 18:15; Mt. 19:21 τέλειος εἶναι, Ph. 4:11 ἔμαθον αὐτάρκης εἶναι, where the principle is the same, though not technically indirect discourse; it is the predicate nominative. So with βούλομαι, θέλω, ζητέω, etc. The personal construction is a good illustration of the nominative. Cf. Heb. 11:4, ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος. The nominative occurs also in Ro. 1:22, φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί. See further Ro. 9:3; 1 Cor. 3: 18; 8:2; 14:37; 2 Cor. 10:2; Heb. 5:12; Jas. 1:26; Jo. 7:4 (W. H. text). In a case like Lu. 20:20 δικαίους εἶναι is inevitable because of ὑποκρινομένους. But there are a good many examples in the N. T. where the nominative could have been properly retained and where the accusative has crept in, perhaps owing to a tendency towards uniformity rather than to any special Latin influence as Blass supposed.[1] Moulton[2] notes the same tendency in the κοινή outside of Latin influence. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 249) refers to AEschylus, P. V. 268 f., with the note of Sykes and Wynne-Wilson, and to Adam's note on Plato, *Apol.*, 36 B., for classical examples of acc. with inf. where nom. could have occurred. Cf. Ro. 6:11, ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκρούς. It is rare in the classical Greek for the accusative to occur in such sentences.[3] The N. T. undoubtedly shows an increase of the ace. where the nominative was the rule for the older Greek. So Ro. 2:19, πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, where αὐτός (cf. Ro. 9:3) would have been sufficient. Cf. also Ac. 5:36 (cf. 8:9) λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν, (Ph. 3:13) ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὔπω λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι, (Heb. 10:34) γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοὺς κρείσσονα ὕπαρξιν, (Eph. 4:22) ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς (some distance from the verb ἐδιδάχθητε). See also Ac. 21:1; Ro. 1:20 f. Blass, p. 238, thinks that in 2 Cor. 7:11 the class. Greek would have had ὄντας, not εἶναι. Even so, but the N. T. has

[1] Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 238 f.
[2] Prol., p. 212 f. [3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237.

εἶναι. An example like Lu. 20:20 (see above) is hardly pertinent, since the participle on which the inf. depends is itself in the accusative. Cf. 6:4.[1] In Ac. 25:21, **τοῦ Παύλου ἐπικαλεσαμένου τηρεῖσθαι αὐτόν** the pronoun could have been assimilated to the case of **Παύλου** (**αὐτοῦ**). So also in Lev. 2:9; 3:9, **τῶν λεγόντων Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτούς** (different order in 3:9). We find the same lack of assimilation in Ac. 22:17, **μοι—μου--με**, and in 25:27 **μοι—πέμποντα** and in Heb. 2:10 **αὐτῷ—ἀγαγόντα**. In 2 Pet. 3:3, **γινώσκοντες** is clue to anacoluthon (cf. 1:20) as with **ἀπέχεσθαι—ἔχοντες** (1 Pet. 2:11 f.) and with **στελλόμενοι** (2 Cor. 8:20). So Lu. 1:74 **ἡμῖν ῥυσθέντας**, 5:7 **μετέχοις ἐλθόντας**. The Greek of the N. T. did sometimes have assimilation of case as in Ac. 16:21, **ἃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδέχεσθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν Ῥωμαίοις οὖσιν**. So also 15:25, **ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκλεξαμένοις** (**–ους** margin of W. H.) **πέμψαι** (cf. accusative retained in verse 22, **ἐκλεξαμένους**). Cf. also Lu. 1:3; 9:59; 2 Pet. 2:21. Contrast **ἔδοξέ μοι** of Lu. 1:3 with **ἔξοξα ἐμαυτῷ** of Ac. 26:9. The same situation applies to the cases with the articular infinitive. Cf. Mt. 26:32, **μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω**. Here the **με** is not necessary and **αὐτός** could have been used. So with Lu. 2:4, **διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτόν**. The **αὐτόν** is superfluous, as in Heb. 7:24.[2] Cf. Lu. 10:35, **ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι**. See further Lu. 1:57; 2:21; 24:30; Ac. 18:3. It is easy to show from this use of the articular inf. that the inf. has no proper "subject." The accusative is due to other reasons. Take Lu. 2:27, **ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν**, where the context makes plain that **παιδίον** is the object of **εἰσαγαγεῖν** and **γονεῖς** the acc. of general reference. The article **τῷ** must be considered in explaining this instance. Cf. Lu. 18: 5; Ac. 1:3; 27:4; Heb. 5:12 (three accusatives in W. H.'s text). The acc. with the inf. was normal when the substantive with the inf. was different from the subject of the principal verb. Cf. Ro. 3:8, **φασίν τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν ὅτι** (note inf. after **φημί**, and **ὅτι** after **λέγω**, but it is recitative **ὅτι**. In Lu. 24:23, **λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν** we see **λέγω** with the acc. and inf. Typical examples are seen in Mt. 17:4, **καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι** Ac. 12:14; 14:19; 16:13; 24:15; 1 Pet. 3:17; 5:12; 1 Cor. 14:5; Heb. 9:8. See further Verbal Aspects of Inf., (d), in next chapter.

The tense of the original is preserved in the inf. as a rule. A case like Mt. 14:7, **ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσηται**, may

[1] See also Lu. 23:2, **λέγοντα αὐτὸν εἶναι.**

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 212. Cf. Zeitlin, The Accusative with Inf. and some Kindred Constr. in Eng. (1908).

seem a bit disconcerting since in the direct discourse in Mk. 6:23 we find δώσω. But the future is aoristic anyhow. The line between indir. discourse and the simple object inf. is not sharply drawn. Cf. Ac. 23:12. In Lu. 20:6, πεπεισμένος γάρ ἐστιν Ἰωάνην προφήτην εἶναι, the inf. represents ἦν of the direct. There was no help for this, since there is no imperfect inf. The future inf. in indir. discourse is rare, but see Jo. 21:25; Ac. 23:30 (see Tenses). Examples of the perfect inf. in this idiom occur in Ac. 12:14; 14:19; 16:27; 25:25; Heb. 9:8. Cf, **ὁμολογεῖ εἰληφέναι,** P. Oxy. 37 (A.D. 49).

There is little more to say. The use of **τοῦ** and the inf. as subject has been noted (pp. 996, 1002). See **τοῦ ἐλθεῖν**, Lu. 17:1, where **τὰ σκάνδαλα** is the acc. of general reference while this genitive inf. is itself in the nominative case. See also Ac. 10:25. We do not have **ἄν** with the inf. in indir. discourse. In 2 Cor. 10: 9, **ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν**, we have **ὡς ἄν**='as if.' It is not the **ἄν** in apodosis. Nestle in his N. T. gives at 1 Pet. 5:8 **ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν**, but surely **τινὰ** is the correct accent. W. H. places even this in the margin. Souter prints **τινὰ**, departing from R. V. which has **τινα**. But Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 147) cites Callinicus in *Vita Hypatii*, 57, 12, **ποῦ εὑρεῖν**, and 113, 11, **τί ποιῆσαι** (cf. German *Was tun*?). It may be worth while to add that frequently we meet an inf. dependent on an inf. (cf. inf. on part. in Lu. 20:20). I have noticed the idiom in Luke, Paul, Mk., Heb. Cf. Lu. 6:12, **ἐξελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι**, where the first is in indirect discourse, and Ac. 18:2, **διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους**, where the second is indirect discourse (indir. command). Cf. Ro. 15:8.

(γ) *The Participle*. Middleton[1] suggests that the use of the participle in indir. discourse is older than the inf. This may be true, since in the Sanskrit it developed much more rapidly than the inf. But there were cross-currents at work in indirect discourse. Just as the inf. was circumscribed by the declarative **ὅτι**, so the participle was limited by **ὅτι** or the infinitive. Thus verbs of showing (**δείκνυμι, δηλόω**) and of manifesting (**φανερόω**) no longer occur with the participle in the N. T. However, we have the participle with **φαίνομαι** ('appear'), as in Mt. 6:16. Besides, the participle has disappeared from use with **αἰσθάνομαι, μανθάνω, μέμνημαι, συνίημι**. The participles with **μανθάνω** in 1 Tim. 5:13 are additional statements, as the Revised Version correctly translates. With the inf. **μανθάνω** means 'to learn how,' not 'to learn that.'

[1] Analogy in Synt., p. 64.

Cf. Ph. 4:11; Tit. 3:14. But some verbs in the N. T. still have the participle in indir. discourse. They are verbs of perception by the senses (hearing, seeing, knowing). In the ancient Greek the nominative was used when the participle referred to the subject of the verb. Thus **ὁρῶ ἡμαρτηκώς** meant 'I see that I have sinned.' In the N. T., however, we have declarative **ὅτι** in such clauses (Mk. 5:29; 1 Jo. 3:14).[1] Viteau[2] rightly insists on a real difference between the participial conception and the declarative **ὅτι** or the inf. If the idea is one of intellectual apprehension merely, an opinion or judgment, we have **ὁρῶ ὅτι** (Jas. 2:24). If it is a real experience, the participle occurs as in Mk. 8:24, **ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας**. So in Ac. 8:23, his **εἰς σύνδεσμον ὁρῶ σε ὄντα**. There is something in this distinction. Cf. **βλέπω ὅτι** (Jas. 2:22), but the participle in Heb. 2:9, **Ἰησοῦν ἐστεφανωμένον**. In Mk. 8:24 we have **ὅτι** with **βλέπω** and the part. with **ὁρῶ**. The realistic quality of the part. is finely brought out in Mk. 9:1, **ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει.** Note the tense as in Lu. 10:18, **ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν—πεσόντα**. Cf. 9:49; 21:20; Ac. 11:13; 17:16. See Jo. 19:33, **ὡς εἶδον ἤδη αὐτὸν τεθνηκότα.** The tense of the direct is preserved. See for **θεωρέω**, Mk. 16:4 and Lu. 24:39, **καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα**. For **ἐπίσταμαι** take Ac. 15:7 and 24:10. Cf. also **μνημονεύω** with **ὅτι**. (Ac. 20:31) and the part. (2 Tim. 2:8). It is very clear in **εὑρίσκω** (see **ὅτι** in Ro. 7:21) which, as in classic Greek, is commonly used with the participle. See Mt. 1:18; 12:44; Lu. 23:2; Ac. 9:2. In Mt. 1:18 we have the passive construction **εὑρέθη ἔχουσα**. In Lu. 23:2 we find three participles. **Δοκιμάζω** in the N. T. has only the inf. (Ro. 1:28) and the participle (2 Cor. 8:22). So with **ἡγέομαι** (Ph. 2:6; 3:7). Cf. also **ἔχε με παρῃτημένον** (Lu. 14:18). In 2 Jo. 7 note the part. with **ὁμολογέω**. In verse 4, **περιπατοῦντας** with **εὑρίσκω**, the case agrees only in sense with **ἐκ τῶν τέκνων**. The difference between **ὅτι** with **οἶδα** (Ac. 23: 5) and the part. is clear (2 Cor. 12:2), though this is the only instance of the part. with this verb. It prefers **ὅτι**, but may have the inf. (Lu. 4:41). The difference is even clearer in **γινώσκω**. See **ὅτι** in Mt. 21:45, the inf. in Heb. 10:34. The usual idiom is **ὅτι**, but note Lu. 8:46, **ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ**, where Christ thus graphically describes the terrible nervous loss from his healing work. He felt the power "gone" out of him. In our vernacular we speak of a sense of "goneness." See also Ac. 19:35; Heb. 13:23. But see Mk. 5:29, **ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἴαται**.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 246. [2] Le Verbe, p. 531f.

Mk. 5:30 ἐπιγινώσκω has the attributive participle after it. Ἀκούω also occurs with declarative ὅτι (Mt. 5:21; 32 times), the inf. (Jo. 12:18; 1 Cor. 11:18) or the part. (Ac. 7:12; 14: 9; 3 Jo. 4; 2 Th. 3:11, etc.). These examples have the accusative when the thing is understood. Blass[1] curiously calls the acc. incorrect in Ac. 9:4; 26:14. The genitive with φωνή does occur in 11:7; 22:7. Blass has an overrefinement on this point. As with the acc. construction of the part. with ἀκούω, so most of the genitive examples are found in the Acts. So 2:6; 6:11; 14:9, etc. But see also Mk. 12:28, ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων. So 14:58; Lu. 18:36; Jo. 1:37. The perfect part. in this construction is seen in Lu. 8:46; Jo. 19:33, etc. For the aorist see Lu. 10:18. In Mk. 6:8 we have *oratio variata*. The sentence starts with ἵνα and concludes with the inf. Hence the part. ὑποδεδεμένους is construed with the inf. See the acc. part. in Rev. 4:4 as explained by εἶδον in verse 1, though ἰδού and the nominative have come between.

(δ) **Καὶ ἐγένετο**. One hardly knows whether to treat this construction as indirect discourse or not. It is a clear imitation of the Hebrew וַיְהִי and is common in the LXX with two constructions. It is either καὶ ἐγένετο καί with finite verb (or ἐγένετο δέ) as in Gen. 24:30; 29:13; Josh. 5:1, etc.), or we have asyndeton, καὶ ἐγένετο plus finite verb (Gen. 22:1; 24:45, etc.). For ἐγένετο we often find ἐγενήθη (1 Sam. 4:1; 11:1, etc.). This asyndeton is also common in the future as καὶ ἔσται with finite verb (Is. 9:16; 10:20, 27, etc.). This καὶ ἔσται construction is quoted a few times in the N. T. (Ac. 2:17, 21; Ro. 9:26) from the LXX. For καὶ ἔσται καί see Ex. 13:11 f. W. F. Moulton[2] has pointed out that the idiom occurs when the principal sentence has some note of time. J. H. Moulton[3] quotes Driver (*Tenses*, § 78) as describing the וַיְהִי construction in a similar fashion, "a clause specifying the circumstances under which an action takes place." All the examples of these two constructions in Luke fit this description. Luke has in the Gospel eleven of the καὶ ἐγένετο καί examples and twenty-two of the καί ἐγένετο type. For καὶ ἐγένετο καί see Lu. 17:11; without the second καί 17:14. See in particular Lu. 8 and 9. It is frequently the case that Luke has ἐν τῷ and the inf. with the idiom. So 9:51, ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι—καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστήρισεν. Here καὶ is almost equivalent to ὅτι. So καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι—εἶπέν τις (11:1). We have καὶ ἐγένετο καί also in

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 246.
[2] W.-M., p. 760, n. 2. [3] Prol., p. 16.

Mt. 9:10. The form **καὶ ἐγένετο** Moulton[1] counts outside of Luke only twice in Mark and five times in Matthew with the phrase **ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν**. Cf. Mt. 7:28. Moulton is concerned to show against Dalman that the idiom is not Semitic. He admits the Hebraism in **καὶ ἐγένετο καί**, but doubts as to **καὶ ἐγένετο** (asyndeton). But surely the LXX has left its mark in this point also. The LXX does not have **ἐγένετο** (or **γίνεται**) and the infinitive (but cf. 2 Macc. 3:16 **ἦν — τιτρώσκεσθαι**). In the N. T. we find it in Mt. 18:13; Mk. 2:15; five times in Luke and seventeen times in Acts. Cf. **ὑμῖν γίνοιτο κρατεῖν**, P. Par. 26 (B.C. 163-2). The other two constructions are absent from the Acts, showing that in the Gospel Luke was more directly using Semitic sources or imitating the LXX on the point. But even inf. with **ἐγένετο** is not ancient Greek, which used **συνέβη**. We have **συνέβη** and the inf. in Ac. 21:35. The modern Athenian vernacular has **συνέβη ὅτι** on while the country districts[2] use **ἔτυχε νά**. Moulton finds the inf. with **γίνεται** in the papyri and rightly in the vernacular **κοινή** the origin of this idiom. There is no essential difference between the inf. with **γίνεται** and **ἐγένετο**. Cf. Ac. 9:32; 16:16; 9:32, 37, 43; 11:26, etc. Outside of Luke (Gospel and Acts) the inf. with **ἐγένετο** is confined to Mk. 2:23, which Moulton calls "a primitive assimilation of Lu. 6:1." See Ac. 10:25, **ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν**. This is Moulton's presentation, which is certainly more just than the mere description of "Hebraism" for all these constructions.[3] We do not have the **ὅτι** clause with **γίνεται** or **ἐγένετο** in the N. T.

(g) Indirect Questions.

(a) *Tense*. See (c) under Indirect Discourse. It may here be simply stated that when the principal verb is primary no change in tense occurs. When it is secondary, still no change appears as a rule, though occasionally one does see it, as in, Jo. 2:25; 6:6; 18:32. But note **ἐπυνθάνετο ποῦ γεννᾶται** (Mt. 2:4); **ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται** (Mk. 15:47). Cf. Ac. 10:18. Note difference between present perfect in Mk. 15:44 and the aorist in the same verse. For the future ind. see Jo. 21:19; Mk. 11:13.

(β) *Mode*. It is only necessary to say that as a rule the same mode is retained in the indirect question that was in the direct. Thus see Mk. 5:14; 15:47; Lu. 8:36; 23:55; Ac. 10:29, where the indicative occurs. We have the ind. after secondary as well as primary tenses. This is the common idiom in the N. T. as in

[1] Ib. [2] Ib., p. 17.
[3] As in Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 142

the κοινή. In all instances where a subj. appears in this construction it is due to the fact that the subj. would have been present in the direct (deliberative subj.). Note τί φάγωμεν; in Mt. 6:31 and τί φάγητε (6:25). See also ποῦ μένεις; of Jo. 1:38 and εἶδαν ποῦ μένει of verse 39 for the retention of the indicative. The Latin changed the ind. to the subj. in indirect questions, but the Greek did not. This deliberative subj. occurs after primary tenses as in Lu. 9:58, οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ, and after secondary tenses also as in Mk. 9:16, οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἀποκριθῇ. Cf. also Mk. 6:36; Lu. 5:19; 12:36. So also the optative occurs a few times where it was in the direct. This is the construction with ἄν which has already been discussed twice. See Ac. 17:18, τί ἂν θέλοι, for the direct form, and Lu. 1:62, τί ἂν θέλοι, for the indirect. Cf. Lu. 9:46; Ac. 5:24. In 2 Tim. 2:25, μή ποτε δῴη (W. H. have δώῃ in margin), we have the optative without ἂν after a primary tense if δῴη be correct. Moulton[1] considers the subj. here a "syntactical necessity." We heed not moralize, therefore, on this instance of the optative even if it is genuine. Radermacher (*Neut. Gr.*, p. 132) shows that the Atticists frequently used the opt. after a primary tense, as copyists often fail to catch the spirit of a thing. The papyri (*ib.*) have some illustrations of the same idiom. The other examples of the opt. in indirect questions are all after secondary tenses and the change is made from an indicative or a subj. to the optative. These examples all occur in Luke. As instances of the opt. where the direct had the incl. see Lu. 1: 29; 3:15; 18:36. See Ac. 21:33 for both modes. In Ac. 17: 27, εἰ ἄραγε ψηλαφήσειαν, the opt. represents a subj. with ἐάν after a primary tense. So in Ac. 27:12. In no instance where the opt. without ἄν occurs in the indirect discourse is it necessary. In all these examples the indicative or the subj. could have been retained. The infinitive with τίνα in 1 Pet. 5:8 is read by Nestle, but not by W. H. or Souter. See under (f),(β).

(γ) *Interrogative Pronouns and Conjunctions Used.* One notes at once the absence of ὅστις in this construction, the common classic idiom. We do have ὅτι once in Ac. 9:6, λαληθήσεταί σοι ὅτι σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. Elsewhere the most usual pronoun is τίς and τί as in Ac. 10:29; 21:33. We even have τίς τί ἄρῃ in Mk. 15:24 (double interrogative). Tischendorf reads τίς τί in Lu. 19:15, but W. H. have only τί. Thin double use appears rarely in the older Greek.[2] As a rule the distinction between τίς and ὅς is pre-

[1] Prol., pp. 55, 193. Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 134.
[2] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 68.

served in indirect questions, as in Jo. 13:24 (cf. 13:12). The occasional confusion between **τίς** and **ὅς** was discussed under Pronouns. See 1 Tim. 1:7 and Jas. 3:13. Now and then the simple relative pronoun or adverb is used in an indirect question, as was true of classical Greek also. So Mk. 5:19 f. **ὅσα**, Lu. 8:47 **δι᾽ ἣν αἰτίαν**, Ac. 15:14 **καθώς**, 1 Th. 1:5 **οἷοι,** and the various examples of **ὡς** discussed in connection with Indirect Assertions (Lu. 8:47; Ac. 10:28, 38, etc.) which are more likely to be understood in the sense of 'how,' and so indirect questions. Cf. Lu. 6:3 f. (**ὅ** and **ὡς**), Mt. 10:19 (**δοθήσεται πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε**) Lu. 17:8 (**τί**). Other interrogative words used are **ποῦ** (Mt. 2:4), **πόθεν** (Jo. 8:14), **ποῖος** (Rev. 3:3), **πότε** (Lu. 12:36), **πῶς** (Lu. 8:36), **πηλίκος** (Gal. 6:11), **πόσος** (Mt. 16:9), **ποταπός** (Lu. 1:29). The correlative words, besides the lone instance of **ὅτι** in Ac. 9:6, are **ὅπως** (Lu. 24:20), **ὁποῖος** (1 Th. 1:9). In Mk. 14:14 (Lu. 22:11) **ποῦ—ὅπου φάγω**; most likely the **ὅπου** clause is an indirect question with the deliberative subj., but it may be the volitive subj. simply. There are plenty of instances of **εἰ** in indirect questions (see Conditional Sentences) as in Mk. 15:44 after **θαυμάζω** and **ἐπερωτάω**; Lu, 14:28 after **ψηφίζω**; 14:31 after **βουλεύομαι**; Mt. 26:63 after **εἶπον**; 27:49 after **ὁράω**; Mk. 3:2 after **παρατηρέω**; Jo. 9:25 after **οἶδα**; Ac. 4:19 after **κρίνω**; 10:18 after **πυνθάνομαι**; 19:2 after **ἀκούω**; 2 Cor. 2:9 after **γινώσκω**; 13:5 after **πειράζω**. There are, besides, those passages[1] where a word is suppressed, like Mk. 11:13; Eph. 3:2; Ph. 3:12; 2 Th. 2:15. See also the optative with **εἰ** in Ac. 17:27; 25:20; 27:12. This is all quite classical and gives no trouble. We find **μή** also used like an indirect question after **σκοπέω** (cf. p. 995) with the ind. (Lu. 11:35) and **μή ποτε** after **διαλογίζομαι** with the opt. (Lu. 3:15). In Jo. 7:17 an alternative indirect question occurs with **πότερον—ἤ.** The only other alternative construction in an indirect question is in 2 Cor. 12 : 2 f. after **οἶδα**, and is **εἴτε--εἴτε**. In all these points the N. T. is in harmony with the **κοινή**. The use of **τί** with the subj. (Mk. 6:36) or the future ind. (Ac. 25:26 possibly subj. aor.) may be compared with **ποῦ** after **ἔχω** in Lu. 9:58. In Col. 4:6 **πῶς** after **εἰδέναι** is to be distinguished from the use of the inf. after **οἶδα** ('know how to do.' Cf. Lu. 11:13). In Mk. 2:24, **ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν**; the **ἴδε** is probably just the interjection as in Mt. 25:25. For the acc. and the ind. question side by side see Mt. 16:9.

(δ) *The Article with Indirect Questions*. This classical idiom

[1] Cf. Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 62.

appears in Luke and Paul. See **τὸ τί** (Lu. 1:62), **τὸ τίς** (9:46), **τὸ πῶς** (22:4). So Paul has **τὸ πῶς** in 1 Th. 4:1 and **τὸ τί** in Ro. 8:26 (cf. **τί τό** in 8:27). See also 22:23 f.; Ac. 4:21; 22:30. The substantive nature of the indirect question is well shown also in Jo. 4:10. Cf. Lu. 24:19 f.

(h) **Indirect Command.** As already explained, this construction is somewhat vague and the line is hard to draw between this and other idioms.

(a) *Deliberative Question*. A direct command may be turned into a deliberative question in the indirect with the subjunctive. The volitive idea of the imperative thus glides into the deliberative. In Lu. 12:5, **ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν, κτλ.**, we have the point illustrated both in the direct (imperative) and the indirect (deliberative subj.). Here the only difference between the two forms is the accent. Cf. **μὴ φοβηθῆτε** in verse 4. In Mt. 10:28 we have **φοβεῖσθε**. Obviously this is a natural, though not very frequent, turn for the Command to take.

(β) *The Conjunctions* **ἵνα** *and* **ὅπως**. These may be used after verbs of commanding and beseeching. This idiom does not differ clearly from the sub-final construction. It is a species of purpose (or sub-final. See Final Clauses). The examples there given might suffice, but note the following: Mk. 6:8 **παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν**, Mt. 16:20 **ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν**, 2 Th. 3:12 **παραγγέλλομεν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ ἵνα—ἐσθίωσιν**, Ac. 25:3 **αἰτούμενοι ὅπως μεταπέμψηται**. See further Mt. 8:34; Lu. 16:27; 1 Cor. 1:10. In Lu. 16:27 f. we have the purely final idea in both **ὅπως** and **ἵνα** which are subordinate to the first **ἵνα** after **ἐρωτῶ**. But we cannot follow this use of **ἵνα** after **θέλω** and such verbs where it is more or less purely objective. The recitative **ὅτι** with the imperative in 2 Th. 3:10 is not an instance of indirect command, but simply the direct command preserved.

(γ) *The Infinitive*. It seems more obvious and is still common in the **κοινή**, though retreating before **ἵνα**. The negative is, of course, **μή**. This use of the infinitive must not be confounded with the idiom for indirect assertion (declarative) as in Mk. 12:18, **οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι**. Note Ac. 21:21, **λέγων μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν**, where we have prohibition, not assertion (note incidentally the two Accusatives) with **λέγων** (same verb as above). So also 23:12, **λέγοντες μήτε φαγεῖν μήτε πεῖν**. Cf. 21:4. Simple enough is the construction after **εἶπα** in Lu. 9:54, **εἴπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι**; See also Mk. 8:

7. In Mt. 16:12, **συνῆκαν ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν** (cf. **προσέχετε** in verses 6 and 11), we have the declarative **ὅτι** and the indicative followed by the inf. in indirect command. In im. 2:26, **ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον**, the construction is like that of indirect command, but the sense comes nearer to the mere object infinitive. See the direct **δώσω** in Mk. 6:23 reproduced in the indirect by **δοῦναι** (Mt. 14:7). There is a certain amount of freedom taken in such transference to the indirect. In Ac. 18:2, **διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας**, the inf. is dependent on an inf. Other instances of the inf. in indir. command are seen in Ac. 25:24, **βοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν,** 26:20, **ἀπήγγελλον μετανοεῖν**. In 2 Th. 3:6 we have **παραγγέλλομεν στέλλεσθαι**, while in verse 12 we have **ἵνα**. In verse 10 the direct quotation follows this same verb. In Mk. 6:8 f. we have both **ἵνα μὴ αἴρωσιν** and **μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι** (marg. of W. H., **Μὴ ἐνδύσησθε**) after **παρήγγειλεν**. Luke (9:3-5) gives it all in the direct form. In 2 Th. 3:14, **τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε, μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ**, the inf. is not in indirect command, but rather the inf. used in the direct as the equivalent of the imperative. But in 1 Cor. 5:11, **ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι** (so also verse 9), we de have indirect command.

(i) **Mixture**. Strictly this point belongs to the chapter on Figures of Speech (cf. also, *Oratio Variata*, The Sentence), but a word is called for here. We have mixture of several sorts as in the classic Greek. In Ac. 19:1 f., **Παῦλον ἐλθεῖν καὶ εὑρεῖν, εἶπέν τε**, we have the infinitive (object-clause subject of **ἐγένετο**) and the finite clause **εἶπέν τε** side by side. Cf. Ac. 4:5 f. for inf. followed by **καί** and the indicative. So in Lu. 9:19 we have the infinitive construction and the **ὅτι** construction side by side after **ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν**. In Ac. 14:22, **παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει καὶ ὅτι**—**δεῖ**, the construction glides from the inf. into **ὅτι**. In Ro. 3:8 the recitative **ὅτι** is dependent on the inf. **λέγειν** after **φασίν**. In Ac. 9:27, **διηγήσαντο πῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ, καὶ πῶς κτλ**., we have a change from ind. question to indirect assertion and then back again to indirect question. The change may be from the indirect to the direct as in Ac. 1:4, **περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου**. Cf. also 23:22. See also Jo. 12:29. This change appears in Mk. 6:8 f., if the true text is **ἐνδύσησθε**. But the change may be just the reverse, from the direct to the indirec is in Ac. 23: 23, **εἶπεν Ἑτοιμάσατε—κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι**. In 27:10 **ὅτι** occurs with the inf., a mixture of the **ὅτι** and the infinitive constructions in indirect assertions. This use of **ὅτι** with the inf. appears in.

classic Attic (cf. Xen., *Cyr*., 1, 6, 18, etc.). See Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 570. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 213) gives a papyrus example, 0. P. 237 (ii/A.D.), δηλῶν ὅτι εἰ τὰ ἀληθῆ φανείη μηδὲ κρίσεως δεῖσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα. See further Winer-Moulton, p. 426.

(j) **The Subordinate Clause**. A complex sentence may be quoted in indirect discourse as readily as the simple sentence. This principal clause follows the usual laws already discussed. Secondary tenses of the indicative in the subordinate clause suffer no change at all in mood or tense.[1] This is obviously true after primary tenses, as in Gal. 4:15, μαρτυρῶ ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰ δυνατόν --ἐδώκατέ μοι. Here the copula ἦν is suppressed. In Lu. 19:15 note εἶπεν φωνηθῆναι—οἷς δεδώκει. So after primary tenses the primary tense follows, as in Mk. 11:23, λέγω ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ--ἔσται αὐτῷ. Cf. Ac. 25:14 f. But even after secondary tenses the rule is to retain the tense and mode of the direct much more than in the Attic where the mode was quite optional.[2] See Lu. 9:33, εἶπεν μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει. Another example of the relative clause appears in Mt. 18:25, ἐκέλευσεν—πραθῆναι—καὶ ὅσα ἔχει. Even after a condition of the second class the primary tense may be retained, as in Lu. 7 39, ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνὴ ἥτις ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν. For a causal sentence see ἐκωλύομεν αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν (Lu. 9:49). A temporal clause with the subjunctive appears in Mt. 14:22, ἠνάγκασεν—προάγειν—ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ. See also Ac. 23:12 ἀνεθεμάτισαν—ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωσιν In 25:16, however, we have the optative in the subordinate clause of time with πρὶν ἢ (ἔχοι, λάβοι), after ἀπεκρίθην, the sole example. It is in Luke, as one would expect. The change here is from the subj. to the opt. In Lu. 7:43, ὅτι ᾧ, only the subordinate relative clause is given.

10. SERIES OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES. It is interesting to observe how rich the Greek language is in subordinate clauses and how they dovetail into each other. It is almost like an endless chain. The series may run on infinitum and yet all be in perfect conformity to the genius of the language. I have collected quite a number of examples to illustrate this complexity of structure, some of which are here given. A typical one is Mk. 11:23. After λέγω ὅτι we have ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ which has *oratio recta*, but the relative clause proceeds with καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὃ λαλεῖ γίνεται. The relative ὃ λαλεῖ, is the fourth involution of subordinate clauses after λέγω. Cf also Jo. 17:24. A similar multiplicity of subordinate clauses is found in Ac. 25:14-16.

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 273. [2] Ib., p. 272.

After ἀνέθετο λέγων we have *oratio recta*. The first step is the relative clause περὶ οὗ--ἐνεφάνισαν, on which hangs πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθην, which in turn is followed by ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν and that by χαρίζεσθαι, and this again by πρὶν ἢ ἔχοι--λάβοι. The πρὶν ἤ clause is the fifth involution in the *oratio recta*. Cf. also Ac. 3:19 ff. (πρὸς τὸ ἐξαλιφθῆναι, ὅπως ἂν, ὃν δεῖ δέξασθαι, ὧν). In Ac. 11:13 there are five involutions. The complications axe not, of course, always so many. In Lu. 7:39 the *oratio recta* has a series of three (τίς — ἥτις — ὅτι). See the threefold series in Ro. 3:8, καθώς φασίν τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν ὅτι, κτλ. So also Mk. 6:55, περιφέρειν ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἔστιν (infinitive, relative, declarative). So again 1 Cor. 11:23 f. (ὅτι, ᾗ, εἶπεν and *oratio recta*). Here also the ὅ clause is in apposition with the ὅτι clause. Cf. Lu. 19:15 (inf., ἵνα, τί). In Ac. 7:25, ἐνόμιζεν συνιέναι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὅτι, κτλ., we have two forms of indirect assertion (the inf., then ὅτι), one dependent on the other. So also ὅτι follows διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι in Lu. 9:7 f. In 4:10 we have the ὅτι clause and then the articular inf. In Jo. 6:24 the ὅτι clause is subordinate to the ὅτε clause. In 1 Jo. 5:9 we have a ὅτι clause dependent on a ὅτι clause. In Jo. 4:1 we have ὡς — ὅτι—ὅτι. In Mt. 16:20 the sequence is ἵνα—ὅτι. So Jo. 16: 4; 17:23. In Mk. 14:14 we have two cases of *oratio recta*, one dependent on the other. In Lu. 24:7 it is ὡς—ὅτι. Cf. ἵνα — ἵνα in Gal 3:14. In Col. 1:9 the ἵνα clause and the infinitive περιπατῆσαι are parallel. The instances are numerous where one infinitive is dependent on another infinitive. Thus ἐξελθεῖν προσεύξασθαι (Lu. 6:12); δοθῆναι φαγεῖν (8:55); πρὸς τὸ δεῖν προσεύχεσθαι (18:1); διὰ τὸ τεταχέναι **Κ**λαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι, after ἐληλυθότα (Ac. 18:2); δεῖν πρᾶξαι (26:9); γεγενῆσθαι εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι (Ro. 15: 8); κατηρτίσθαι εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι (Heb. 11:3). In Ac. 23:30, μηνυθείσης μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα ἔσεσθαι, the future inf. in indirect discourse is dependent on the participle in the genitive absolute. In Heb. 9:8, τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου πεφανερῶσθαι, the perfect inf. follows the genitive absolute. There are various other combinations. These are given as illustrations. No rules are called for about the using of a series of subordinate clauses. The presence of so many of them in Luke, Paul and Hebrews shows the literary quality of a more periodic structure.

CHAPTER XX

VERBAL NOUNS (**ʾONOMATA TOῩ ʿRHMATOΣ**)

I. Kinship. The finite verb, *verbum finitum* (*das bestimmte Verb*), has now been discussed as adequately as the space in this grammar allows. Originally there was no difference between verb and noun (see Conjugation of the Verb). But gradually there was developed a difference. It was done largely by the help of the pronouns which were added to the verb-stems. Nouns also had their own inflection. But a considerable body of words partook of the nature of both verb and noun and yet did not cut loose from either. In a sense therefore the finite verb is a combination of verb and pronoun while the non-finite verb combines verb and noun. These verbal nouns are the non-finite verb, *verbum infinitum* (*das unbestimmte Verb*).[1] They failed to add the personal pronominal endings of the finite verb and so did not become limited to a subject (finite). And yet they developed tense and voice and were used with the same cases as the finite verb. In so far they are true verbs. On the other hand they are themselves always in a case like other nouns. The verbal substantive comes to drop its inflection (fixed case-form) while the verbal adjective is regularly inflected in the singular and plural of all three genders just like any other adjective. These verbal nouns may be regarded either as hybrids or as cases of arrested development, more properly deflected development, for they continued to develop in a very wonderful way. The Greek of the Attic period would be barren indeed if robbed of the infinitives and the participles. The names are not distinctive, since both are participles[2] (partake of the nature of both verb and noun) and both are non-finite or infinitives (are not limited to a subject by personal endings). The root-difference between these lies not

[1] K.-B1., Bd. II, p. 4.

[2] In K.-G. (Bd. II, p. 1) the ch. begins thus: "Lehre von den Partizipialen; dean Infinitiv and dem Partizipe." Both are "participles" and both are "infinitives."

in the verbal idea, but in the noun. It is the difference between substantive and adjective. Both are verbals both are nouns, but one is a substantive and the other is an adjective. These general remarks may help one to understand the history and usage of both infinitive and participle.

II. The Infinitive (ἡ ἀπαρέμφατος ἔγκλισις or ἀπαρέμφατον ῥῆμα)

1. ORIGIN. There is no real ground for difference of opinion on this subject, however much scholars may argue as to the significance of the infinitive.[1] In the Sanskrit the infinitive did not have tense or voice. The root used was that of a substantive closely connected with a verb.[2] But it is verbal in Sanskrit also in the notion of action, *nomina actionis*. In the Veda and Brahmana the number of these verbal nouns is very large. They are used with cases, the cases corresponding to the verb, but that phenomenon appears in Latin and Greek. In Plautus "we even find the abstract noun *tactio* in the nominative governing its case just as if it were *tangere*. Classical Greek has a few well-known examples of a noun or adjective governing the case appropriate to the verb with which it is closely connected."[2] The same thing occurs in the N. T. also. Cf. **κοινωνία φωτί** (2 Cor. 6:14). See chapter on Cases. These substantives have enough "verbal consciousness " to "govern" cases.[3] In the old Sanskrit these verbal substantives occur in any case (except the vocative, which is not a real case). The later Sanskrit has only one such case-ending so used, the accusative in *–tum* or *–itum* (cf. the Latin supine).[4] But for the developments in other languages, especially in the Greek and Latin, these Sanskrit verbal substantives would not have been called infinitives. But they show beyond controversy the true origin of the infinitive before tense and voice were added. They were originally substantives in any case, which were used as fixed case-forms (cf. adverbs) which had a verbal idea (action), and which were made on verbal roots. The Latin shows three cases used in this way: the locative as in *regere*, the dative as in *regi* and the accusative as in the supine *rectum*.[5] The Greek infinitive shows only two case-endings, the dative —**αι** as in **λῦσαι** (cf. also **δο***F***έναι**, **δοῦναι**, with Sanskrit *davane*; Homeric ***F*ίδμεναι** with Sanskrit *vidmane*) or the

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 297.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 202.
[3] Ib p. 203.
[4] Whitney, Sans. Gr., pp. 347 ff.
[5] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 202; Giles, Man. of Comp. Philol., p. 469; Vogrinz, Gr. d. hom. Dial., 1889, p. 139.

locative in λύειν.[1] Thus in the Greek and Latin it is only oblique cases that were used to form the infinitives.[2] It is then as a substantive that the infinitive makes its start. We see this in the Sanskrit *davane vasunam*= δοῦναι τῶν ἀγαθῶν.[3] This substantive aspect is clearly seen in the use of παντός with τοῦ ζῆν in Heb. 2:15. The first[4] step towards the verbal idea was in the construction δοῦναι τὰ ἀγαθά. Moulton[5] illustrates the border-land of the English inf. by the sentence: "He went out to work again." If we read "hard work" we have a substantive; but if we read "work hard," we have a verbal notion. Strictly speaking, δοῦναι τὰ ἀγαθά= 'for giving the good things,' while ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθά='in seeing the good things.' This was the original etymological sense as the Sanskrit makes clear. See further chapter on Conjugation of Verb.

2. DEVELOPMENT. In the Sanskrit we see the primitive infinitive without tense or voice. In the modern Greek the infinitive, outside of the Pontic dialect, has disappeared save with auxiliary verbs, and even so it is in a mutilated state, as with θέλει λύει, ἤθελεα δεθεῖ, ἔχω δέσει, remnants of the ancient infinitives λύειν, δεθῆναι, δέσαι (Thumb, *Handb*., pp. 162, 167). Between these two extremes comes the history of the rise and fall of the Greek infinitive. We may sketch that history in five periods.[6]

(a) *The Prehistoric Period.* The infinitive is simply a substantive with the strict sense of the dative or locative case. Cf. the Sanskrit. We may infer also that there was no tense or voice. This original epexegetical use of the inf. as the dative of limitation has survived with verbs, substantives and adjectives. So ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν (Lu. 1:57). Cf. our "a wonder to behold." See δύνατι δουλεύειν (Mt. 6:24), ὁρμὴ ὑβρίσαι (Ac. 14:5), ἱκανός λῦσαι (Mk. 1:7). See also Jas. 1:19, ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, where εἰς τὸ reproduces the dative idea.

(b) *The Earliest Historic Period.* The case-form (dative or locative) begins to lose its significance. In Homer the dative idea is still the usual one for the infinitive, in harmony with the form.[7] With verbs of wishing, commanding, expecting, beginning, being able, etc., the dative idea is probably the original explanation of

[1] Cf. Giles (Man., p. 470) for λύ-ειν, and its relation to the Sans. —*san-i*.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 515.
[3] Ib.
[4] Ib.
[5] Prol., p. 203.
[6] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 143, has four. But see Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 188.
[7] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 154.

the idiom. Cf. **οἴδατε διδόναι** (Mt. 7:11), 'knows how to give' (for 'giving'). Homer has **βῆ δ' ἰέναι**= 'stepped' for 'going.' But already in Homer there are signs that the case-form is getting obscured or stereotyped. It occurs as apparent subject with impersonal verbs and as the logical object of verbs of saying in indirect discourse.[1] The use of **πρίν** with the inf. is common also in Homer. **Πρίν** would naturally be used with the ablative, like *pura* and the infinitive in Sanskrit,[2] and so the Greek idiom must have arisen after the dative or locative idea of the inf. in Greek was beginning to fade.[3] In Homer the inf. is already a fixed case-form. The disappearance of **–αι** as a distinct case-ending in Greek may have made men forget that the usual inf. was dative. This dative inf. was probably a survival of the old and once common dative of purpose. Gradually the inf. passed from being merely a word of limitation (epexegetic) to being subject or object. We see the beginning of this process in Homer, though there is only[4] one instance of the article with the inf., and that is in the *Odyssey* (20. 52), **τὸ φυλάσσειν**. But even here **τό** may be demonstrative.[5] But in Homer the inf. has tense and voice, a tremendous advance over the Sanskrit inf. This advance marks a distinct access of the verbal aspect of the inf. But there was no notion of time in the tense of the inf. except in indir. discourse where analogy plays a part and the inf. represents a finite mode.[6] This use of the inf., afterwards so common in Latin, seems to have been developed first in the Greek.[7] But it was the loss of the dative force as an essential factor that allowed the inf. to become distinctly verbalized.[8] As it came to be, it was an imperfect instrument of language. As a verb it lacked person, number and time except in indirect discourse. As a substantive it lacked inflection (without case or number) after it came to be limited to two cases. Even after the case-idea vanished and it was used in various cases it was still indeclinable.[9]

[1] Ib., pp. 157, 159. [2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., § 983.

[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 158. It seems a bit odd to find Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 145) saying of the inf.: "in seiner urspriinglichen Bedeutung als Modus." The inf. is not a mode and the original use was substantival, not verbal.

[4] Monro ib., p. 179.

[5] Birkletn, Entwickelungsgesch. des substantivierten Infin., 1888, p. 2 f.

[6] Monro, Hom. Gk., pp. 158 ff. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 515.

[7] Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, p. 299.

[8] Gildersl. Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, p. 195.

[9] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 568.

The addition of tense and voice to the fixed case-form of the substantive with verbal root was possible just because of the obscuration of the case-idea.

(c) *The Classic Period from Pindar on*. The articular infinitive is often used and there is renewed accent on its substantival aspects. The inf. is freely used with or without the article in any case (except vocative) without any regard to the dative or locative ending. Pindar first uses the neuter article **τό** with the inf. as the subject.[1] "By the assumption of the article it was substantivized again with a decided increment of its power."[2] It is to be remembered, however, that the article itself is a development from the demonstrative and was very rare in Homer with anything. Hence too much must not be made of the later use of the article with the inf. Hesiod shows two examples of the article with the inf. Pindar has nine and one in the accusative.[3] The absence or ambiguous character of the article in early Greek makes it necessary to be slow in denying the substantival aspect or character of the inf. in the Homeric period.[4] Hence it is best to think of the article as being used more freely with the inf. as with other nouns as the article made its onward way. The greatly increased use of the article with the inf. did serve to restore the balance between the substantival and verbal aspects of the inf. now that tense and voice had come in. The enlarged verb-force was retained along with the fresh access of substantival force. "The Greek infinitive has a life of its own, and a richer and more subtle development than can be found in any of the cognate languages."[5] The infinitive, thus enriched on both sides, has a great career in the classic period of the language, especially in Thucydides, the Orators, Xenophon and Plato. It has a great variety of uses. In general, however, it may be said that the inf. was not as popular in the vernacular as in the literary style for the very reason that it was synthetic rather than analytic, that it lacked clearness and emphasis.[6] But it was not till the **κοινή** period that the inf. began to disappear.[7]

(d) The **Κοινή** Period. The inf. begins to disappear before **ἵνα**

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 143.

[2] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, p. 195.

[3] Birklein, Entw. d. subst. Infinitivs, p. 4 f.

[4] Jann., Dist. Gk. Gr., p. 576. Hesseling (Essai hist. sur l'infinitif grec, 1892, p. 5) puts the matter too strongly.

[5] Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, p. 195.

[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 569.

[7] Ib., p. 480.

ion the one hand and ὅτι on the other. Jannaris[1] outlines the two chief functions of the inf. in its developed state to be prospective (purpose like ἵνα) and declarative (subject or object like ὅτι and ἵνα ultimately also). The fondness for analysis rather than synthesis, particularly in the vernacular, gradually pushed the inf. to the wall. The process was slow, but sure. There is indeed a counter tendency in the enlarged use of τοῦ and the inf. in the κοινή, particularly in the LXX under the influence of the Hebrew infinitive construct, and so to some extent in the N. T. So from Polybius on there is seen an increase of τοῦ and the inf. side by side with the enlarged use of ἵνα and ὅτι. The two contradictory tendencies work at the same time.[2] On the whole in the κοινή the inf. has all the main idioms of the classic age (with the marked absence of ἐφ᾽ ᾧτε) and the new turn given to τοῦ and ἐν τῷ. The Hebrew did not use the inf. as much as the Greek and never with the article. Certainly the inf. is far less frequent in the LXX than in the comparatively free Greek of the N. T., about half as often (2.5 to the page in the LXX, 4.2 in the N. T.).[3] But the Hebrew has not, even in the LXX, introduced any new uses of the inf. in the Greek. The Hebrew inf. construct had no article and was thus unlike τοῦ and the inf. The total number of infinitives in the N. T., according to Votaw,[4] is 2,276. The number of anarthrous infs. is 1,957, of articular 319. The inroad of ἵνα and ὅτι is thus manifest as compared with the Attic writers. The writings of Luke show the largest and most varied use of the inf., while the Johannine writings have the fewest.[5] Paul's use is very uneven. Votaw[6] finds the same inequality in the case of the apocryphal books. The papyri show a similar situation. Different writers vary greatly, but on the whole the inf. is dying save in the use with auxiliary verbs, and it is going even there as is seen from the use of ἵνα with θέλω in the N. T. Cf. Mk. 9:30. In the κοινή we find ἵνα with βούλομαι and δύναμαι in Polybius, the LXX and later κοινή writers.[7] As the inf. disappears in the later Greek strange combinations appear, as in Malalas and Theophanes we

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 568.
[2] Kalker, Questiones de Elocutione Polyb., 1880, p. 302.
[3] Votaw, The Use of the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., 1896, p. 55
[4] lb., p. 50.
[5] Ib., p. 52. [6] Ib.
[7] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 248. Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 574, for list of verbs with ba in late Gk.

meet πρὸ τοῦ with the subjunctive (πρὸ τοῦ ἐπιρρίψωσιν, πρὸ τοῦ ἐνωθῶσιν).[1] The inf. never had a monopoly of any construction save as the complement of certain verbs like βούλομαι, θέλω, etc. This was probably the origin use of the inf. with verbs and it was true to the dative case-idea.[2] It was here alone that the inf. was able to make a partial stand to avoid complete obliteration.

(e) *The Later Period*. Outside of the Pontic dialect the inf. is dead, both anarthrous and articular, save with the auxiliary verbs.[3] The use of θέλω as a mere auxiliary is common enough in Herodotus and probably was frequent in the vernacular then as it was later.[4] "The fortunes of the infinitive were determined by its nature."[5] The increased use of abstract nouns made it less needed for that purpose, as the fondness for ἵνα and ὅτι made it less necessary as a verb. The N. T. is mid-stream in this current and also midway between the rise and the end of this river. The writers will use the inf. and ἵνα side by side or the inf. and ὅτι parallel. Even in the classical Attic we find ὅπως after πειράομαι (Xenophon).[6] As ὅπως disappeared ἵνα stepped into its place. In Latin *ut* was likewise often used when the inf. could have occurred. The blending of ἵνα and ὅτι in the κοινή helped on the process.

In the N. T. the exclusive province of the inf. is a rather narrow[7] one. It still occurs alone with δύναμαι and μέλλω. It has a wide extension of territory with τοῦ. But on the whole it has made distinct retreat since the Attic period. The story is one of the most interesting in the history of language.

3. SIGNIFICANCE. Originally as we have seen, the infinitive was a substantive, but a verbal substantive. This set case of an abstract substantive has related itself closely to the verb.[8] The Stoic grammarians[9] called it a verb, ἀπαρέμφατον ῥῆμα, ἀπαρέμφατος ἔγκλισις. Apollonius Dyskolos[10] called it a "fifth mode" and the later grammarians followed his error. Some of the Roman grammarians actually took *infinitivus* in the sense *perfectus*,

[1] Rueger, Beitr. zur hist. Synt. d. griech. Sprache, 1895, p. 11.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 154.
[3] Jebb in V. and D.'s Handb., p. 324.
[4] Ib., p. 326. G. Meyer (Essays and Studien, 1885, p. 101) says that the Albanians are the only Slavic folk "dem ein Infinitiv abgeht." It .is due to the mod. Gk.
5 Thompson, Synt. of th,,, Attic Gk., p. 247.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 221. [7] Ib., p. 222.
[8] Curtius, Erlaut., p. 296.
[9] Jolly, Gesch. des Inf. im Indoger., 1873, p. 16. [10] Ib., p. 22.

just as they mistranslated **γενική** by *genitivus*.[1] Bopp[2] rightly perceived that the inf. has a nominal origin and was later adjusted to the verb in Greek. It is not a real verb in the very height of its glory.[3] And yet the consciousness of the nominal origin was partially obscured even in the time of Homer. The original case-form is so far forgotten that this dative may appear in the nominative and the accusative. The tenses and voices have developed. But Brugmann[4] seems to go too far in saying that already the inf. was "only" a verb in the popular feeling. Moulton,[5] indeed, harks back to Apollonius Dyskolos: "The mention of 'The Verb' has been omitted in the heading of this chapter, in deference to the susceptibilities of grammarians who wax warm when **λύειν** or **λύσας** is attached to the verb instead of the noun. But having thus done homage to orthodoxy, we proceed to treat these two categories almost exclusively as if they were mere verbal moods, as for most practical purposes they are." He states, it is true, that every schoolboy knows that in origin and part of the use the inf. is a substantive, but "nearly all that is distinctive is verbal."[6] I venture to say that this is overstating the case. It is not a mere question of the notion of the user of the infinitive in this passage or that. The history is as it is. In the full development of the inf. we see the blending of both substantive and verb. In this or that example the substantival or the verbal aspect of the hybrid form may be dominant, but the inf. in the historical period is always both substantive and verb. It is not just a substantive, nor just a verb, but both at the same time. The form itself shows this. The usage conforms to the facts of etymology. It is not true that the article makes the inf. a substantive as Winer[7] has it. As a matter of fact, therefore, the inf. is to be classed neither with the noun nor with the verb, but with the participle, and both stand apart as verbal nouns. The article did enlarge[8] the scope of the inf. just as the use of tense did. The Germans can say *das Trinken* and French *le savoir* like the Greek **τὸ γνῶναι**. There is no infinitive in Arabic. As a matter of fact, the inf. because of its lack of endings (here the participle is better off with the adjective endings) is the least capable of all parts of speech of fulfilling its functions.[9]

[1] Ib., pp. 31 ff. [2] Vergl. Gr., p. 3.

[3] Cf. Schroeder, Vber die formelle Untersch. der Redet. im Griechischen and Lateinischen, p. 10.

[4] Griech. Gr., p. 515. [3] Ib. [8] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 298.

[6] Prol., p. 202. [7] W.-M., p. 406. [9] W.-M., p. 399,

In its very nature it is supplementary. It is either declarative or prospective,[1] but always a verbal substantive. There is a difference between τὸ πράσσειν and ἡ πρᾶξις. Both have, verbal stems and both are abstract. The difference[2] lies in the tense and voice of πράσσιν. But πράσσειν has all that is in πρᾶξις plus tense and voice. I decline, therefore, to divide the infinitive into the anarthrous and articular uses so popular in the grammars. These uses do exist, but they simply represent two uses of the inf. in its substantival aspects. They do not affect the verbal side of the inf. at all. The inf. may properly be discussed under its substantival and its verbal aspects. But even so a number of uses cross over as indirect discourse, for instance, or the inf. to express purpose (with or without the article). We must look at both sides of the inf. every time to get a total idea of its value. A number of points of a special nature will require treatment.

4. SUBSTANTIVAL ASPECTS OF THE INFINITIVE.

(a) *Case (Subject or Object Infinitive)*. Here I mean the cases of the inf. itself, not the cases used with it. The inf. is always in a case. As a substantive this is obvious. We have to dismiss, for the most part, all notion of the ending (dative or locative) and treat it as an indeclinable substantive. A whole series of common expressions has the inf. as subject besides the ordinary verbs. Thus note 1 Cor. 9:15 **καλόν μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν**, (Heb. 4:6; 9:27) **ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀπθανεῖν**, (Mt. 18:13) **ἐὰν γένηται εὑρεῖν αὐτό**, (3:15) **πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι**, (Ac. 21:35) **συνέβη βαστάζεσθαι**, (Lu. 6:12) **ἐγένετο ἐξελθεῖν αὐτόν**, (18:25) **εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν**, (Jo. 18:14) **συμφέρει ἀποθανεῖν**, (Mt. 22:17) **ἔξεστιν δοῦναι**, (Heb. 9:5) **οὐκ ἔστιν νῦν λέγειν**, (Ac. 27:24) **δεῖ παραστῆναι**, (Ac. 2:24) **ἦν δυνατὸν κρατεῖσθαι**, (Ph. 3:1) **τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν οὐκ ὀκνηρόν**. So Ac. 20:16; 2 Pet. 2:21. All this is simple enough. The articular inf. is likewise found in the nominative as in Mk. 9:10, **τί ἐστιν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι**. Here the article is not far removed from the original demonstrative. Cf. 10:40, **τὸ καθίσαι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι**, where **δοῦναι** is probably the original dative 'for giving.' One naturally feels that the articular inf. is more substantival than the anarthrous, as in Ro. 7:18, **τὸ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι**, but that is no correct. The subject-inf. occurs freely both with and without the article in the N. T. as in the **κοινή** generally. See Mt. 15:20 **τὸ φαγεῖν**, (Mk. 12:33) **τὸ**

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 568, f. Cf. Henry, Revue de Linguistique de la Philologie. Comparee, vol. XX, ii.

[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 153.

ἀγαπᾶν, (Ro. 7:18) **τὸ θέλειν** and **τὸ κατεργάζεσθαι**. Add 1 Cor. 7:26; 11:6; 2 Cor. 9:1; Ph. 1:21, 24, 29; Heb. 10:31; Ro. 14:21. The origin of this nominative or subject is probably due to its use with impersonal expressions. Moulton[1] illustrates it by the Latin *humanum est errare*, where the force of the locative form *errare* may be seen by translating: 'There is something human in erring.' This may have been the original idiom, but it has gone beyond that to mean: 'Erring is human.' English students often forget that 'erring' is here infinitive, not participle, both in sense and history. It is a step further in the N. T. to see **τοῦ** and the inf. used as subject nominative. Cf. Lu. 17:1; Ac. 10:25; 1 Cor. 16:4. In 2 Cor. 7:11 the substantival aspect of the inf. is shown by the use of the pronoun **αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ λυπηθῆναι** in the nominative with **κατειργάσατο**. Cf. the inf. in the predicate nom. with **τοῦτο** in Ro. 1:12, **τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν συνπαρακληθῆναι**. So in Ro. 13:11, **ὥρα ἤδη ὑμᾶς ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι**, where the inf. is in predicate apposition with **ὥρα**. Originally it was doubtless 'time for arising.' In 1 Th. 4:6 we have both the anarthrous and articular inf. in apposition with **τοῦτο**. Cf. also the appositive inf. in Ac. 15:28; Jas. 1:27; 1 Th. 4:3; Ro. 4:13.

The object-infinitive in the accusative is quite common both with and, particularly, without the article. In the N. T. more than half of the instances of the inf. come in here, the object-inf. with verbs of various sorts.[2] In the LXX, however, it is rare in proportion to the other uses. The accusative case is to us more manifest when the article occurs. See Ph. 2:6, **οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ**, where the articular inf. is the direct object of **ἡγήσατο**. So in 2:13, with **ὁ ἐνεργῶν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν**. Cf. Ac. 25:11, **οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν**. See further 1 Cor. 14:39; 2 Cor. 8:10. In Ph. 4:10, **ἀνεθάλετε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν**, the acc. may be that of general reference. Certainly in 1 Th. 3:3, **τὸ σαίνεσθαι**, this is true. Blass[3] calls it here "quite superfluous." In Ro. 14:13 **τὸ μὴ τιθέναι**. is in apposition with the accusative **τοῦτο**, as in 2 Cor. 2:1. In 2 Cor. 10:2, **δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι**, we should naturally look for the ablative with **δέομαι**. The instances without the article are more numerous. A fairly complete list of the verbs in the N. T. that have the inf. in indirect discourse was given in the chapter on Modes (Indirect Discourse, pp. 1036 ff.). These infs. are in the acc.,

[1] Prol., p. 210. [2] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl.Gk., p. 57.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 234. Cf. 2 Esd. 6:8 **τὸ μὴ καταργηθῆναι**.

though some of them may possibly preserve the original dative or locative idea. But the acc. with the inf. is that of general reference, while the inf. itself is in the acc. case, the object of the verb of saying or thinking. Cf. Lu. 2:44, **νομίσαντες αὐτὸν εἶναι**. The occasional use of the nom. predicate, as in Ph. 4:11, **ἔμαθον αὐτάρκης εἶναι**, accents the acc. character of the object-inf. This point is clear also in the case of indirect commands where the noun or pronoun is in the dative and the inf. in the acc., as in 1 Cor. 5:11, **ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι**. The illustrations are numerous and need not be multiplied (see list under Indirect Discourse). With **βούλομαι, δύναμαι, θέλω** the dative makes a good idea and was probably so understood in the beginning.[1] It may be questioned, however, if in actual usage this idiom is not also the acc. Cf. Mt. 1:19 **ἐβουλήθη ἀπολῦσαι**, (1:20) **μὴ φοβηθῇς παραλαβεῖν**, (5:34) **λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι**, (16:12) **οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν**, (Lu. 18:1) **πρὸς τὸ δεῖν προσεύχεσθαι** (both infs. in the acc., one with **πρός**, the other general reference with **δεῖν**), (Ro. 15:8) **λέγω Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι** (cf. Ac. 27:13), (2 Cor. 10:2) **λογίζομαι τολμῆσαι**, (1 Th. 4:11) **παρακαλοῦμεν περισσεύειν καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι** (note the interrelation of these infs.). See further Mk. 9:28; 12:12; Lu. 16:3; Jo. 5:18; Ro. 14:2; Gal. 3:2; 1 Cor. 10:13. In the acc. also are the articular infs. with prepositions like **εἰς** (Ro. 1:11); **διά** (Ac. 8:11); **μετά** (Lu. 22:20); **πρός** (Mt. 5:28).

But the inf. occurs in the other oblique cases also with more or less frequency. The genitive, for instance, appears with the prepositions **ἀντί** (Jas. 4:15); **διά** (Heb. 2:15, **διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν**); **ἕνεκα** (2 Cor. 7:12); **ἕως** (Ac. 8:40). The only instance of an attribute with the infinitive in the N. T. is Heb. 2:15, except in apposition with **τοῦτο**. It was rare in classic Greek and confined to pronouns. Cf. **τὸ αὐτοῦ πράττειν**, Plato, Rep. 433. The genitive may be found with **ἐπιλανθάνομαι** as in Mk. 8:14, **ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν** (cf. **ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου** in Heb. 6:10. But we have **τὰ ὀπίσω** in Ph. 3:13). At any rate in Lu. 1:9, **ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι** (cf. 1 Sam. 14:47), we have an undoubted genitive. Cf. also **μετεμελήθητε τοῦ πιστεῦσαι** (Mt. 21:32). The very common use of **τοῦ** with the inf. must also be noted. Most of these are genitives, as in **τοῦ ἀπολέσαι** (Mt. 2:13). The free use of **τοῦ** with the inf. where the case is not genitive will be discussed under a special section under the article with the inf. Cf., for instance, Lu. 17:1; Ac. 10:25; 20:3; 27:1. The gen. occurs

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 154.

with substantives just as other substantives are used. This is a fairly common idiom. See Ac. 27:20 **ἐλπὶς πᾶσα τοῦ σώζεσθαι**, (1 Cor. 9:10) **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν**, (Ro. 15:23) **ἐπιπόθειαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν**, (1 Pet. 4:17) **καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι**, (Heb. 5:12) **χρείαν τοῦ διδάσκειν**. Note, in particular, Ro. 11:8, **ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν**, where the infs. are parallel with **κατανύξεως**. Cf. Lu. 1:57, 74; 2:6; 10:19; 21:22; 22:6, etc. Note especially Ph. 3:21, **κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι**. Let these suffice. They illustrate well how the inf. continued to be regarded as a real substantive. The genitive occurs also with adjectives as in **βραδεῖς τοῦ πιστεῦσαι** (Lu. 24:25); **ἕτοιμοί ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν** (Ac. 23:15). The genitive is found with **ἄξιος** (the anarthrous inf.) as in Lu. 15:19, 21, **ἄξιος κληθῆναι** (cf. Rev. 5:4, 9). In 1 Cor. 16:4 **τοῦ πορεύεσθαι** may be due to **ἄξιον**, but is probably used as subj. nominative in a rather loose way. The inf. ins the genitive is specially common in Luke and also in Paul.[1]

The ablative illustrations are not very numerous, but they are clear. Thus we have the abl. with verbs of hindering as in Mt. 19:14, **μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν πρός με**, and Lu. 4:42, **κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι**. The classical Greek had also **τό** and the inf., as in 1 Cor. 14:39, and **τὸ μή** after verbs of hindering, which last does not occur in the N. T., so that it is probable that an inf. without the art. as in Mt. 19:14 is in the abl., though not certain. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 220) illustrates Lu. 4:42 and Ac. 14: 18 by B. U. 164 (ii/iii A.D.) **πεῖσαι αὐτὸν τοῦ ἐλθεῖν**, J.H.S., 1902, 369 (Lycaonian inscription) **τῷ διχοτομήσαντί με τοῦ τὸ λοιπὸν ζῆν**, B. U. 36 (ii/iii A.D.) **τοῦ ζῆν μεταστῆσαι**, N. P. 16 (iii/A.D.) **κωλύοντες τοῦ μὴ σπείρειν**. See further Lu. 24: 16 **ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν,** Ac. 10:47 **δύναται κωλῦσαί τις τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι**, 14:18 **κατέπαυσαν τοῦ μὴ θύειν**. Cf. also Ac. 20:20, 27; Ro. 11:10; 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:8; Heb. 7:23; 1 Pet. 3:10. Cf. in the LXX, Gen. 16:2; 20:6; Ps. 38:2; 68:24 (quoted in Ro. 11:10); Is. 24:10; 1 Sam. 8:7; Jer. 7:10.[2] The abl. occurs also with prepositions as **ἐκ** in 2 Cor. 8:11, **ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν** and **πρό**, in Mt. 6:8 **πρὸ τοῦ αἰτῆσαι**. In Ac. 15:28, **τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες, ἀπέχεσθαι**, the inf. is in the abl., in apposition with the preceding words.

The only instance of the inf. in the instrumental in the N. T. occurs in 2 Cor. 2:13, **τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν με Τίτον**. The inf. is not found with **σύν** in the N. T. Votaw (Inf. in Biblical Greek, p. 29) notes six examples of the instrumental **τῷ** and the inf. in, the LXX text

[1] Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 234. [2] Cf. Viteau, Le Verbe., p. 172.

of B (2 Chron. 28 : 22; Eccl. 1 : 16; Is. 56 : 6; 4 Macc. 17: 20, 21). But other MSS. vary. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 220) cites L. Pb. (ii/B.C.), ἄλλως δὲ τῷ μηθέν᾽ ἔχειν.

The locative occurs with ἐν as in ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν (Lu. 24:51). It is extremely frequent in the N. T., especially in Luke. The possible Hebraistic aspect of the idiom comes up under Prepositions with the Inf. There remains, of course, a possible locative use of a form like λύειν. But one doubts if this original idea is preserved in the N. T.[1] Cf. Mt. 16:3, γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, which is more naturally explained as a dative: 'ye have knowledge for discerning,' though 'in discerning' makes sense. But with the dative it is different. There is no instance of the dative inf. with a preposition, but the original dative is clear in all examples of purpose without τοῦ or a preposition. Thus Mt. 5:17, οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι, 'I came not for destroying, but for fulfilling.' So Lu. 12:58, δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι, 'give diligence for being reconciled.' Cf. Mt. 7:11; 16:3 with οἶδα and γινώσκω. See further Mt. 2:2, ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι, 'we came for worshipping'; Jo. 21:3, ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν, 'I go a-fishing.' So Ro. 3: 15, LXX, ὀξεῖς ἐκχέαι αἷμα, 'swift for shedding blood.' The substantive also has the dative inf. in Ro. 9:21, ἐξουσίαν ποιῆσαι, 'power for making.' See further 1 Pet. 4:3, κατειργάσθαι, 'for having wrought'; Gal. 5:3, ὀφειλέτης ποιῆσαι, 'debtor for doing'; Heb. 11:15, καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι, 'time for returning.' This was the original idiom and, with all the rich later development as verbal substantive, the inf. did not wholly get away from the dative idea.

(b) *The Articular Infinitive*. We have to cross our tracks frequently in discussing the inf. in a lucid fashion. Numerous examples of the articular inf. have already been given in treating the cases of the inf. But the matter is so important that, it calls for special investigation. If we pass by the doubtful articular inf., τὸ φυλάσσειν, in the Odyssey,[2] we still find (cf. p. 1054) a few examples in the oldest Greek (two in Hesiod, nine in Pindar, nine in the Lyrics).[3] The use of the article with the inf. grew with the growth of the article itself. But it is not to be overlooked that in Homer the anarthrous inf. had already developed nearly

[1] Moulton, Prol D. 210.

[2] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 179. Gildersl. (Am. Jour. of Philol., 1912, p. 488) gave this name ("articular infinitive") to the idiom. "I watch the fate of my little things with a benevolent detachment."

[3] Birklein, Entwickelungsgeschichte, p. 91.

all the constructions of this verbal substantive.[1] The addition of the article made no essential change in the inf. It was already both substantive and verb. But the use of the article greatly enlarged the range of the inf. It is extended to new uses, especially with prepositions. The article was first used with the nom., then the acc. and then the other cases. The use of **τοῦ** and **τῷ** with the inf. is wholly post-Homeric.[2] In the Dramatists and Herodotus it is still chiefly in the nom. and acc., though we do find **τοῦ** and **τῷ**, and we see the inf. used with prepositions also.[3] In Thucydides the articular inf. suddenly jumps to great prominence, occurring 298 times,[4] especially in the speeches. Of these 163 occur with prepositions.[5] He even uses **τό** with the future inf. and with **ἄν** and the inf. The orators likewise use the art. inf. very freely. It was especially in Demosthenes that "the power of taking dependent clauses" was fully developed.[6] Only the Pontic dialects, as already noted, keep the inf. as a living form, and a few substantives preserve a mutilated form) like **τὸ φαγί** ('eating') **τὸ φαγεῖν, τὸ φιλί**, ('kissing') = **τὸ φιλεῖν** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 117). In the N. T. we see all this power still retained with the further development in the use of **τοῦ**. The inf. itself, as we have seen, is retreating in the N. T., but it still possesses the full range of its varied uses. The articular inf. has all the main uses of the anarthrous inf. Votaw (*The Inf. in Bibl. Gk*., p. 51) finds 22 uses of the inf. (19 anarthrous, 15 articular), but some of these overlap and are artificial. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 214) concludes from a study of the inscriptions that the articular inf. only invaded dialects as the **κοινή** was starting. There is no essential differenece in idea, and the mere presence or absence of the article is not to be pressed too far. Jannaris[7] admits that sometimes the verbal character is completely obscured. On that point I am move than skeptical, since the inf. continues to have the adjuncts of the verb and is used with any voice or tense. Jannaris[8] thinks that in late Greek the substantival, aspect grew at the expense of the verbal and the articular inf. had an increasing popularity. I admit the popularity, but doubt the dis-

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 315.

[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 164. [3] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 315.

[4] Birklein, Entwickelungsgeschichte, p. 91.

[5] Gildersl., Contrib. to the Hist. of the Inf., Transac. of the Am. Philol. Asso., 1878, pp. 5-19.

[6] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 315. Hypereides, he adds, even exceeds Demosthenes.

[7] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 576. [8] Ib., p. 577.

appearance of the verbal aspect. Jannaris makes the mistake of taking "substantival inf." as coextensive with "articular inf." Blass[1] questions if the article always has its proper force with the inf. and suggests that perhaps sometimes it merely occurs to show the case of the inf. Here again I am skeptical. Why does the case of the inf. need to be shown any more than other indeclinable substantives? In Mt. 1 the article does serve to distinguish object from subject. I have never seen an articular inf. where the article did not seem in place. Moulton[2] considers the use of the article "the most characteristic feature of the Greek infinitive in post-Homeric language." Blass[3] seems puzzled over the frequency of the articular inf. in the N. T., since it is chiefly confined to Luke and Paul, whose writings have most affinity with the literary language. Jannaris[4] notes how scarce it is in the writings of John and in unlearned papyri and inscriptions, doubtful in the mediaeval period, and absent from the modern vernacular. "The articular infinitive, therefore, could not resist any longer the tendency of the time, whether it was conceived as a noun or as a verb."[5] The analytic tendency drove it out finally. Moulton[5] has made some researches on the use of the articular inf. in the dialect inscriptions. He does not find a single instance in Larfield's Boeotian inscriptions. He finds one from Lesbos, one from Elis, one from Delphi, a few from Messene, etc. He notes the silence of Meisterhans on the subject. The conclusion seems to be inevitable that the articular inf. is as rare in the Attic vernacular as it was common in the Attic orators. It is "mainly a literary use, starting in Pindar, Herodotus and the tragedians, and matured by Attic rhetoric." Aristophanes uses it less than half as often as Sophocles and Aristophanes gives the Attic vernacular. And yet it is not absent from the papyri. Moulton[7] counts 41 instances in vol. I of B. U. The N. T. uses it about as often to the page as Plato. He scores a point against Kretschmer's view that the Attic contributed no more to the κοινή than any one of the other dialects, since from the literary Attic "the articular inf. passed into daily speech of the least cultured people in the later Hellenist world."[8] Polybius[9] deserves to rank with Demosthenes in the wealth of his use of the inf. He employs the

[1] Gr. of N. T. Uk., p. 233.
[2] Prol., p. 213.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 233.
[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 579.
[5] Ib.
[6] Prol., pp. 213 ff.
[7] Ib., p. 213.
[8] Ib., p. 215.
[9] Allen, The Inf. in Polyb. Compared with the Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 47.

inf. in all 11,265 times, an average of 7.95 to the page. He has the articular inf. 1,901 times, an average of 1.35 to the page. In the N. T. the inf. occurs 2,276 times, an average of 4.2 times to a page. The articular inf. is found in the N. T. 322 times, an average of .6 times to a page. The N. T. shows fewer uses, in proportion, of the articular inf. than the 0. T. or the Apocrypha. Of the 303 (Moulton) instances, 120 are in Luke's writings and 106 in Paul's Epistles. But Votaw[1] counts 319 in all. The MSS. vary in a number of instances and explain the difference. Moulton[2] gives the figures for all the N. T. books thus: James 7, Hebrews 23, Gospel of Luke 71, Paul 106, Acts 49, 1 Peter 4, Matthew 24, Mark 13 (14), John 4, Revelation 1, not in Col., Philem., Past. Eps., Joh. Eps., 2 Pet., Jud. Luke has the most varied use of the articular inf., and Paul's is somewhat uneven.[3] The use of the articular inf. in the various cases has already been sufficiently discussed. In general one may agree with Moulton[4] that "the application of the articular infin. in. N. T. Greek does not in principle go beyond what is found in Attic writers." The special use of the articular inf. with prepositions is reserved for separate discussion. There is little doubt that the first use of **τό** with the inf. was demonstrative as it was with everything.[5] In Mk. 9:10, **τί ἐστιν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆνι**, the article is almost demonstrative, certainly anaphoric (cf. verse 9). The same thing is true of 10:40 where **τὸ καθίσαι** refers to **καθίσωμεν** in verse 37. It is not necessary to give in detail many examples of the articular inf. in the N. T. I merely wish to repeat that, when the article does occur with the inf., it should have its real force. Often this will make extremely awkward English, as in Lu. 2:27, **ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον**. But the Greek has no concern about the English or German. It is simply slovenliness not to try to see the thing from the Greek standpoint. But we are not to make a slavish rendering. Translation should be idiomatic. It is hardly worth while to warn the inept that there is no connection between the article **τό** and the English to in a sentence like Ph. 1:21, **ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος.** Here the article **τό** has just the effect that the Greek article has with any abstract substantive, that of distinction or contrast. Life and death (living and dying) are set over against each other. See further Mt. 24:45; Lu. 24:29; Ac. 3:12; 10:25; 14:9; 21:

[1] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., pp. 50 ff.
[2] Prol., p. 216.
[3] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 52.
[4] Prol., p. 215.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 164.

12; 25:11; Ro. 4:11, 13, 16, 18; 13:8; 14:21; 2 Cor. 8:10 f.; 9:1; Ph. 1:23, 29; 2:6; 4:10; 1 Th. 3:2 f.

Some special words are needed about **τοῦ** and the inf. The question of purpose or result may be deferred for separate discussion. We have seen how the genitive inf. with **τοῦ** occurs with verbs, substantives, adjectives and prepositions. The ablative inf. with **τοῦ** is found with verbs and prepositions. The ablative use is not here under discussion, since it involves no special difficulties save the redundant **μή**. We may note that in Critias **τοῦ** was very common with the inf.[1] We see it also in Polybius in various uses named above.[2] It is an Attic idiom that became very common in the postclassical and Byzantine Greek.[3] Cf. **μὴ ἀμελήσῃς τοῦ ἐνοχλῆσαι θωνίῳ**, O. P. 1159, 11-13 (iii/A.D.). There is no special difficulty with **τοῦ** and the inf. with verbs as object except in a case like Mt. 21:32 where **τοῦ πιστεῦσαι** "gives rather the content than the purpose of **μετεμελήθητε**."[4]

The instances with substantives like Ac. 14:9, **ἔχει πίστιν τοῦ σωθῆναι**, give no trouble on the score of the article. It is the case (objective genitive) that has to be noted. So with Ph. 3:21, **τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι**. As to adjectives, as already noted, it is doubtful if in 1 Cor. 16:4, **ἐὰν δὲ ἄξιον ᾖ τοῦ κἀμὲ πορεύεσθαι**, the inf. is to be taken with **ἄξιον** as genitive. Moulton[5] so regards it, but it may be a loose nominative, as we shall see directly. But there is a use of **τοῦ** and the inf. that calls for comment. It is a loose construction of which the most extreme instance is seen in Rev. 12:7, **ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος**. This inf. (note the nom. with it) is in explanatory apposition with **πόλεμος**. Moulton[6] cleverly illustrates it with the English: "There will be a cricket match — the champions to play the rest." It is a long jump to this from a case like Ac. 21:12, **παρακαλοῦμεν τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτόν**, where the simple object-inf. is natural (cf. 1 Th. 4:10 f.). Cf. also Ac. 23:20, **συνέθεντο τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαι σε ὅπως καταγάγῃς**. "This loose inf. of design" is found twelve times in Thucydides, six in Demosthenes and five in Xenophon.[7] These writers prefer the prepositions with **τοῦ** and the inf. Polybius in his first five books has this simple **τοῦ** and the inf. only six times, all negative.[8]

[1] Birklein, Entwick., p. 9.
[2] Allen, The Inf. in Pdyb., pp. 29 ff.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 578.
[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 216.
[5] Ib.
6 Ib., p. 218.
[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 578. Cf. Birklein, Entwick., p. 101.
[8] Jann., ib.

The normal use of **τοῦ** with the inf. was undoubtedly final as it was developed by Thucydides, and in the N.T. that is still its chief use.[1] But many of the examples are not final or consecutive. It is only in Luke (Gospel 24, Acts 24) and Paul (13) that **τοῦ** with the inf. (without prepositions) is common.[2] They have five-sixths of the examples.[3] And Luke has himself two-thirds of the total in the N. T. Matthew has seven. John avoids it. Moulton[4] shows that of Paul's "thirteen" examples three (Ro. 6: 6; 7:3; Ph. 3:10) either final or consecutive, two (Ro. 15:22; 2 Cor. 1:8) are ablative, five occur with substantives (Ro. 15:23; 1 Cor. 9:10; 16:4; 2 Cor. 8:11; Ph. 3:21), four are epexegetic (Ro. 1: 24; 7:3; 8:12; 1 Cor. 10:13). In Luke calls about half are not final. It is this loose epexegetical inf. that calls for notice. We find it in the LXX (cf. Gen. 3:22; 19:19; 31:20; 47:29, etc.).[5] It is possible that this very common idiom in the LXX is due to the Hebrew לְ. It does not occur in Polybius.[6] In the LXX also we see **τοῦ** and the inf. used as the subject of a finite verb in complete forgetfulness of the case of **τοῦ**. Cf. 2 Chron. 6:7, **ἐγένετο ἐπὶ καρδίαν Δαυεῖδ τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον.** So 1 Sam. 12:23; 1 Ki. 8:18; 16:31; Ps. 91:3; Is. 49:6; Jer. 2:18; Eccl. 3:12; 1 Esd. 5:67.[7] One must recall the fact that the inf. had already lost for the most part the significance of the dative ending —**αι** and the locative –**ι** (–**ειν**). Now the genitive **τοῦ** and the dative –**αι** are both obscured and the combination is used as subject nominative. We have this curious construction

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 216. [2] Ib., p. 217.
[3] Mr. H. Scott gives the following list for Toy and the inf.:

	Pres.	Aor.
Paul	13	4
Synoptics	9	22
Acts	11	13
Heb.	1	3
Rev.	—	1
Jas.	---	1
1 Pet.	---	1
	34	45
		79 (less 9 fr. LXX, 4 Paul, 5 Ac.=70)

[4] Prol., p. 217. Cf. also Gal. 3:10. [5] Cf. W.-M., p. 410 f.
[6] Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 53. Cf. Gildersl., Am. J. of Phil., vol. XXVII, p. 105 f.
[7] Votaw, The Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 28.

in Lu. 17:1, ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν. See also Ac. 10: 25, ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν, and 27:1, ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀπολεῖν. Cf. further 20: 3. It is naturally rarer in the N. T. than in the LXX. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 220) gives a papyrus example closely allied to it, 0. P. 86 (iv/A.D.) ἔθος τοῦ παρασχεθῆναι. See Winer-Moulton, p. 411, for numerous examples in LXX. But very much like it is the use of τοῦ as object-inf., with ἐντέλλομαι in Lu. 4:10 (Ps. 90: 11); κατανεύω in 5:7; στηρίζω in 9:51; ποιέω in Ac. 3:12; κακόω in 7:19; ἐπιστέλλω in 15:20; παρακαλέω in 21:12; συντίθεμαι in 23: 20. Cf. also ἕτοιμος τοῦ in Ac. 23:15. This is surely "a wide departure from classical Greek."[1] It is, however, after all in harmony with the genius and history of the inf., though the nominative use of τοῦ comes from the LXX.

The vernacular papyri show a few examples of τοῦ and the inf. It is found in the inscriptions of Pisidia and Phrygia. Cf. Compernass, p. 40. Moulton[2] illustrates Lu. 1:9 with ἀμελεῖν τοῦ γράφειν, B. U. 665 (i/A.D.); Mt. 18:25 and Jo. 5:7 (ἔχω) with ἵν' ἔχι τοῦ πωλεῖν, B. U. 830 (i/A.D.); 1 Cor. 9:6 with ἐξουσίαν---τοῦ --θέσθαι, C. P. R. 156; Lu. 22:6 with εὐκαιρίας—τοῦ εὑρεῖν, B. U. 46 (ii/A.D.). He concludes that the usage is not common in the papyri and holds that the plentiful testimony from the LXX concurs with the N. T. usage to the effect "that it belongs to the higher stratum of education in the main." This conclusion holds as to the N. T. and the papyri, but not as to the LXX, where obviously the Hebrew inf. construct had a considerable influence. Moulton seems reluctant to admit this obvious Hebraism.

(c) *Prepositions*. We are not here discussing the inf. as purpose or result, as temporal or causal, but merely the fact of the prepositional usage. The idiom cannot be said to be unusual in classical Greek. Jannaris[3] agrees with Birklein[4] that classical writers show some 2000 instances of this prepositional construction. The writers (classic and later) who use the idiom most frequently are Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Diodorus, Dionysius, Josephus, Plutarch, Dio Cassius. The most prolific user of the construction is Polybius (1053 instances) and Josephus next (651 times).[5] If the prepositional adverbs be added to the strict

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 159. In late Gk. this use of τοῦ and the inf. came to displace the circumstantial participle and even finite clauses, only to die itself in time. Cf. Jann., WA. Gk. Gr., p. 483.

[2] Prol., p. 219 f.

[3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 576.

[4] Entwickelungsgesch., p. 103.

[5] Krapp, Der substantivierte Inf., 1892, p. 1.

list of prepositions, the number is very much enlarged, especially in Polybius, who has 90 with χάριν, 115 with ἅμα, 504 with διά, 160 with πρός, 74 with εἰς, 24 with ἐν, 90 with ἐπί, 33 with μετά, 41 with περί, only one with παρά.[1] The idiom was here again later than the articular inf. itself and was also Attic in origin and literary. But it is common also in the Greek inscriptions according to Granit.[2] It is rare in the papyri, according to Moulton,[3] save in the recurrent formula, εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι, and (cf. 990) in the case of πρὸς τό. Cf. πρὸς τὸ τυχῖν, B. U. 226 (i/A.D.); πρὸς τὸ μὴ--ἐντυγχάνειν, 0. P. 237 (i/A.D.); πρὸς τὸ --δεηθῆναι (ib.). Votaw[4] finds the prepositional inf. almost one-half of all the articular infs. in the 0. T., the Apocrypha and the N. T., the proportion being about the same in each section of the Greek Bible. Not quite, all the prepositions were used with the inf. in ancient Greek, the exception[5] being ἀνά. Ἀμφί had it only with the genitive, κατά, with the accusative, παρά, with the acc., περί with the acc. and gen., πρός with acc. and loc., ὑπέρ with the ablative, ὑπό with the ablative.[6] It was not therefore freely used with all the usual case with the different prepositions. As a rule the article was essential if a preposition occurred with an inf. The reason for this was due to the absence of division between words. It was otherwise almost impossible to tell this use of the inf. from that of composition of preposition with the verb if the two came in conjunction. Cf. ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν in Jas. 4:15. A few instances are found without the article. Thus ἀντὶ δὲ ἄρχεσθαι (note presence of δέ between) in Herodotus I, 210. 2. It appears thus three times in Herodotus. So also in AEschines, *Eum*. 737, we have πλὴν γάμου τυχεῖν.[7] So Soph., *Ph*., 100. Winer[8] finds two in Theodoret (cf. IV, 851, παρὰ συγκλώθεσθαι). The papyri give us εἰς βάψαι, 0. P. 36 (i/A.D.), and the common vernacular phrase[9] εἰς πεῖν ('for drinking'). Cf. δός μοι πεῖν in Jo. 4:10. Moulton[10] cites also an example of ἄχρι from Plutarch, p. 256 D, and one from an inscription of iii/B.C. (0. G. I. S. 41, Michel 370) ἐπὶ — λαμβάνειν. The instances without the article are clearly very few. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 81) suggests that the significant frequency of

[1] Allen, The Inf. in Polyb., p. 33. Ἐκ 25, πρό 12=1179 for all.

[2] De Inf. ef Part. in Inscr. Dialect. Graec. Questiones Synt., 1892, p. 73.

[3] Prol., p. 220.

[4] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 19.

[4] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 320.

[5] Cf. Birklein, Entwickelungsgesch., p. 104. These preps. "retain this disqualification in the N. T." (Moulton, Prol., p. 216).

[7] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 246.

[9] Moulton, Prol., p. 216.

[8] W.-M., p. 413.

[10] Ib.

εἰς πεῖν in the papyri is due to Ionic influence. The LXX furnishes several instances of anarthrous εἰς, as εἰς ἐκφυγεῖν in Judg. 6:11 (cf. 2 Esd. 22:24; Sir. 38:27; Judith 4:15). Note also ἕως ἐλθεῖν in 1 Macc. 16:9; ἕως οὗ οἰκτειρῆσαι in Ps. 122:2 (so Ruth 3:3); μέχρις οὗ ἐγγίσαι in Tob. 11:1. Cf. also πλήν with anarthrous inf. in Polybius, etc.

The tenses have their full force in this prepositional construction, as in Mk. 5:4, διὰ τὸ --δεδέσθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι καὶ --συντετρίφθαι. Naturally some tenses suit certain prepositions better, as with the present tense.[1] The principles of indirect discourse apply also to the inf. with prepositions. Cf. μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω (Mk. 14:28). In the N. T. the accusative seems to occur always even when the nominative predicate would be possible,[2] as in διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτόν (Heb. 7:24). So also Lu. 11:8. But note Xen., *Cyr*., I, 4. 3, διὰ τὸ φιλομαθὴς εἶναι.

It is not necessary for the article to come next to the inf. as in Mt. 13:25. Several words may intervene and the clause may be one of considerable extent. Cf. Mk. 5:4; Ac. 8:11; Heb. 11:3; 1 Pet. 4:2. But the N. T. does not have such extended clauses of this nature as the ancient Greek, and the adverbs usually follow the inf.[3] The English "split inf." is not quite parallel.

In the 0. T. there are 22 prepositions used with the inf. and the Apocrypha has 18, while the N. T. shows only 10.[4] Of these only eight are the strict prepositions (ἀντί, διά, εἰς, ἐν, ἐκ, μετά πρό, πρός) and two the prepositional adverbs ἕνεκα and ἕως. It remains now to examine each in detail.

Ἀντὶ τοῦ is not rare with the inf. and is chiefly found in the Greek orators.[5] But we have it in Thucydides, Xenophon and Plato. Herodotus[6] has only 11 instances of the preposition with the inf., but 5 of them are with ἀντί. It does not occur in Polybius. In the N. T. we have only one instance, Jas. 4:15, ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν. Votaw gives one for the LXX, Ps. 108:4, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαπᾶν.

Διά has 33 instances in the N. T., all but one (genitive, Heb. 2:15, διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν) in the accusative. Mr. H. Scott reports the 33 exx. thus: Phil. 1, Jas. 1, Heb. 4, Mk. 5, Mt. 3, Lu. 9, Ac. 9, Jo. 1. The 0. T. has it with the inf. 35 times and the

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 50.
[2] W.-M., p. 415. [3] Ib., p. 413.
[4] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Ck., p. 20.
[6] Birklein, Entwiek., p. 104.
[6] Helbing, Die Prapositionen bei Herod., p. 148.

Apocrypha 26,[1] all with the accusative. The idiom **διὰ τό** is so frequent in Xenophon and Thucydides that as compared with **ὅτι** it stands as 2 to 3.[2] In later Greek (**κοινή** and Byzantine) it comes to displace even **ἵνα** and **ὅπως** though finally shifting to **διὰ νά**, in modern Greek (cf. English "for that").[3] It is not surprising therefore to find it in the N. T. with comparative frequency. **Διὰ τό** is frequent in Luke's writings, and once in Paul's Epistles, and rare in the other N. T. writers.[4] It is always the cause that is given by **διὰ τό**, as in Mt. 13:5 f., **διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν**. It is not merely the practical equivalent **ὅτι** and **διότι**, but is used side by side with them. Cf. Jas. 4:2f. **διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτιῆσθαι ὑμᾶς—διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε**. It may stand alone, as in Lu. 9: 7; 11:8, or with the accusative of general reference as in indirect discourse, as in Lu. 2:4; 19:11. Note two accs. in Ac. 4:2. The perfect tense occurs seven times, as in Mk. 5:4 (*ter*); Lu. 6:48; Ac. 8:11; 18:2; 27:9. In Mk. 5:4 it is the evidence, not the reason, that is given.[5] Blass (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 236) unnecessarily rejects Jo. 2:24.

Εἰς τὸ is in comon also with the inf. without much difference in sense from **ἐπὶ τῷ** and **πρὸς τό** with the inf.[6] But the N. T. does not use **ἐπὶ** with the inf. There is no doubt about the final use of **εἰς τό** whatever, is true of the consecutive idea. In the late Greek Jannaris[7] notes a tendency to use **εἰς τό** (cf. **βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι** in Jas. 1:19) rather than the simple inf. Cf. 1 Th. 4:9. But this tendency finally gave way to **ἵνα**. The 0. T. has **εἰς τό** 124, the Apocrypha 28 and the N. T. 72 times.[8] In the N. T. it is more common than any other preposition with the inf., **ἐν** coming next with 55 examples. Moulton[9] counts only 62 instances of **εἰς τό** in the N. T., but Votaw is right with 72. Paul has it 50 times. There are 8 in Hebrews and only one each in Luke and Acts, a rather surprising situation. The papyri[10] show scattered examples of it. Cf. **εἰς τὸ ἐν μηδενὶ μεμφθῆναι**, P. Fi. 2 (111/A.D.) 4 times. In 1 Pet. 4:2, **εἰς τὸ --βιῶσαι**, note the long clause. There is no doubt that in the N. T. **εἰς τό** has broken away to some extent from the classic notion of purpose. That idea still occurs as in Ro. 1: 11, **εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι**. This is still the usual con fiction. Cf. Ro. 3:26; 7:4; 8:29; Eph. 1:12; Ph. 1:10; 1 Th. 3:5; Jas.

[1] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
[2] Birklein, Entwick., p. 107.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 373 f.
[4] Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 165.
[5] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 161.
[6] Birklein, Entwick., p. 107.
[7] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 487.
[8] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
[9] Prol., p. 218.
[10] Ib., p. 220.

1:18; 1 Pet. 3:7; Heb. 2:17, and other examples in Mt. and Heb., to go no further. In Paul we notice other usages. In Ph. 1:23, ἐπιθυμίαν εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι, we have it with a substantive and in Jas. 1:19 it occurs with the adjectives ταχύς and βραδύς. It is epexegetic also with the verbal adjective θεοδίδακτοι in 1 Th. 4:9. Besides, we find it as the object of verbs of command or entreaty giving the content of the verb as in 1 The 2:12; 3:10; 2 Th. 2:2, ἐρωτῶμεν εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι. Cf. also 1 Cor. 8:10. So in Mt. 20:19; 26:2; 1 Cor. 11:22 there is a really dative idea in εἰς τό. Just as ἵνα came to be non-final sometimes, so it was with εἰς τό, which seems to express conceived or actual result (cf. τοῦ also) as in Ro. 1:20; 12:3; 2 Cor. 8:6; Gal. 3:17. Cf. the double use of ὥστε for 'aim' or 'result!'[1] The perfect tense can be used with εἰς τό as in Eph. 1:18 εἰς τό εἰδέναι and Heb. 11:3 εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι, the only instances. But the present occurs 32 times, the aorist 38, the perfect 2=72. These developed uses of εἰς τό occur to some extent in the LXX (1 Ki. 22:8; 1 Esd. 2:24; 8:84).

Ἐν τῷ appears in the tragedies.[2] It is found 6 times in Thucydides, 16 in Xenophon, 26 in Plato.[3] But Blass[4] observes that the classical writers did not use ἐν τῷ in the temporal sense of 'while' or 'during.' Moulton[5] sought to minimize the fact that in the 0. T. ἐν τῷ occurs 455 times (45 in the Apocrypha) and that it exactly translates the Hebrew בְּ and held that it did not in principle go beyond what we find in Attic writers. But he took that back in the second edition[6] under the suggestion of Dr. E. A. Abbott that we must find Attic parallels for 'during.' So he now calls this "possible but unidiomatic Greek." In the N. T. we have. ἐν τῷ and the inf. 55 times and 3/4 in Luke. In the Greek Bible as a whole it is nearly as frequent as all the other prepositions with the inf.[7] The Semitic influence is undoubted in the 0. T. and seems clear in Luke, due probably to his reading the LXX or to his Aramaic sources.[8] Cf. Lu. 1:8; 8:5 (ἐν τῷ σπείρειν); 24:51; Ac. 3:6; 4:30; 9:3, etc. Jannaris[9] sees here a tendency also to displace the participle. The

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236; Moulton, Prol., p. 219; Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 161.

[2] Birklein, Entwick., p. 108.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 215.

[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237.

[5] Prol., p. 215.

[6] P. 249.

[7] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.

[8] But Dalman, Worte Jesu, p. 26 f., denies that it is an Aramaean constr.

[9] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 379.

idiom is not confined to Luke's writings. Cf. Mt. 13:4; 13:25; Mk. 4:4; Heb. 2:8; 3:12, etc. Ordinarily it is the present inf. as in Mt. 13:4; Lu. 8:5; Ac. 3:26, where the Attic writers would have the present participle. But in Luke we have also the aorist inf. as in 2:27 **ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν**, (3:21) **ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι**, where Blass[1] sees the equivalent of the aorist participle (cf. **ʼΙησοῦ βαπτισθέντος**) or a temporal conjunction with the aorist indicative. One questions, however, whether the matter is to be worked out with so much finesse as that. The aorist inf. with **ἐν τῷ** occurs only 12 times in the N. T.[2] It is more correctly just the simple action of the verb which is thus presented, leaving the precise relation to be defined by the context, like the aorist participle of simultaneous action. Cf. **ἐν τῷ ὑποτάξαι** in Heb. 2:8; Gen. 32:19, **ἐν τῷ εὑρεῖν**. This is all that **ἐν τῷ** should be made to mean with either the present or the aorist. Cf. Mt. 13:4; 27:12; Lu. 8:40; 9:29. The idea is not always strictly temporal. In Ac. 3:26 (cf. Jer. 11:17), 4:30, it is more like means. Votaw[3] sees content in Lu. 12:15; Heb. 3:12. In Heb. 8:13, **ἐν τῷ λέγειν**, the notion is rather causal. The conception is not wholly temporal in Lu. 1:21.[4] No other preposition occurs in the N. T. with the inf. in the locative case. But cf. **ἐπὶ τῷ ἐμαὶ παραμένιν**, 0. P. 1122, 9 f. (A.D. 407).

ʽΕνεκεν τοῦ appears in Xenophon, Plato and Demosthenes, usually as final, but also causal.[5] Sophocles in his *Lexicon* quotes the construction also from Diodorus and Apophth. There is only one instance of it in the N. T., 2 Cor. 7:12, **ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴ σπουδὴν ὑμῶν**, where it is clearly causal as with the two preceding participles, **ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος, ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος** (a good passage to note the distinction between the inf. and the part.). The case is, of course, the genitive.

ʼΕκ του, likewise, appears in the N. T. only once with the inf. (2 Cor. 8:11, **ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν**), but the case is ablative. Its usual idea in Attic prose is that of outcome or result.[6] Votaw[7] gives no illustration from the 0. T., but three from the Apocrypha. Blass[8] takes it in 2 Cor. 8:11, to be equivalent to **καθὸ ἂν ἔχῃ**. More

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237.
[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 50.
[3] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237.
[5] Birklein, Entwick., p. 106. It is found in Polyb. also. Cf. Kalker, Questiones, p. 302; Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 35. Lutz (Die Casus-Adverbien bei Att. Redn., 1891, p. 18) finds it "zuerst bei Antiphon."
[6] Birklein, Entwiek. p. 105.
[7] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 237.

likely it is meant to accent the ability growing "out of" the possession of property, whatever it may be. In Polybius **ἐκ τοῦ** with the inf. has a more varied use (departure, source of knowledge, source of advantage).[1] He uses it 25 times.

Ἕως τοῦ, likewise, occurs but once (Ac. 8:40, **ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν**), and with the genitive. Birklein does not find any instances of **ἕως τοῦ** and the inf. in the classic writers, though he does note **μέχρι τοῦ** and less frequently **ἄχρι τοῦ**.[2] Cf. **μέχρι τοῦ πλεῖν**, P. B. M. 854 (i/ii A.D.). But in the O. T. Votaw[3] observes 52 instances of **ἕως τοῦ** and 16 in the Apocrypha. Cf. Gen. 24:33; Judith 8: 34. We have already noted the anarthrous use of **ἕως ἐλθεῖν** in 1 Macc. 16:9 A. Cf. Gen. 10:19, 30, etc. So also **ἕως οὗ** and **μέχρι(ς) οὗ** and the inf., 1 Esd. 1:49, and Tob. 11:1 B. It is rather surprising therefore that we find only one instance in the N. T. and that in the Acts. The construction is probably due to the analogy of **πρίν** and the inf.

Μετὰ τό is found only a few times in Herodotus, Plato and Demosthenes.[4] It appears, however, thirty-three times in Polybius and usually with the aorisit tense.[5] The idea is temporal and the aorist is a practical equivalent for the aorist participle. In the 0. T. Votaw[6] finds it 99 times and only 9 in the Apocrypha. There are 15 examples in the N. T. and the case is the accusative always. **Μετὰ τό** vanished with the inf. in modern Greek.[7] The aorist is always used in the N. T. save one perfect (Heb. 10:15). See Mk. 1:14; 14:28, **μετὰ τὸ ἐγεθῆναί με**. Eight of the examples occur in Luke's writings (Lu. 12:5; 22:20; Ac. 1:3; 7:4; 10: 41; 15:13; 19:21; 20:1). See also Mt. 26:32; Mk. 16:19; 1 Cor. 11:25; Heb. 10:15, 26.

Πρὸ τοῦ in the ancient writers was used much like **πρίν** and in the temporal sense.[8] It gradually invaded the province of **πρίν**, though in the N. T. we only meet it 9 times. It is not common in the papyri nor the inscriptions.[9] See Delphian inscr. 220, **πρὸ τοῦ παραμεῖναι**. Polybius has it 12 times.[10] In the 0. T. we find it 46 times, but only 5 in the Apocrypha.[11] The tense is always the aorist save one present (Jo. 17:5) . Cf. Gal. 3:23, **πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν**. There is no essential differ-

[1] Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 34 f.
[2] Entwick., p. 105.
[3] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
[4] Birklein, Entwick., p. 108.
[5] Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 41.
[6] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.
[7] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 386.
[8] Entwick., p. 105.
[9] Moulton, Prol., p. 214.
[10] Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 33.
[11] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.

ence in construction and idea between rrpiv and the inf. and πρὸ τοῦ and the inf. The use of πρίν with the inf. was common in Homer before the article was used with the inf. The usage became fixed and the article never intervened. But the inf. with both πρίν, and πρό is in the ablative case. Cf. ablative[1] inf. with *pura* in Sanskrit. **Πρίν** was never used as a preposition in composition, but there is just as much reason for treating πρίν as a prepositional adverb with the ablative inf. as there is for so considering ἕως τοῦ, not to say ἕως alone as in ἕως ἐλθεῖν (1 Macc. 16: 9). The use of the article is the common idiom. The fact of πρίν and the inf. held back the development of πρὸ τοῦ. In modern Greek πρὸ τοῦ as προτοῦ occurs with the subj. (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 193). In the N. T. πρίν is still ahead with 13 examples. The instances of πρὸ τοῦ are Mt. 6:8; Lu. 2:21; 22:15; Jo. 1:48; 13:19; 17:5; Ac. 23:15; Gal. 2:12; 3:23.

Πρὸς τό is the remaining idiom for discussion. It was used by the ancients in much the same sense as εἰς τό and ἐπὶ τῷ, 'looking to,' with a view to.'[2] The idiom is very common in Polybius,[3] 150 examples, and there are 10 of πρὸς τῷ. But in the 0. T. we have only 14 examples and 12 in the Apocrypha.[4] The N. T. shows 12 also. Some of the LXX examples are of πρὸς τό (Ex. 1:1; 2 Macc.7:14), but in the N. T. they are all πρὸς τό. the papyri Moulton[5] finds πρὸς τό rather more common than εἰς τό. In the N. T. Matthew has it five times (5:28; 6:1; 13:30; 23:5; 26:12). These express aim unless 5:28 is explanatory of βλέπων.[6] Mark has it once, 13:22. Luke has it twice (18: 1, where πρὸς τὸ δεῖν means 'with reference to'; Ac. 3:19 only ℵB, while other MSS. read εἰς).[7] Paul's four examples (2 Cor 3:13; Eph. 6:11, DEFG εἰς; 1 Th. 2:9; 2 Th. 3:8) all give the "subjective purpose."[8] Both present (3 times) and aorist (9 times) tenses occur. Cf. πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι in Mt. 6:1.

(d) *The Infinitive with Substantives.* Numerous examples of the inf. with substantives were given in the discussion of the cases of the inf. The matter calls for only a short treatment at this point. The use of the inf. with substantives was ancient[9] and natural, first in the dative or locative and then in the genitive

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., § 983; Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 15S. Homer used πρίν with the inf. after both positive and negative clauses.

[2] Birklein, Entwiek., p. 107.

[3] Allen, Inf. in Polvb., p. 33.

[4] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 20.

[5] Prol., p. 220.

[6] Ib., p. 218.

[7] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 236.

[8] W.-M., p. 414 note.

[9] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 154.

with **τοῦ**. It was always common in the classic Greek.[1] The usage is common in Polybius with both the anarthrous and the articular inf.[2] The same thing is true of the 0. T. and the Apocrypha.[3] It is so frequent as not to call for illustration. The meaning is that of complement and the inf. most frequently occurs with words of time, fitness, power, authority, need, etc. It is abundantly used in the N. T. both with and without the article. Some anarthrous examples are (Mt. 3:14) **χρείαν βαπτισθῆναι**, (Lu. 2:1) **δόγμα ἀπογράφεσθαι**, (Jo. 1:12) **ἐξουσίαν γενέσθαι**, (19:40) **ἔθος ἐνταφιάζειν**, (Ac. 24:15) **ἐλπίδα μέλλειν**, (Ro. 13:11) **ὥρα ἐγερθῆναι**, (Gal. 5:3) **ὀφειλέτης ποιῆσαι**, (Heb. 7:5) **ἐντολὴν ἀποδεκατοῖν,** (Rev. 11:18) **καιρὸς κριθῆναι**, etc. These are all real datives and the construction is common enough in the N. T., more so than in the LXX. In Ph. 1:23 note **ἐπιθυμίαν εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι**. The same substantives may have **τοῦ** and the inf., though now, of course, the case is genitive. Cf. (Lu. 1:57) **χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν,** (2:21) **ἡμέραι τοῦ περιτεμεῖν**, (10:19) **ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν** (Ac. 14:9) **πιστιν τοῦ σωθῆναι**, (27:20) **ἐλπὶς τοῦ σώζεσθαι**, etc. It occurs ten times in Luke's writings and nine in Paul'sEpistles. It is about as common in proportion as in the LXX.[4] See further Lu. 1:74; 2:6; 21:22; 22:6; Ac. 20:3; Ro. 1:24; 8:12; 11:8; 15:23; 1 Cor. 9:10; 10:13; 2 Cor. 8:11; Ph. 3:21; 1 Pet. 4:17; Heb. 5:12, etc. Since the inf. is a substantive, the genitive relation with other substantives is obvious and natural.

(e) *The Infinitive with Adjectives.* This idiom is likewise classical and is common from Homer on.[5] As already shown, the case varies with different adjectives. This inf. is complementary as with substantives. It is natural with adjectives as any other substantive is. It held on longest with **δυνατός, ἱκανός**, but other adjectives in late **κοινή** began to give way to **εἰς τό** (cf. Jas. 1:19, **ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι**) rather than the simple inf. and finally this disappeared before **ἵνα** (cf. Mt. 8:8, **ἱκανὸς ἵνα**).[6] In the LXX and the N. T. the inf. with adjectives is less frequent than with substantives. We have it with both the anarthrous and the articular inf. See (Mt. 3:11) **ἱκανὸς βαστάσαι,** (Mk. 10:40) **ἐμὸν δοῦναι**, (Lu. 15:19) **ἄξιος κληθῆναι**, (Jas. 3:2) **δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγῆσαι**, (1 Cor. 7:39) **ἐλευθέρα γαμηθῆναι**, (Heb. 5:11) **δυνσερμήνευτος λέγειν**, (1 Pet. 4:3) **ἀρκετὸς κατειργάσθαι**, etc. It is

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 301.
[2] Allen, Inf. in Polyb., pp. 23, 32.
[3] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., pp. 15, 25.
[4] Ib., p. 27.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p.155 f. For Polyb. see Allen, Inf. in Polyb., pp. 23, 32.
[6] Jann., Hist. Gk. Cr., p. 487.

more common with ἄξιος, δυνατός, ἱκανός. The only adjective that often has **τοῦ** and the inf. in the 0. T. is ἕτοιμος.[1] We find it also with adverbs as in Ac. 21:13, δεθῆναι ἀποθανεῖν ἑτοίμως ἔχω (so 2 Cor. 12:14). The articular examples are less frequent. But note (Lu. 24:25) βραδεῖς **τοῦ** πιστεύειν, (Ac. 23:15) ἕτοιμοι **τοῦ** ἀνελεῖν. Some would add 1 Cor. 16:4, ἄξιον **τοῦ** πορεύεσθαι, but see Cases of the Inf.

(f) *The Infinitive with Verbs*. This usage came to be, of course, the most frequent of all. It started as a dative or locative, then a sort of accusative of reference,[2] then the object of verbs with whatever case the verb used. It is both anarthrous and articular. It is not necessary to go over again (see Cases of the Inf.) the varied uses the inf. with verbs, whether the object of verbs of saying or thinking in indirect discourse, verbs of commanding or promising, direct object of verbs (auxiliary inf.), verbs of hindering,[3] etc. As a matter of fact they are all object-infs. whatever the case (acc., gen., abl., dat., instr.). Votaw[4] notes that in the N. T. this use of the inf. is four times as common as any other. It is usually the anarthrous inf., but not always. Even δύναμαι and ἄρχομαι (not N. T.) are used with **τοῦ** and the inf. Jannaris[5] has made a careful list of the verbs that continued for a while in late breek to use the inf. against the inroads of ἵνα. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 150) argues that in general the N. T. use of the inf. With verbs is like that of the **κοινή**. The inf. λαλῆσαι with ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα (1 Th. 2:2) is not a Hebraism, but a Hellenism. But surely it is not necessary to call this usage an Atticism. In the discussion of ἵνα (see pp. 430, 994) the displacement of the inf. by ἵνα even after verbs like θέλω was sufficiently treated. Schmid[6] "shows how this 'Infinitivsurrogat' made its way from Aristotle onwards."[7] In the N. T. it is chiefly in the Gospel of John that we find this use of ἵνα**.** "The strong volitive flavour which clung to ἵνα would perhaps commend it to a writer of John's temperament."[8] But after all, the inf. with verbs has not quite disappeared from John's Gospel. Jannaris[9] has worked out the situation in John's Gospel as between this use of the inf. and ἵνα.

[1] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 27.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 154.
[3] See Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 4S7.
[4] Inf. in Bibl. p. 7.
[6] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 574 f.
[6] Atticismus, Bd. IV, p. Sl. Cf. also Hatz., Einl., p. 215.
[7] Moulton, Prof, p. 211.
[8] Ib.
[9] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 572 f. For an extended list of the verbs in the N. T. used with the complementary inf. see Viteau, Le Verbe, pp. 157

He finds ἵνα, about 125 times and the inf. with verbs about 129 times. Of these 57 belong to δύναμαι (37) and θέλω (20). There are besides, 10 with δεῖ and 12 each with ζητέω and with μέλλω. The rest are scattered with δίδωμι, ἔχω, ὀφείλω, δοκέω, ἀφίημι, αἰτέω, ἐρωτάω, ἄρχομαι, etc. It is clear, therefore, that the inf. with verbs is by no means dead in the N. T., though the shadow of ἵνα is across its path. As illustrations of the great wealth of verbs with the inf. in the N. T. note (Mt. 11:20) ἤρξατο ὀνειδίζειν, (27:58) ἐκέλευσεν ἀποδιοθῆναι, (Mk. 12:12) ἐζήτουν κρατῆσαι, (Lu. 16:3) σκάπτειν οὐκ ἰσχύω, ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι. Almost any verb that can be used with a substantive can be used with the inf. The use of the inf. with προστίθεμαι is a Hebraism. Cf. Ex. 14: 13. See Lu. 20:11 f., προσέθετο πέμψαι. It means 'to go on and do' or 'do again.' It is the one Hebraism that Thumb[1] finds in Josephus, who is Atticistic. The articular inf. with verbs is much less frequent. But note τὸ ἀγαπᾶν after ὀφείλω (Ro. 13:8); παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, (Ac. 25:11); τοῦ περιπατεῖν after ποιέω (Ac. 3:12); ἐπιστεῖλαι τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι (15:20); κατεῖχον τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι, (Lu. 4:42). In 1 Ki. 13:16 we have τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι with δύναμαι. These are just a few specimens. See Cases of the Inf.

(g) *The Appositional Infinitive*. The grammars draw a distinction here, but it is more apparent than real as Votaw[2] well says. The inf. in apposition is that with nouns; the epexegetical inf. is used with verbs. But at bottom the two uses are one. They are both limitative. With nouns the appositional inf. restricts or describes it. It is a common enough idiom in classical Greek[3] and is found also in the LXX. In the N. T. observe Ac. 15:28 πλὴν τούτων τῶν ἐπάναγκες, ἀπέχεσθαι, (Jas. 1:27) θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος—αὕτη ἐστίν, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι. Cf. further Ac. 26:16; 2 Cor. 10:13; Eph. 3:6, 8; 4:17; 1 Th. 4:3 f.; Heb. 9:8; 1 Pet. 2:15 (οὕτως). The articular inf. may also be appositional as in Ro. 14:13, τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τινθέναι. So also 2 Cor. 2:1; 7:11; Ro. 4:13; 1 Th. 4:6 *bis*. In the N. T. and the Apocrypha it is only τό (in the articular use) that is appositional, but in the 0. T. 15 out of the 17 instances have τοῦ without any reference to the case of the noun.[4] It is worth noting that ἵνα is common also in appositional clauses (cf. Lu. 1:43; 1 Cor. 9:18), especially in the writings of John (Jo. 4:34; 15:8;

[1] Hellen., p. 125. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 233.
[2] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 17.
[3] Cf. Hadley and Allen, § 950; Goodwin, § 1517.
[4] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 29.

17:3; 1 Jo. 3:11, 23; 4:21; 5:3, etc.). We find ὅτι also in 1 Jo. 2:3; 3:16).[1]

5. VERBAL ASPECTS OF THE INFINITIVE. It is worth repeating (p. 1057) that the inf. is substantive as well as verb. Each inf. does not, of course, have all the substantival and verbal uses, but each inf. has both substantival and verbal aspects. The uses vary with each example. The verbal aspects do not exclude the substantival, though some[2] writers say so. *Per contra*, Jannaris[3] holds that "the verbal nature of the substantival infinitive was sometimes completely lost sight of." This I do not concede. After tenses came to the verbal substantive its dual character was fixed. But, pp. 1050, 1056 f., the inf. did not come to the rank of a mode.

(a) *Voice*. The Sanskrit inf. had no voice. In Homer the inf. already has the voices, so that it is speculation as to the origin. It is possible that the original Greek inf. had no voice. This is an inference so far as the Greek is concerned, but a justifiable one. Moulton[4] illustrates it well by δυνατὸς θαυμάσαι, 'capable for wondering,' and ἄξιος θαυμάσαι, 'worthy for wondering,' when the first means 'able to wonder' and the second 'deserving, to be wondered at.' They are both active in form, but not in sense. "The middle and passive infinitives in Greek and Latin are merely adaptations of certain forms, out of a mass of units which had lost their individuality, to express a relation made prominent by the closer connection of such nouns with the verb."[5] There was so much freedom in the Greek inf. that the Sanskrit *–tum* did not develop in the Greek as we see it in the Latin supine. Gradually by analogy the inf. forms came to be associated with the voices in the modes. Practically, therefore, the Greek inf. came to be used as if the voices had distinctive endings (cf. the history of the imper. endings).[6] Thus in Lu. 12:58, δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, it is clear that the passive voice is meant whatever the origin of the form –σθαι. The reduplication shows the tense also. The same remark applies to Mk. 5:4, διὰ τὸ δεδέσθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὰς ἁλύσεις. See also 5:43, εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν. No special voice significance is manifest in φαγεῖν, which is like our

[1] See Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 229.

[2] As, for instance, Szczurat, De Inf. Horn. Usti, 1902, p. 17. He claims that the Horn. inf. came to serve almost all the ideas of the finite verb.

[3] Hist. Gk. Gr p. 576. [4] Prol., p. 203. [5] Ib.

[6] In Ac. 26:28, πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι, one notes a possible absence of the strict voice in ποιῆσαι. But it is a hard passage.

'eating' and is the acc. of general reference with δοθῆναι which in turn is the direct object of εἶπεν. But δοθῆναι has the passive force beyond a doubt. Cf. further ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο in Ac. 26:32 and ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι in 2 Cor. 7:12. In general, therefore, after the inf. is fully developed, the voice in the inf. appears exactly as in the modes. So τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι (Ac. 15:20); ἀπογράψασθαι (Lu. 2:5); ἐπιλαθέσθαι (Heb. 6:10); γαμηθῆναι (1 Cor. 7:39); κληθῆναι υἱός (Lu. 15:19). Cf. θεάσασθαι (Lu. 7:24) and θεαθῆναι (Mt. 6:1).

(b) *Tense*. See chapter on Tenses for adequate discussion of this point. Some general remarks must here suffice. As the Sanskrit inf. had no voice, so it had no tense. In the original Greek there was possibly no tense in the inf., but in Homer the tense is in full force.[1] There is no time-element in the inf. (cf. subj., opt. and imperative) except as the future inf. echoes the expectation of a verb like ἐλπίζω (or μέλλω) or as the inf. represents a fut. ind. in indirect discourse (see Indirect Discourse under Modes). It is probably true that originally there was no distinction between aorist (punctiliar) and present (linear) action in the inf. In Sanskrit and Latin the infinitives and supines have no necessary connection with the present stem (cf. supine *tactum* and inf. *tangere*).[2] "The σ in λῦσαι has only accidental similarity to link it with that in ἔλυσα."[3] Moulton[4] tersely adds: "But when once these noun-forms had established their close contact with the verb, accidental resemblances and other more or less capricious causes encouraged an association that rapidly grew, till all the tenses, as well as the three voices, were equipped with infinitives appropriated to their exclusive service." But even so at first the tense of the inf. had only to do with the kind of action (punctiliar, linear, state of completion), not with time.

In general, as with the subj., opt. and imper., the aorist inf. came to be the natural[5] one unless some reason for the present or perf. or fut. existed. Cf. καταβῆναι (Lu. 9:54); παθεῖν (Lu. 24: 46); καταλῦσαι (Mt. 5:17); προσεύξασθαι (Lu. 18:10); ἀκοῦσαι (Ac. 10:33); ἐκχέαι (Ro. 3:15), etc. Sometimes, as in ἔδει ποιῆσαι (Mt. 23:23), the inf. was used to suggest antecedent action. But the timeless aorist may point to what is future, as in Lu. 24: 46 above. Cf. also Lu. 2:26; Ac. 3:18. Essentially, it does neither. Cf. μέλλω with aor. inf. So μέλλοντα ἐνεγκ[εῖ]ν, P. Grenf.,

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 160.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 204
[3] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 59, notes 5,484 aorists and 3,327 presents in the Gk. Bible. In the N. T. the ratio is 4:3, in the 0. T. 2:1.
[3] Ib.
[4] Ib.

ii, 77 (iii/A.D.). In indirect assertions the aorist inf. represents the aor. indicative, but the N. T. seems to show no instance like this.[1] However, that is a mere accident, for note **ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτούς**. (Lu. 2:27) where the same principle applies. Contrast the tense of **ποιῆσαι** and **πείθεις** in Ac. 26:28. In Lu. 24:46, **γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν**, we have the timeless aorist in indirect discourse.

The present inf. with some verbs would accent linear action and with others the inf. would not draw the point, sharply. Some writers have a fondness for the present.[2] One can see the force of linear action in **ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι** (Jo. 9:4) and in **τὸ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτόν** (Mk. 12:33). Cf. also **στοιχεῖν**, in 3:16. In 1 Jo. 3:9, **οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν**, the linear notion is prominent (cf. **οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει** in verse 6). It is also quite normal with **μέλλω**, with which it occurs 84 times in the N. T. to 6 of the aorist. See Mt. 14:22 for both aorist **ἐμβῆναι** and present **προάγειν** in same sentence. Cf. also Ac. 15:37 f. The usual tense-distinction may be assumed to exist, though in a case like **λέγειν** (Heb. 5:11) the point is not to be stressed. The present inf. in indirect assertion represents the same tense of the direct, as in Mt. 22:23; Lu. 11: 18, etc. Rarely the present inf. represents an imperfect indicative as in Lu. 20:6.

The perfect inf. is common also in indirect discourse to stand for the same tense of the direct, as in Jo. 12:2. A.c. 12:14; 14: 19; 16:27. This is natural enough. But the perfect inf. is found also in the complementary inf. as Ac. 26:32, **ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο**. Note Lu. 12:58, **δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι**. But we also find the perfect tense with the articular inf. (so aorist and present) as in Mk. 5:4; Lu. 6:48; Ac. 27:9. In the N. T. there are in all 47 perfect infs. and the same number in the 0. T.[3] Of the N. T. examples 23 are anarthrous, 8 articular. The papyri show the articular perf. inf. Cf. **ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονέναι**, P. Oxy. 294 (A.D. 22); **ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀπολελύσθαι σε**, P. Br. M. 42 (B.C. 168).

The future inf. is increasingly rare. Thucydides even used **τό** with the future inf. The same construction is found in Polybius.[4] But in the **κοινή** the future inf. is weakening rapidly. This disappearance of the fut. inf. is partly due to the retreat of the fu-

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 53.

[2] Gilders1., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1882, p. 193. Madvig, Bemerkungen uber einige Punkte des Griech., 1848, p. 321, shows how the inf. has only the time of the principal verb.

[3] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 50. [4] Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 48.

ture tense in general[1] and partly to the apparent kinship between the future and aorist forms. In the papyri Moulton[2] notes that the future inf. is sometimes used in the κοινή as equivalent to the aorist or even the present, since the sense of the future was vanishing. Cf. χωρήσειν in Jo. 21:25 (ℵBC), while the other later MSS. give χωρῆσαι. In the 0. T. the fut. inf. (anarthrous always) occurs only 14 times and only 6 in the N. T. The Apocrypha has, however, 54, but almost all in 2 and 3 Maccabees.[3] Three of the N. T. examples are with μέλλω (Ac. 11:28; 24:15; 27:10). Another is in Ac. 23:30 and is dependent on a participle after a past indicative. In Ac. 26:7 the margin of W. H. (after B) has καταντήσειν (text —ῆσαι) with ἐλπίζει. In Heb. 3:18 note ὤμωσεν μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι (LXX). Another example is in Jo. 21:25, after οἶμαι. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 219) cites χρὴ ἑτοιμάσειν, B. U. 830 (i/A.D.).

(c) *Cases with the Infinitive.* In general the inf. uses the same case that the finite verb does. So the genitive in Heb. 6:10 ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου, the dative in 1 Cor. 7:39 ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, the acc. in Ac. 23:15 τοῦ ἀνελεῖν, the instrum. in Mt. 15:20 τὸ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν φαγεῖν, the locative in Ac. 21:21 μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθεσιν περιπατεῖν, the ablative in Ac. 15:20 τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἀλισγημάτων, the predicate nominative in Ac. 17:18 καταγγελεὺς εἶναι, the predicate accusative in Ro. 2:19 πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι, or the acc. of general reference in ind. discourse in Mk. 12:18. But this brings us again to the acc. in indirect assertion, a matter already treated at some length. (See Accusative Case, Indirect Discourse, and the next section.) But the thing to note is the real verbal nature of the inf. in the matter of cases. Note the three accusatives with τοῦ διδάσκειν in Heb. 5:12, two objects, one of general reference. The cognate neuter plural is seen in πολλὰ παθεῖν (Mt. 16:21).

(d) *The Infinitive in Indirect Discourse.* The frequent obscuration of the cases with the inf. in indirect discourse justifies some additional remarks besides those in the chapter on Modes. The inf. is not finite and, like the participle, has no subject. By courtesy the grammars often say so, but it beclouds more than it clears to do so. The case of the predicate[4] with the inf. is the

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 486, 552 ff.

[2] Prol., p. 204 f. Cf. Hatz., Einl., pp. 142, 190; Kalker, Quest., p. 281.

[3] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 59.

[4] Cf. Delbruck, Vergl. Synt., Tl. II, p. 460. Brug. (Griech. Gr., p. 518) takes the acc. as originally the obj. of the verb. That was not always true, as we have seen in Indirect Discourse (pp. 1037 ff.).

place to start. Cf. Mt. 19:21, εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι. See also 2 Cor. 10:2, δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι, where the nominative occurs within the domain of the accusative articular inf. But note Mk. 14:28, μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω. The true nature of the acc. with the inf. as being merely that of general reference comes out well in the articular inf., as in Jas. 4:2, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς. It is not necessary here to go over again the steps taken under Modes, but simply to insist on the true nature of the accusative with the inf. It stands, indeed, in the place of a finite verb of the direct statement, but does not thereby become finite with a subject. From the syntactical standpoint the construction is true to both the substantival and verbal aspects of the inf. The subject of the finite verb, when thrown into the acc., takes this turn because of the limitations of the inf. When it is retained in the nominative, it is by apposition with the subject of the principal verb or by attraction if in the predicate. Draeger sees this point clearly in his treatment of the latter in Latin where the acc. with the inf. is much more frequent than in Greek.[1] "The name is confessedly a misnomer," say King and Cookson.[2] Schmid[3] also sees the matter clearly and makes the acc. with the inf. the acc. of general reference. The usual beaten track is taken by Jolly,[4] but the truth is making its way and will win. Schmitt[5] admits that the acc. is not the grammatical subject, but only the logical subject. But why call it "subject" at all? Schroeder[6] properly likens it to the double accusative with διδάσκω, as in διδάσκω αὐτὸν περιπατεῖν. The late Sanskrit shows a few examples like English "if you wish me to live:"[7] The use of the acc. with the inf. early reached a state of perfection in Greek and Latin. Schlicher[8] notes 130 instances of it in Homer with φημί alone as against 15 with ὡς ὅτι. We see it in its glory in historians like Xenophon and Thucydides in Greek and Cesar in Latin. Votaw[9] notes the rarity of the construction in the 0. T. and Apoc. (46 verbs), while the N. T. has 27 (83 exx.) verbs which use the idiom. But even in the N. T., as compared with the ancient Greek, the construction is greatly narrowed. The particular

[1] Hist. Synt., Bd. II, pp. 380, 446.
[2] Introd. to Comp. Gr., 1890, p. 214.
[3] Uber den Infinitiv, p. 40.
[4] Gesch. de Inf., p. 247.
[5] Uber den Urspr. des Substantivsatzes, p. 5.
[6] Uber die formelle Untersch. der Redet., p. 28.
[7] Wilhelmius, De Inf. linguarum Sanscritae, Beoticae, Persicae, Graecae, Oscae, Vmbricae, Latinae, Goticae Forma et Vsv, 1873, p. 5.
[8] Moods of Indirect Quotation, Am. Jour. of Theol., Ja ., 1905.
[9] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 9.

verbs in the N. T. which may use the acc. and the inf. in indirect assertion were given under Modes. A general view of the matter discloses a rather wide range still. But the idiom, being largely literary, is chiefly found in Luke, Rom. and 1 Cor. The other writers prefer ὅτι. Luke, in fact, is the one who makes the most constant use of the idiom, and he quickly passes over to the direct statement. There is with most of them flexibility as was shown. Blass[1] has a sensible summary of the situation in the N. T. There is, in truth, no essential difference in the Greek construction, whether the inf. is without a substantive, as in Ac. 12:15 διισχυρίζετο ὅτως ἔχειν, with the acc., Ac. 24:9 φάσκοντες ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν, or with the nom. Ro. 1:22 φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί. Cf. Ac. 17:30; 1 Pet. 3:17. Words like δεῖ, ἀνάγκη may be followed by no substantive (Mt. 23:23; Ro. 13:5). Cf. Lu. 2:26. In 1 Pet. 2:11, we have only the predicate ὡς παροίκους—ἀπέχεσθαι. Freedom also exists. In Mk. 9:47 we have καλόν σέ ἐστιν μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν, while in Mt. 18:8 we read καλόν σοί ἐστιν μονόφαλμον εἰσελθεῖν. Even in Matthew the predicate adj. is acc., though it might have been dative, as in Ac. 16:21. Further examples of the predicate dative when an accusative is possible are seen in Lu. 1:3; 9:59; Ac. 27:3 (ℵAB); 2 Pet. 2:21. But see Ac. 15:22, 25; Heb. 2:10. The case of the inf. itself is not the point here. There are besides verbs of willing, desiring, allowing, making, asking, beseeching, exhorting, some verbs of commanding, the inf. with πρίν, ὥστε, τό, τοῦ, prepositions and the articular infinitive. With all these the acc. may occur.

A difficult inf. occurs in Ac. 26:28, ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. Is με the object of πείθεις or of ποιῆσαι? Can πείθεις be 'try by persuasion'? Prof. W. Petersen suggests that this is a contamination of ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν εἶναι and ἐν ὀλίγῳ με ποιήσεις Χριστιανόν. But verbs differ. Κελεύω, for instance, always has the acc. and the inf., while the dative comes with τάσσω (Ac. 22:10), ἐπιτάσσω (Mk. 6:39), and verbs like ἐντέλλομαι, ἐπιτρέπω, παραγγέλλω, and impersonal expressions like συμφέρει, ἔθος ἐστίν ἀθέμιτον, αἰσχρόν, etc. As shown above, καλόν ἐστιν is used either with the acc. or the dative, as is true of λέγω (cf. Mt. 5:34, 39 with Ac. 21:21; 22:24). Blass[2] adds also Ac. 5:9, συνεφωνήθη ὑμῖν πειράσαι. He notes also that προστάσσω occurs with the acc. (Ac. 10:48) as is true of ἐπιτάσσω (Mk. 6:27) and τάσσω (Ac. 15:2). Even συμφέρει appears with the acc. and inf. (Jo. 18:14) and ἔξεστιν (Lu. 6:4, where D has the dative, as is true of Mt.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 239-241. [2] Ib., p. 240.

12:4). With ἐγένετο Blass[1] observes how clumsy is ἐγένετό μοι—γενέσθαι με (Ac. 22:17). The acc. and inf. occurs with ἐγένετο (Ac. 9:32) and the dative also in the sense of it 'befell' or 'happened to' one, as in Ac. 20:16. In Ac. 22:6, ἐγένετό μοι—περιαστράψαι φῶς, the two constructions are combined. Blass[2] further observes the independence of the inf. in adding an ace. of general reference besides the acc. with a verb of asking, as in Ac. 13:28 ἠτήσαντο Πειλᾶτον ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν, (1 Th. 5:27) ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολήν. In Ac. 21:12, παρεκαλοῦμεν—τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, the αὐτόν is acc. of general reference with the inf., which is itself in the genitive as to form, though the real object of the verb. There is no instance in the N. T. of the inf. in a subordinate clause unless we follow Nestle in 1 Pet. 5:8, ζητῶν τίνα καταπιεῖν. There are sporadic examples of such a construction due to analogy of the inf. in the main clause.[3] Cf. 0. P. 1125, 14 (ii/A.D.), οὓς καὶ κυριεύειν τῶν καρπῶν.

(e) *Personal Construction with the Infinitive.* Many verbs and adjectives allowed either the personal or the impersonal construction with the infinitive. The Greek developed much more freedom in the matter than the Latin, which was more limited in the use of the impersonal.[4] In the N. T. the impersonal construction occurs with fixed verbs like δεῖ, Ac. 25:24, βοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν μηκέτι, where note inf. dependent on inf. as is common enough (Ac. 26:9; Lu. 5:34; Heb. 7:23; Mk. 5:43; Lu. 6:12; 8:55). So also with ἔξεστιν, etc. The impersonal construction is seen also in Lu. 2:26; 16:22; Ph. 3:1; Heb. 9:26, etc. The inf. with impersonal verbs is somewhat more frequent in the N. T. than in the LXX. On the whole the personal construction with the inf. is rare in the N. T.[5] But in the N. T. δοκέω has the personal construction, as in Ac. 17:18, δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι (cf. Jas. 1:26; Gal. 2:9, etc.), but we find ἔδοξέ μοι in Lu. 1:3 (cf. Ac. 15:28, etc.) and even ἔδοξα ἐμαυτῷ δεῖν πρᾶξαι (Ac. 26:9). The κοινή seems to use it less frequently than the ancient Greek. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 148) quotes Vett. Valens, p. 277, 19, δόξει—ὑπάρχειν αὐτῆν τὴν αἵρεσιν. We have δεδοκιμάσμεθα πιστευθῆναι (1 Th. 2:4) and ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι (Heb. 11:4). One may compare the personal construction with ὅτι (1 Cor. 15:12; 2 Cor.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 241. [2] Ib.

[3] Cf. Middleton, Analogy in Synt., p. 9. Maximus of Tyre has it in a rel. clause. Durr, Sprachl. Unters., p. 43.

[4] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 239.

[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 239.

3:3; 1 Jo. 2:19). The personal construction occurs with πρέπει (Heb. 7:26). The impersonal has the acc. and the inf. (1 Cor. 11:13), the dative and the inf. (Mt. 3:15), both the dative and the acc. (Heb. 2:10). Cf. W. F. Moulton in Winer-Moulton, p. 402. The love of the passive impersonal appears in Ac. 13: 28 ᾐτήσαντο **Πειλᾶτον, ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν** and in 5:21, ἀπέστιλαν ἀχθῆναι αὐτούς (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 148). The nominative predicate with the inf. and the nom. in indirect discourse is to be noted also.

(f) *Epexegetical Infinitive*. As already remarked, there is no essential difference between the appositional and the epexegetical use of the infinitive. The epexegetical inf. is added to a clause more or less complete in itself, while the merely appositional is more simple.[1] It is common in the dramatists. This use is probably adnominal[2] in origin, but it drifts into the verbal aspect also. We see a free use of the limitative[3] inf. in ὡς ἔπος εἰ πεῖν which only occurs once in the N. T. (Heb. 7:9). Brugmann does not agree with Granewald that this is the original epexegetical or limitative inf., though it is kin to it. Blass[4] applies "epexegetical" merely to the appositional inf. It is in the epexegetical inf. that we see more clearly the transition from the original substantive to the verbal idea. It is hard to draw the line between δόγμα ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην (Lu. 2:1) and παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα (Ro. 1:28). The first is appositional, the latter epexegetical. A good instance of the epexegetical inf. is seen in 2 Cor. 9:5, where ταύτην ἑτοίμην εἶναι ὡς εὐλογίαν is subsidiary to the ἵνα clause preceding, as is often the case. Viteau[5] notes that the construction is frequent in the Epistles. Cf. Eph. 1:16-18 **(**ἵνα—εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι**)**, 3:16 f. **(**ἵνα –κραταιωθῆναι, κατοικῆσαι, Col. 1:10 **(**ἵνα –περιπατῆναι), 4:3 (ἵνα—λαλῆσαι). Further examples occur in Lu. 1:54 μνησθῆναι, 1:72 ποιῆσαι καὶ μνησθῆναι, 1:79 ἐπιφᾶναι τοῦ κατευθῦναι, Ac. 17:27 ζητεῖν, 2 Pet. 3: 2 μνησθῆναι. The LXX[6] shows rather frequent instances of the articular inf. in this sense (cf. Gen. 3:22; Judg. 8:33; Ps. 77:18). The N. T. shows very few. Indeed, Votaw finds only one, that in Gal. 3:10, ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει πᾶσιν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. But certainly

[1] Thomspon, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 239.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 517.
[3] Granewald, Der freie formelhafte Inf. der Limit. im Griech., p. 21 f.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 229.
[5] Le Verbe, p. 161.
[6] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 26.

τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι (Ro. 1:24) after παρέδωκεν is just as truly epexegetical as is ποιεῖν in verse 28 after παρὲδωκεν. So also Ro. 7:3; 8:12; 1 Cor. 10:13. Burton[1] looks at the epexegetical inf. as "an indirect object," as in Lu. 10:40, ἡ ἀδελφή μου μόνην με κατέλειπεν διακονεῖν. There is no doubt that in such instances the inf. is in the original dative case with the dative idea. See further Mk. 4:23; 6:31; Lu. 7:40; 12:4; Ac. 4:14; 7:42; 17:21; 23:17, 18, 19; Tit. 2:8, etc.

(g) *Purpose*. It is but a step from the explanatory or epexegetical inf. to that of design. Indeed, the epexegetical inf. sometimes is final, a secondary purpose after ἵνα, as in Eph. 1:18; 3:17; Col. 1:10, etc. The sub-final or objective use of the inf. is also a step on the way. This use was very common in the ancient Greek, but was partially taken up by ἵνα in N. T.[2] But many verbs, as we have seen, retain the sub-final inf. in the N. T. as in the rest of the κοινή. Blass' careful lists and those of Viteau were given under Indirect Discourse. This notion of purpose is the direct meaning of the dative case which is retained. It is the usual meaning of the inf. in Homer,[3] that of purpose. It goes back to the original Indo-Germanic stock.[4] It as always more common in poetry than in prose. The close connection between the epexegetical inf. and that of purpose is seen in Mk. 7:4, a παρέλαβον κρατεῖν (‘for keeping,’ ‘to keep’). So Mt. 27:34, ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν οἶνον (‘for drinking,’ ‘to drink’). So Mt. 25:35, ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν. The inf. with the notion of purpose is exceedingly frequent in the LXX, second only to that of the object-inf. with verbs.[5] It was abundant in Herodotus.[6] Hence Thumb[7] thinks its abundant use in the κοινή is due to the influence of the Ionic dialect. Moulton[8] agrees with this opinion. This is true both of the simple inf. of purpose and τοῦ and the inf. The Pontic dialect still preserves the inf. of purpose after verbs like ἀναβαίνω, etc. It is noteworthy that this inf. was not admitted into Latin except with a verb of motion. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 205) cites Par. P. 49 (ii/B.C.) ἐὰν ἀναβῶ κἀγὼ προσκυνῆσαι, as parallel to Lu. 18:

[1] N. T. M. and T., p. 147.

[2] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255 f.; Humphreys, Th Problems of Greek, Congress of Arts and Sciences, 1904, vol. III, pp. 171 ff.

3 Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 154.

[4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 516; Delbruck, Grundr., IV, pp. 463 ff.

[5] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 10.

[6] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 240.

[7] Theol. Lit., 1903, p. 421.

[8] Prol., p. 205.

10, ἀνέβησαν—πορσεύξασθαι. Moulton[1] notes this correspondence between the ancient and the modern vernacular and agrees with Thumb's verdict again that the result is due to the two conflicting tendencies, one the universalizing of ἵνα, which prevailed in Western Hellenism and resulted in the disappearance of the inf. in modern Greece, while the idealizing of the inf. in Pontus serves to illustrate to-day the N. T. idiom. The N. T. use of the inf. of purpose includes the simple inf., **τοῦ** and the inf., **εἰς τό** and the inf., **πρὸς τό** and the inf. **ὥστε** and the inf. There is no example of **ἐφ' ᾧ τε**. First note the simple inf., all in the original dative case. This use had a wider range in Homer than in the Attic writers. Thus Mt. 2:2 **ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ**; (5:17) **οὐκ ἦλθον καταλύσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι**; (7:5) **διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος** (11:7) **τί ἐήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι** (so verse 8, **ἰδεῖν**); 20:28; (Mk. 3:14) **ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν** (5:32) **περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν; (**Lu. 18:10) **ἀνέβησαν προσεύξασθαι**; (Jo. 4:15) **διέρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν**; (Ac. 10:33) **πάρεσμεν ἀκοῦσαι**; (2 Cor. 11:2) **ἡρμοσάμην ὑμᾶς** –**παραστῆσαι**; (Rev. 5:5) **ἐνίκησεν—ἀνοῖξαι**; (16:9) **οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι**. These examples will suffice. It is very common in the N. T. It is not necessary to multiply illustrations of **τοῦ** after all the previous discussion. The 0. T. shows the idiom in great abundance, though the construction is classic. It was used especially by Thucydides.[2] This was a normal use. We have already noticed that Paul makes little, if any, use of this idiom.[3] It is possible in Ro. 6:6; Ph. 3:10. Indeed, Votaw[4] notes only 33 instances of **τοῦ** and inf. of purpose in the N. T., and these are chiefly in Matthew, Luke and Acts. Note (Mt. 2: 13) **ζητεῖν τοῦ ἀπολέσαι**, (13:3) **ἐξῆλθεν τοῦ σπείρειν**, (Lu. 21:22) **τοῦ πλησθῆναι πάντα**, (24:29) **τοῦ μεῖναι**. See further Ac. 3:2; 5: 31; 26:18; 1 Cor. 10:7; Gal. 3:10; Heb. 10:7, etc. The use of **τοῦ μή** is, of course, the same construction. Cf. Ro. 6:6, **τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς.** Cf. Ac. 21:12. In Lu. 2:22 note **παραστῆσαι**, and in verse 24 **τοῦ δοῦναι**. Purpose is also expressed by **εἰς τό** as in 1 Th. 3:5, **ἔπεμψα εἰς τὸ γνῶναι**, and by **πρὸς τό** as in. Mt. 6:1, **πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι**. In the N. T. **ὥστε** with the inf. of purpose is rare. Originally purpose was the idea with **ὥστε**, or conceived result. Actual result with **ὥστε** was expressed by the indicative.

[1] Prol., p. 205. Allen gives no ex. of the simple inf. of purpose in Polyb., only **τοῦ, ὥστε, ἐφ' ᾧτε**. Cf. Inf. in Polyb., p. 22.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 216. Thuci was the first to use **τοῦ** and the inf. for purpose (Berklein, Entwickelungsgesch., p. 58).

[3] Ib., p. 217 f.

[4] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 21.

In the LXX the notion of purpose is still common, especially in the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus.[1] In the N. T. there are only 8 instances, leaving out Ac. 20:24, according to W. H., and only 7 if we follow W. H. in Lu. 9:52. See Mt. 10:1, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν καὶ θεραπεύειν. And ὥστε (=ὡς, τε, 'and so') is simply 'so as,' not 'so that.' See also Lu. 4:29, ὥστε κατακρημνίσαι. Cf. further Mt. 15:33; 27:1; Lu. 20:20. Burton[2] thinks that in Mt. 27:1 ὥστε gives rather content than purpose. One must not confuse with τοῦ and the inf. of purpose the somewhat analogous construction of τοῦ and τοῦ μή after verbs of hindering. This is in reality, as was shown, the ablative and the regular object-inf. (substantival aspect). Cf. Lu. 4:42; Ac. 20:27; Ho. 15:22. Votaw[3] notes 22 verbs in the LXX and the N. T. that use this idiom. The only common one is κωλύω. See further Final Clauses in chapter on Modes for papyri examples.

(h) *Result*. Purpose is only "intended result," as Burton[4] argues. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 153) says that the difference between purpose and result in the inf. is often only in the more subjective or objective colouring of the thought. It is hard to draw a line between conceived result and intended result. Blass[5] explains a number of examples as result that I have put above under Purpose, as Rev. 5:5; 16:9. It is largely a matter of standpoint. The line of distinction is often very faint, if not wholly gone. Take Rev. 5:5, for instance, ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων ἀνοῖξαι. The lion had opened the book and so it was I actual result. So also Ac. 5:3, διὰ τί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σε. Ananias had actually lied. In the ancient Greek also the distinction between purpose and result was not sharply drawn.[6] The inf. may represent merely the content[7] and not clearly either result or purpose, as in Eph. 3:6, εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη. Cf. also 4:22, ἀποθέσθαι. This is not a Hebraistic (Burton) idiom, but falls in naturally with the freer use of the inf. in the κοινή. See also Ac. 15:10 ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγόν, (Heb. 5:5) γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα. Where it is clearly result, it may be actual or hypothetical.[8] The hypothetical is the natural or conceived result. The N. T. shows but 12

[1] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 10. [2] N. T. M. and T., p. 150.
[3] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 24. Cf. W.-M., p. 409.
[4] N. T. M. and T., p. 148.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 224. [6] Baumlein, Modi, p. 339.
[7] W.-M., p. 400. See Burton, N. T. M, and T., p. 150 f.
[8] Allen, Inf. in Polyb., p. 21,

instances of the simple inf. with the notion of result, according to Votaw.[1] In the 0. T. it is quite common. The 12 examples in the N. T. are usually hypothetical, not actual. So Ro. 1:10 **εὐοδωθήσομαι ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς** (Eph. 3:17) **κραταιωθῆναι, κατοικῆσαι**, (6:19) **γνωρίσαι**, (Col. 4:3) **λαλῆσαι**, (4:6) **εἰδέναι**, (Heb. 6:10) **ἐπιλαθέσθαι**. It is here that the kinship with purpose is so strong. Cf. Rev. 16:9. But some examples of actual result do occur, as in Lu. 10:40; Ac. 5:3; Rev. 5:5. In the 0. T.[2] we have actual result with **τοῦ** and the inf., but no examples occur in the N. T. Not more than one-half of the examples of **τοῦ** and the inf. in Luke, who gives two-thirds of the N. T. instances, are final.[3] Some of these are examples of hypothetical result. See discussion of Result in chapter on Mode for further discussion and papyri examples. It is rather common in the 0. T., though not so frequent in the N. T.[4] It is possible to regard Mt. 21:32, **μετεμελήθητε τοῦ πιστεῦσαι**, thus, though in reality it is rather the content of the verb.[5] There is similar ambiguity in Ac. 7:19, **ἐκάκωσεν τοῦ ποιεῖν**. But the point seems clear in Ac. 18:10, **οὐδεὶς ἐπιθήσεταί σοι τοῦ κακῶσαί σε**, and in Ro. 7:3, **τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα.** If **τοῦ** can be occasionally used for result, one is prepared to surrender the point as to **εἰς τό** if necessary. It is usually purpose, but there is ambiguity here also, as in Mt. 26:2; 1 Cor. 11:22, where the purpose shades off toward hypothetical result. In Ac. 7:19 we seem to have hypothetical result, **εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογονεῖσθαι**. So also Ro. 6:12, **εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν**. It is true also of Heb. 11:3, **εἰς τὸ γεγονέναι**. See further Ro. 12:3; 2 Cor. 8:6; Gal. 3:17.[6] Votaw[7] argues for actual result in Ro. 1:20, **εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους**. It is hard to deny it in this passage. But it is **ὥστε** and the inf. that is the usual N. T. construction for this idea with the inf. As already shown (see Mode) nearly all of the 62 examples of **ὥστε** and the inf. in the N. T. have the notion of result. Once Votaw[8] notes an instance of hypothetical result in the N. T., 1 Cor. 13:2, **κἂν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάνειν**. Burton[9] goes further and includes in this category Mt. 10:1; 2 Cor. 2:7. But these debatable examples are n harmony with the usual am-

[1] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 13.

[2] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 25. Cf. Ruth 2:10, **τί ὅτι εὗρον χάριν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου τοῦ ἐπιγνῶναί με**; See also 2 Chron. 33:9; 1 Macc. 14:36.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 217.

[4] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 25.

[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 216.

[6] Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 161; Moulton, Prol., p. 219.

[7] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 21.

[8] Ib., p. 14.

[9] N. T. M. and T., p. 149.

biguity as to result and purpose. There is no doubt about the examples of actual result with ὥστε. Thus Mt. 13:54 ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ὥστε ἐκπλήσσεσθαι καὶ λέγειν, (Mk. 9:26) ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν, (Lu. 12:1) ὥστε περιπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, (Ac. 5:15) ὥστε ἐκφέφειν. See also Ac. 15:39; Ro. 7:6; 2 Cor. 7:7; Ph. 1:13, etc. There is one instance in the text of W. H. where ὡς occurs with the inf., Lu. 9: 52, ὡκ ἑτοιμάσαι with the idea of purpose involved. Cf. ὡς σχεῖν 0. P. 1120, 19 f. (iii/A. D.). The use of ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν (Heb. 7:9) is the absolute idea, as already shown. Different also is ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν (2 Cor. 10:9) = 'as if.' A clear case of result occurs in Epictetus, IV, 1, 50, οὕτως—μὴ ἀποδύρασθαι.

(i) *Cause*. There is only one example in the N. T. of the articular inf. without a preposition in this sense. That is in 2 Cor. 2:13, τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν, and it is in the instr. case as already shown. The LXX shows a half-dozen examples, but all with variant readings.[1] But it is common with διὰ τό to have the causal sense, some 32 times in the N. T.[2] See Prepositions and Substantival Aspects of the Infinitive. Cf. Mt. 13:5 f.; Mk. 5:4; Lu. 6:48; Jas. 4:2 f. There is one instance of ἕνεκεν τοῦ in 2 Cor. 7:12.

(j) *Time*. Temporal relations are only vaguely expressed by the inf. See Tense in this chapter for the absence of the time-element in the tenses of the inf. except in indirect discourse. Elsewhere it is only by prepositions and πρίν, (an adverbial preposition in reality) that the temporal idea is conveyed by the inf. Antecedent time is expressed by πρίν or πρὸ τοῦ. For πρὸ τοῦ, see Mt. 6:8; Lu. 2:21, etc. **Πρίν**, or πρὸ τοῦ (so in Mt. 1:18; Mk. 14:30; Ac. 7:2; W. H. have πρὶν ἤ in the margil in Ac. 2:20) occurs with the inf. 11 times, all aorists (all in Gospels and Acts). We have it only twice with finite verb after negative sentences, once with the subj. (Lu. 2:26), once with the opt. (Ac. 25:16), both in Luke (literary style). See, for the inf.,[3] Mt. 26:34 πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, (Jo. 4:49) πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν. See further Mt. 26:75; Mk. 14:72; Lu. 22:61 (five of the instances are practically identical); Jo. 8:58; 14:29; Ac. 2:20. In Herodotus, under the influence of indirect discourse, the inf. occurs with ὅκως, ἐπεί ἐπειδή, εἰ, διότι and the relative pronouns.[4] Con-

[1] Votaw, Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 29.

[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 161, mentions only 23.

[3] The inf. with πρίν is common in Hom. See Monro, p.58.

[4] Benard, Formes verbales en Grec d'apres le Texte d' Orodote, 1890, p. 196. See also Sturm, Die Entwick. der Konstrukt. mit πρίν, 1883, p. 3.

temporaneous action is described by ἐν τῷ, especially in Luke. Cf. Lu. 1:21, ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν. See Prepositions with Infinitive for further remarks. Subsequent action is set forth by μετὰ τό as in Mt. 26:32; Lu. 12:5, etc. In Ac. 8:40, ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν, we have the prospective future.

(k) *The Absolute Infinitive*. This idiom is very common in Homer, especially as an imperative and in the midst of imperatives.[1] R. Wagner[2] notes that in Homer this use of the inf. occurs with the nom. The papyri still show examples like ὁ δεῖνα τῷ δεῖνα χαίρειν.[3] Gerhard[4] holds that in such cases there is ellipsis of λέγει. The Attic inscriptions[5] frequently have the absolute infinitive as imperative. Deissmann (*Light from the Anc. East,* p. 75) notes that, as in German, it is common in edicts and notices. Cf. imperatival use of infinitive in modern French. He quotes from the "Limestone Block from the Temple of Herod at Jerusalem" (early imperial period): **Μηθένα ἀλλογενῆ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τρυφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου**, 'Let no foreigner enter within,' etc. See also Epictetus, IV, 10, 18, **ἵνα δὲ ταῦτα γένηται, οὐ μικρὰ δέξασθαι οὐδὲ μικρῶν ἀποτυχεῖν**. The imperatival use was an original Indo-Germanic idiom.[6] It flourishes in the Greek prose writers.[7] Burton[8] and Votaw[9] admit one instance of the imperatival inf. in the N. T., Ph. 3:16, τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν. But Moulton[10] rightly objects to this needless fear of this use of the inf. It is clearly present in Ro. 12:15, **χαίρειν, κλαίειν**. The case of Lu. 9:3 is also pertinent where **μήτε ἔχειν** comes in between two imperatives. Moulton himself objects on this point that this inf. is due to a mixture of indirect with direct discourse. That is true, but it was a very easy lapse, since the inf. itself has this imperatival use. In 1 Th. 3:11; 2 Th. 2:17; 3:5 there is the nominative case and the whole context besides the accent to prove that we have the optative, not the aorist active infinitive. See Mode for further discussion. Moulton[11] quotes Burkitt as favouring the mere infinitive, not **ἔδει**, in Mt. 23:23, **ταῦτα δὲ ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφεῖναι**, after the Lewis Syriac MS., and also **καυχᾶσθαι**.— in 2 Cor. 12:1 after **א**. The

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 162.
[2] Der Gebr. des imper. Inf. ion Griech., 1891, p. 12.
[3] Reinach, Pap. grecs et demotiques, 1905.
[4] Unters. zur Gesch. des griech. Briefes, Phil. Zeitschr., 1905, p. 56.
[5] Meisterh., p. 244.
[6] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 516.
[7] W.-M., p. 397.
[8] N. T. M. and T., p. 146.
[9] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 18.
[10] Prol., p. 179.
[11] Ib., p. 248.

imperatival use of the inf. was common in laws and maxims and recurs in the papyri.[1] So A. P. 86 (i/A.D.) ἐξεῖναι, μισθῶσαι. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 146) quotes Theo, *Progymn.*, p. 128, 12, φέρε ζητεῖν, where the inf. is used as a deliberative subj. would be. He gives also the Hellenistic formula, εἰς δύναμιν εἶναι τὴν ἐμήν, Inscr. Pergam., 13, 31; 13, 34. Hatzidakis[2] notes that in the Pontic dialect this construction still exists. The epistolary inf. has the same origin as the imperatival inf. It is the absolute inf. This is common in the papyri. See Ac. 15:23; 23:26; Jas. 1:1, χαίρειν. The nom. is the nominative absolute al Cf. 2 Jo. 10, where χαίρειν is the object of λέγετε. Radermacner (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 146) notes how in the later language the ace. comes to be used with the absolute inf., as in C. Inscr. lat. V. 8733, δουνε αυτων= δοῦ ναι αὐτόν. It is just in this absolute inf. that we best see the gradual acquirement of verbal aspects by the inf. It is probably the oldest verbal use of the inf.[3] The construction in Heb. 7:9, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, is but a step further on the way. There is but one example of this absolute inf. with ὡς in the N. T.[4] Cf. τοῦ πολεμῆσαι in Rev. 12:7, where it is an independent parenthesis.

(1) *Negatives*. The ancient Greek used μή chiefly with the inf. except in indirect assertion where οὐ of the directs was retained. But we see οὐ with the inf. after verbs of saying as early as Homer, φὴς οὐχ ὑπομεῖναι, *Iliad*, XVII, 174. Thus οὐ won a place for itself with the inf., but many verbs retained μή as verbs of swearing, hoping, promising, etc. But special phrases could have οὐ anywhere and strong contrast or emphasis would justify οὐ.[5] Votaw[6] finds 354 instances in the Greek Bible where the inf. itself is modified by the negative. Of these 330 have μή and the rest have compounds of μή. The anarthrous inf. with he notes 59 times in the 0. T., 32 in the Apocrypha and 47 in the N. T., 139 in all. The articular inf. with μή he finds in the 0. T. 136 times (τοῦ 99, τό 37), in the Apocrypha 21 times (τοῦ 10, τό 11), in the N. T. 35 times (τοῦ 15, τό 20), 192 in all (τοῦ 124; τό 68). With the anarthrous inf. the negative more frequently occurs with the principal verb as in οὐ θέλω. We do have οὐ in infinitival clauses, as will be shown, but in general it is true to say that the inf. directly is always negatived by μή in the N. T. This is true of

[1] Ib., p. 179. [2] Einl., p. 192. [3] Moulton Prol., p. 203.
[4] For the variety of uses of the absolute inf. in ancient R. see Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 310 ff.
[5] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 414.
[6] Inf. in Bibl. Gk., p. 58.

all sorts of uses of the inf. So the subject-inf. uses **μή**, as **κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι** (2 Pet. 2:21), both the anarthrous as above and the articular as in Lu. 17:1. The object-inf. likewise has **μή**, as in Lu. 21:14, **θέτε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν μὴ προμελετᾶν**. For the articular accusative with **μή** see Ro. 14:13. We have it with indirect commands as in Mt. 5:34, **λέγε ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι**, and in indirect assertion as in Ac. 23:8, **λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν μήτε ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα.** We have it with **τοῦ μή** as in Jas. 5:17, **τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι**, and with prepositions as in 2 Cor. 4:4, **εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι**. With verbs of hindering and denying the negative **μή** is not necessary, but it was often used by the ancients as a redundant negative repeating the negative notion of the verb, just as double negatives carried on the force of the first negative. It was not always used. When the verb itself was negatived, then **μὴ οὐ** could follow.[1] But we do not find this idiom in the N. T. Examples of the N. T. idiom have already been given in this chapter. The variety in the N. T. may be illustrated. See Lu. 23:2 **κωλύοντα φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι**, (Ac. 4:17) **ἀπειλησώμεθα αὐτοῖς μηκέτι λαλεῖν**, (Gal. 5:7) **τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι**, (Ro. 15:22) **ἐνεκοπτόμην τοῦ ἐλθεῖν** (Lu. 4:42) **κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι**, (Mt. 19:14) **μὴ κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν πρός με**, (1 Cor. 14:39) **τὸ λαλεῖν μὴ κωλύετε** (Ac. 14:18) **μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς** (Ac. 8:36) **τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι**, (10:47) **μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ δύνατι κωλύσαί τις τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι**, (20:20) **οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι**. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 149) illustrates "the Pauline **τὸ μή** with the infinitive" by Sophocles' *Electra*, 1078, **τό τε μὴ βλέπειν ἑτοῖμα** and the inscr. (Heberdey-Wilhelm, Reisen in Kilikien, 170, 2), **τὸ μηδέν' ἄλλον--ἐπεισενενκεῖν**. We may note also Ac. 4:20, **οὐ δυνάμεθα μὴ λαλεῖν**, where the negative is not redundant. Cf. also Jo. 5:19, **οὐ δύναται ποιεῖν οὐδέν**, where the second negative is redundant, but it repeats the **οὐ**. Some MSS. have a redundant negative **μή** with **εἰδέναι** in Lu. 22:34 (cf. 1 Jo. 2:22 after **ὅτι**) and with **προστεθῆναι** in Heb. 12:19. So AP read **ἀντιλέγοντες** in Lu. 20:27.

Even in indirect discourse the same negative is repeated, as in Ac. 26:26, **λανθάνειν αὐτὸν τούτων οὐ πείθομαι οὐθέν**. Here **οὐθέν** strictly goes with **λανθάνειν** in spite of its position after **πείθομαι**, but **οὐ** is construed with **πείθομαι**, and so **οὐθέν**, is used rather than **μηθέν** or **μηδέν**. But in Mk. 7:24, **οὐδένα ἤθελεν γνῶναι**, it is not best to explain **οὐδένα** with the inf. in this fashion. This looks like the retention of the old classic use of **οὐ** with the inf. which

[1] See Thompson, Synt., pp. 425 ff.

the grammars are not willing to allow in the N. T.[1] Epictetus uses **οὐ** with the inf. as in IV, 10, 18, **οὐ μικρὰ δέξασθαι οὐδὲ μικρῶν ἀποτυχεῖν**. As a matter of fact we have a number of other examples of **οὐ** with the inf., too many to rule out without ceremony. There is the case in.Heb. 7:11, **τίς ἔτι χρεία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν λέγεσθαι**; It is true that a comes just before **κατὰ τὴν τάξιν** but it is rather orced to deny it any connection with **λέγεσθαι**. Sec also Ro. 8:12, **ὀφειλέται οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν**, where, however, a occurs outside of **τοῦ** and is directly concerned with **τῇ σαρκί**. Other examples of sharp contrast by means of **οὐ** are found, as in Ac. 10:40 f., **ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι, οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ ἀλλὰ μάρτυσι**; Ro. 7:6, **ὥστε δουλεύειν ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος;** Heb. 13:9, **βεβαιοῦσθαι οὐ βρώμασιν** (but here no contrast is expressed). In Ro. 4:12, 16, with **εἰς τό**, we find **οὐ μόνον**—**ἀλλὰ καί**.

(m) **᾽Αν** *with the Infinitive*. This classic idiom has vanished from the N. T. save in 2 Cor. 10:9, **ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν**. Even here it is not a clear case, since **ἐκφοβεῖν** depends on **δόξω** and **ὡς ἄν** to comes in as a parenthetical clause, ‘as if’ (‘as it were').

The treatment of the infinitive has thus required a good many twists and turns due to its double nature.

III. **The Participle** (**ἡ μετοχή**).

1. THE VERBALS IN **–τος** AND **–τέος**. These verbals are not exactly participles inasmuch as they have no tense or voice. They are formed from verb-stems, not from tense-stems, and hence are properly called verbal adjectives.[2] In the broadest sense, however, these verbals are participles, since they partake of both verb and adjective. Originally the infinitive had no tense nor voice, and the same thing was true of the participle. For convenience we have limited the term participle to the verbal adjectives with voice and tense. The verbal in **–τος** goes back to the original Indo-Germanic time and had a sort cf perfect passive idea.[3] This form is like the Latin *–tus*. Cf. **γνωτός**, *notus*; **ἄγνωτος**, *ignotus*. But we must not overdo this point. Strictly this pro-ethnic *–tos* has no voice or tense and it never came to have intimate verbal connections in the Greek as it did in Latin and English.[4] Thus *amatus est* and **ἀγαπητός ἐστιν** do not correspond, nor, in truth, does 'he is loved' square with either. "Even in Latin, a word like *tacitus* illustrates the absence of both tense

[1] Cf. Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.
[2] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 262.
[3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 200. [4] Moulton, Prol., p. 221.

and voice from the adjective in its primary use."[1] Already in the Sanskrit voice and tense appear with some of the participles, but "the division-line between participial and ordinary adjectives is less strictly drawn in Sanskrit than in the other Indo-European languages."[2] The ambiguity due to the absence of voice in the verbal in **--τος** was inherited from the original Indo-Germanic time.[3] It becomes, therefore, a lexical, not a syntactical problem to decide in a given instance whether the verbal is "active" or "passive" in signification. In itself it is neither. A similar problem is raised in compound adjectives like **θεο-μάχοι** (Ac. 5:39), 'fighting God.' In modern Greek the verbal in **--τος** is rare and is little more than an adjective (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 151), though the new formation in **–άτος** has more verbal force. This ambiguity appears in Homer and all through the Greek language.[4] Blass[5] overstates it when he says that in the N. T. "the verbal adjective has practically disappeared, with the exception of forms like **δυνατός**, which have become stereotyped as adjectives." As a matter of fact the verbal in **–τος** is still common in the N. T. as in the **κοινή** in general. Take, for instance, **ἀγαπητός, ἄγνωτος, ἀδύνατος, ἀκατάγνωτος, ἀναμάρτητος, ἀνεκτός, ἀόρατος,ἄπιστος, ἀπόβλητος, ἀρεστός, ἀρκετός, γεννητός, γραπτός, διδακτός, δυνατός, εὐλογητός, ζεστός, θαυμαστός, θνητός, θεόπνευστος, ὁρατός, παθητός, παρείσακτος, πιστός, φθαρτός, χρηστός**, etc. It is true[6] that the tendency is rather to accent the adjectival aspect at the expense of the verbal idea of these words. But this also was true at the start, as we have just seen in the Sanskrit. The point to note is that the verbal does not denote voice. In Ac. 14:8; Ro. 15:1, **ἀδύνατον** is 'incapable,' whereas usually it is 'impossible,' as in Mt. 19:26 =Mk. 10:27, etc. In Ro. 8:3, therefore, it is doubtful whether **τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου** is the 'impotency' or the 'impossibility' of the law.[7] There is no' notion of tense or of *Aktionsart* in these verbals in **–τος** and so **ἀγαπητός** does not distinguish[8] between **ἀγαπώμενος, ἀγαπηθείς** and **ἠγαπημένος**. Moulton thus properly notes the fact that in Mt. 25:41 we have **κατηραμένοι**, 'having become the subjects of a curse,' not **κατάρατοι**, 'cursed.' It is interesting to note **χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ** in 1 Pet. 1:8, but here **ἀνεκλάλητος** is active in sense,

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 221.
[2] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 347.
[3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 200.
[4] Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 761.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 37.
[6] Cf. Viteau, Essai sur la Synt. des Voix, Revue de Philol., p. 41.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 221.
[8] Ib.

'inexpressible.' The ambiguity comes also in our English participle 'borne' used for αἰρόμενον in Mk. 2:3, and the punctiliar 'brought' used for ἐνεχθεῖσαν in 2 Pet. 1:18. With these Moulton[1] contrasts ἠρμένον ('taken away') in Jo. 20:1. It is worth while to study a few more examples from the lexical point of view. In general[2] the passive sense is more common, as in ἀγαπητός (Mt. 3:17); εὔθετος (Lu. 9:62); διδακτός (Jo. 6:45); θεόπνευστος (2 Tim. 3:16); θεοδίδακτος (1 Th. 4:9); γραπτός and κρυπτός (Ro. 2:15 f.).[3] Here (Ro. 2:15 f.) τὰ κρυπτά is used just like a substantive (neuter adjective in plural). But ζεστός (Rev. 3:15) is active in sense as ἀσύνετος (Ro. 1:31), though ἀσύνθετος next to it (paronomasia) is made from the middle συντίθεμαι ('covenant').[4] Συνετός, sometimes passive in sense in the old Greek, is always active in the N. T., as in Mt. 11:25, but θνητός (Ro. 6: 12) is 'liable to death,' not 'dying,' as παθητός (Ac. 26:23) is 'capable of suffering.' Cf. the Latin adjectives in —*bilis*.

The verbal in –τέος is later than that in -τος and does not occur in Homer. It is probably a modification of the verbal -τος to express the idea of the predicate-infinitive, like 'this is not to eat (to be eaten).'[5] It is really a gerundive and is used in the personal or impersonal construction, more commonly the latter.[6] The personal is always passive in sense, while the impersonal is active and may be formed from transitive or intransitive verbs.[7] It expresses the idea of necessity. It wall never as common as the verbal in —τος and is not unknown in the papyri,[8] though not frequent. It is more like the verb (and participle) than the verbal in -τος in one respect, that it often uses the cases of the regular verb.[9] This is seen in the one example n the N. T. (Lu. 5:38) οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς βλητέον. It is the impersonal construction, though the agent is not here expressed. This example of -τέον in Luke is a survival of the literary style (cf Viteau, "Essai sur la Syntaxe des Voix," *Revue de Philologie*, p. 38). See Theo, *Progymn*., p. 128, 12, εἰ γαμητέον.

[1] Ib., p. 222. [2] Riem. and Goelzer, Synt., p. 707.

[2] In Sans. the verbal adjs. in *-ta* are sometimes called passive participles (Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 340). This form does not belong to the tense system.

[4] Moulton, Prol., p. 222.

[5] Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 184, 525. [7] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 368 f.

[6] Riein. and Goelzer, Synt,, p. 707. [8] Moulton, Prol., p. 222.

[9] But even with -τος this sometimes appears as in διδακτοὶ θεοῦ (Jo. 6:45) where we have the ablative. Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 5221

2. HISTORY OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) *The Sanskrit Participle*. This was more advanced in its development than the Sanskrit infinitive, which had no voice or tense. In the Veda the aorist present, perfect and future tenses have participles.[1] The distinction in the structure of the participle as compared with the other verbal adjectives lies just in this point. The mere verbal is formed on the verb-stem, while the participle is formed on the tense-stem.[2] In the Sanskrit also both voices (active and middle) show these participles. Thus already in the original Indo-Germanic tongue it appears probable that the participle existed with voice, tense, *Aktionsart* and government of cases.[3] The Greek participle is thus rooted in this pro-ethnic participle as seen by the very suffixes *–nt--*, *–meno–*, *–wos–* (*–us*).[4]

(b) *Homer's Time.* Already in Homer and Hesiod the participle occurs as a fully developed part of speech. It occurs on an average of 8 1/6 times per page of 30 lines.[5] In Hesiod the participle is chiefly attributive, while the predicate participle is less common than in Homer.[6] This use of the participle as the practical equivalent of the hypotactic clause is a purely Greek development (copied by the Latin to some extent) within historical times.[7] The participle is a literary device, and flourished best with writers of culture who were **φιλομέτοχοι**.[8] Broadus used to call the Greek "a participle-loving language," and, taken as a whole, this is true. Certainly the participle had its most perfect development in the Greek. The aorist participle died in the Sanskrit and did not appear in the Latin. It is the aorist active participle which made the participle so Powerful in Greek. The English, like the Sanskrit and the Greek, is rich in participles, though the German is comparatively poor. "We gain a certain grandeur and terseness by the constructidn, a certain sweep, a certain **περιβολή**, such as Hermogenes recognises as lying in the participle."[9] This wealth of participles gives flexibility and swing td the language.

(c) *The Attic Period.* In Herodotus the participle jumps to

[1] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 202. [2] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 262.
[3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 521 f.
[4] Brug., Indoger. Forsch., V, pp. 80 ff.; Giles, Man., p. 473; Moulton, Prol., p. 221.
[5] Williams, The Part. in the Book of Acts, 1909, p. 7.
[6] Bolling, The Part. in Hesiod, Cath. Univ. Bull., 1S97, III, p. 423.
[7] Ib. [8] Jann., Hist. Gk. Or., p. 505.
[9] Gildersl., Stylistic Effect of the Gk. Part., Am. Jour, of Philol., 1888, p. 142.

17 1/2 times per page of 30 lines.[1] But Sophoeles has it only 9 times on the same scale. Williams[2] runs the parallel on with 13 for Thucydides, 125 for Xenophon, 10 1/6 for Platt, 10 3/4 for Demosthenes. It is thus in the historians and orator and not the poets, that we see the participle in its glory.

(d) The **Κοινή**. Here we note a sharp difference in the several styles of writing. The Atticists like Josephus with 20, and 2 Maccabees with 23 1/2, lead in conscious imitation of the ancients. They go beyond them in fact. But the writers of the literary κοινή follow close behind, as Polybius with 17 4/5, Strabo with 13 1/2 and Plutarch with 14. Certainly there is no sign of decay here. But in the LXX, Exodus, Deuteronomy and Judges give only 6 1/6 while[3] the papyri show 6 4/5. This confirms the judgment that the vernacular was not fond of the participle and found it clumsy. Jannaris[4] quotes striking passages from Thucydides, Plato and Demosthenes which illustrate well the clumsiness and ambiguity of the participle in long, involved sentences. Even in the older Greek in unconventional or unscholarly composition the accumulation of participles is shunned. The clearer and easier analysis of co-ordinate or subordinate clauses was used instead.[5] In the N. T. we see the participle used on the whole more frequently than in the LXX and the papyri. The Hebrew had a certain restraining influence on the participle in the LXX. In the vernacular papyri the participle was held back on the principle just stated above. It is Luke who make most frequent use of the participle with 161 in the Gospel and 17 1/6 in the Acts per page of 30 lines.[6] But 1 Peter follows close behind with 15 2/3 and Hebrews with 14. In the other Gospels Matthew has it 12 1/2, Mark 11 2/3 and John 10 2/5.[7] James has it 10 per page, while in the Epistles and Revelation it drops back to 8 and 9. On the whole it is much as one would expect. The more literary books lead (after Paul with only 9 per page average in Gal., 1 Cor., and Rom.).[8] The historical books surpass the Epistles, while Hebrews here reveals its hortatory, sermonic character. For a succession of participles see Ac. 12:25; 23:27; Heb. 1:3 f.; Mk. 5:15. The details of the N. T. situation will come later.

(e) *Modern Greek*. The participle more and more came to be

[1] Williams, The Part. in Acts, p. 7.
[2] Ib., p. 10.
[3] Ib.
[4] Hist. Gk. Cr., p. 504.
[5] Ib., p. 505.
[6] Williams, Part. in Acts, p. 23.
[7] Ib.
[8] Ib., p. 22. Williams did not count 2 Cor. and the other Pauline Epistles.

scholastic and dropped out of the vernacular.[1] In particular was this true of the circumstantial participle. The classic Greek by means of the participle developed the periodic style (λέξις κατεστραμμένη) and is seen at its highest in Isocrates. See, for example, the "Ciceronian period" in Isocrates, p. 82. Jebb[2] contrasts this with λέξις εἰρομένη, simply tacking clause to clause as in Mt. 7:25, 27 and colloquial repetition of finite verbs as in Jo. 1 47; 7:4. But βλέπετε, βλέπετε, βλέπετε (Ph. 3:2) has rhetorical effect. In the vernacular modern Greek, therefore, we see a retreat of the participle all along the line. It is not dead as the infinitive, but is dying, though some vernacular writers are bringing back the use of the participle for literary purposes (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 168). The analytic tendency of modern language is against it. See Jebb's remarks for the various devices used instead of the participle. The only participles left in modern Greek are the indeclinable present active in —οντας (cf. gerund in Latin), some middle (or passive) parts. in –ούμενος or –άμενος and perfect passives like δεμένος (no reduplication).[3] A few are made from aorist stems like ἰδωμένος (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 150). The use of the part. in the modern Greek is very limited indeed.

3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) *Originally an Adjective*. The infinitive was originally a substantive, as we have seen. In the Sanskrit it did not acquire voice and tense, though it had the verbal idea of action. The participle, as we have seen, had made more progress in the Sanskrit, but it was also originally an adjective. It never got away from this original adjectival idea.[4] But we are not left to history and logic to prove this point. It so happens that some participles in form never became participles in fact. They are merely adjectives. Homer shows a number of such words.[5] Cf. ἄσ-μενος. We see remnants of this usage in the N. T. like ἑκών (Ro. 8:20), ἄκων (1 Cor. 9:17). Other participles come in certain uses to be only substantives (adjectives, then substantives), though the true participial use occurs also. Cf. ἄρχων, 'a ruler' (Mt. 20: 5); ἡγούμενος, 'a governor' (Ac. 7:10); τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν, 'your belongings' (Lu. 12:33). In general "the adjective represents a quality at rest, the participle represents a quality in motion."[6] But

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 505. [2] V. and D., Handb., p. 333.
[3] Thumb, Handb., p. 167. pf. also Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 242.
[4] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 522.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 54. Cf. Stahl, Krit.-hist. Synt., p. 681.
[6] Bolling The Part. in Hesiod, Cath. Univ. Bull., 1897, III, p. 422.

not all verbs express motion. The mere adjectival notion is more common in the Latin, as in *praeteritus, quietus, tacitus*, etc. In Mt. 17:17, γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, the verbal adjective and participle occur together.

(b) *The Addition of the Verbal Functions.* These functions are tense, voice and case-government. There was originally no notion of time in the tense, nor does the tense in the participle ever express time absolutely. It only gives relative time by suggestion or by the use of temporal adverbs or conjunctions.[1] The verbal idea in the participle thus expands the adjectival notion of the word.[2] But the addition of these verbal functions does not make the participle a real verb, since, like the infinitive, it does not have subject.[3]

(c) *The Double Aspect of the Participle.* The (very name participle (*pars, capio*) indicates this fact. The word is part adjective, part verb. Voss calls it *mules*, which is part horse and part ass.[4] Dionysius Thrax says: **Μετοχή ἐστι λέξις μετέχουσα τῆς τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἰδιότητος**. In the true participle, therefore, we are to look for both the adjectival and the verbal aspects, as in the infinitive we have the substantival and the verbal. The emphasis will vary in certain instances. Now the adjectival will be more to the fore as in the attributive articular participle like **ὁ καλῶν**.[5] Now the verbal side is stressed as in the circumstantial participle. But the adjectival notion never quite disappears in the one as the verbal always remains in the other (barring a few cases noted above). One must, therefore, explain in each instance both the adjectival and verbal functions of the participle else he has set forth only one side of the subject. It is true that the verbal functions are usually more complicated and interesting,[6] but the adjectival must not be neglected.

(d) *Relation between Participle and Infinitive.* As already explained, they are closely allied in use, though different in origin. Both are verbal nouns; both are infinitival; both are participial. But the participle so-called is inflected always, while the infinitive so-called has lost its proper inflection. The infinitive, besides, expresses[7] the action in relation to the verb, while the participle expresses the action in relation to the subject or the object of the

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 522.
[2] Ib.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 53.
[4] Farrar, Gk. Syn p. 169.
[5] Brug., Griech. Gr., p: 522.
[6] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 163.
[7] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 242. In general, on this Point, see Goodwin, M. and T., p. 357.

verb (or some other substantive or pronoun).[1] The distinction between the participle and the infinitive thus becomes quite important. Thus in Lu. 16:3, **ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι**, the idea is 'I am ashamed to beg and do not do it,' while **ἐπαιτῶν αἰσχύνομαι** would be 'I beg and am ashamed of it.'[2] Cf. the analytic expression in 2 Tim. 1:12. In Xenophon, *Mem*., 2, 6, 39, we have **αἰσχύνομαι λέγων**. So **ἄρχομαι** in Attic Greek took the infinitive as a rule, linking the infinitive with the verb. But sometimes the participle occurred, linking the action to the subject (or object) and so contrasting the beginning with the end.[3] In the N. T. all the examples have the present infinitive except Lu. 13:25 **ἑστάναι**. In Lu. 3:23, **ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα**, we have neither with **ἀρχόμενος**. Cf. Lu. 14:30, **ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν**. Radermacher (N. T. Gr., p. 169) compares **ἀρξάμενος ἐξετίθετο** (Ac. 11: 4) with **ἀρξαμένη—κατέχομαι** (Xen. of Eph., p. 388, 31). On the other hand, in the N. T. **παύομαι** occurs only with the participle, as in Lu. 5:4, **ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν**. Cf. Ac. 5:42; 6:13; Eph. 1:16; Col. 1:9; Heb. 10:2. But in Ac. 14:18 note **κατέπαυσαν τοῦ μὴ θύειν**, which well illustrates the difference between the inf. and the part. The use of **ἐτέλεσεν διατάσσων** (Mt. 11:1) Blass[4] calls unclassical. The part. alone occurs with **ἐνκακέω** (Gal. 6:9; 2 Th. 3:13). Note also **ἐπέμενον ἐρωτῶντες** (spurious passage in Jo. 8:7), but **ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε** (Ac. 27:33) without **ὄντες**. Cf. Ac. 12:16, **ἐπέμενεν κρούων**, and Lu. 7:45, **οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσα**. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 169) finds the part. with **ἐπιμένω** in "vulgar literature." He observes that many of these neater classical idioms with the part. do not appear in the N. T. Contrast with this the inf. in Ac. 20:20, 27, **οὐ γὰρ ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι**. There is no example of the inf. with **φαίνομαι** in the N. T., but the part. occurs in Mt. 6:16, 18 (**νηστεύων**). The adjective alone is seen in Mt. 23:27, 28. Cf. also Ro. 7:13. It is hardly on a par with the participle in Mt. 6:17 in spite of Blass's insistence.[5] Thoroughly classical also are **προέφθασεν αὐτὸν λέγων** (Mt. 17:25) and **ἔλαθον ξενίσαντες** (Heb. 13: 2), specimens of literary style. The infinitive with **προφθάνω** occurs in Clem., *Cor*., II, 8, 2. The part. with **τυγχάνω** does not occur in the N. T. In the later **κοινή** the inf. takes the place of the participle with **λανθάνω, παύομαι** and **φθάνω** (Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 169). The part. is found with **ὑπάρχω**

[1] Cf. Schoemann, Die Lehre von den Redet. nach den Alten, 1862, p. 34.
[2] Robertson, Short Gr., p. 194.
[3] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 245.
[4] Ib.
[5] Ib.

(Ac. 8:16) and προϋπάρχω (Lu. 23:12). It is doubtful if the participle belongs to the verb in 1 Tim. 5:13, ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσιν περιερχόμεναι, but, if so, it is not to be understood as like the inf.[1] In Ph. 4:11; 1 Tim. 5:4, the inf. occurs with μανθάνω according to classic idiom. At any rate, if περιερχόμεναι (1 Tim. 5:13) is a circumstantial part., something has to be supplied with ἀργαί. The part. in 1 Tim. 1:12, πιστόν με ἡγήσατο θέμενος, is certainly circumstantial. The distinction between the inf. and the part. comes out sharply in indirect discourse also. The inf. is more objective. Thus note ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον (Jo. 12:18) and ἀκούομεν γάρ τινας περιπατοῦντας (2 Th. 3:11). The participle is a descriptive adjective even though in indirect discourse (cf. Lu. 4:23; Ac. 7:12). See 1 Cor. 11:18 for the inf. again. In Mt. 7:11, οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι, the inf. with οἶδα means 'know how to give.' But in Lu. 4:41, ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, it is mere indirect discourse. For lithe part. see 2 Cor. 12:2, οἶδα— ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον (cf. Mk. 6:20). In Ac. 3:9 note εἶδεν αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα. Here we have the same root, though a different sense. Οἶδα is common with ὅτι. But γινώσκω occurs both with the inf. as in Heb. 10:34, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοὺς κρείσσονα ὕπαρξιν, and the participle as in Heb. 13:23, γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον. Cf. Lu. 8:46, ἐγὼ ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν, where the tense and participle both accent the vivid reality of the experience. But note the inf. in Mt. 16:13. The same thing is true of ὁμολογέω as in Tit. 1:16, θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, and 1 Jo. 4:2, ὃ ὁμολογεῖ ᾽Ιησοῦν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα (cf. 2 Jo. 7). Cf. also Ac. 24: 10 ὄντα σε κριτὴν ἐπιστάμενος and δοκιμάζω in 1 Th. 2:4 and 2 Cor. 8:22. Note difference between ἵνα εὕρωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ (Lu. 6:7) and εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας (Mk. 14:37). Cf. Indirect Discourse. Further examples of the supplementary participle come later. These sufficiently illustrate the difference between the use of inf. and part.

(e) *Method of Treating the Participle*. The hybrid character of the participle has led to a great deal of diversity in its treatment in the grammars. Prof. Williams[2] gives an interesting summary in his monograph. None of them are satisfactory because they do not follow a consistent plan. Part of the, divisions are from the adjectival, part from the verbal point of view. They are not parallel. Thus we have Kuhner's complementary, attributive, adverbial participles; Goodwin's attributive, circumstantial, supplementary; Burton's adjectival, adverbial, substantival;

[1] W.-M., p. 436. [2] The Part. in Acts, pp. 1 ff.

Jannaris' adjectival and adverbial; Blass' attributive and in additional clause; Hadley and Allen's attributive and predicate; Delbruck-Brugmann's external, objective, adverbial. Then Williams[1] adds another that no better, ascriptive, adverbial, complementary. Thompson[2] gives the attributive and the supplementary participle after saying that the nominal and the verbal classification is more elastic. The only way to get symmetry in the treatment of the participle is to follow the line of its double nature (adjectival and verbal) and discuss the adjectival functions and the verbal functions separately. See the discussion of the infinitive. That is to say, each participle must be considered as both adjectival and verbal. Not all the adjectival aspects will be true of any one participle nor all of the verbal, but each one will have some adjectival and some verbal functions. Thus alone can one get a clear statement of the many participial combinations and permutations. As an Adjective the participle is attributive (anarthrous or articular) or predicate. It may even be substantival, especially with ὁ. It is always declinable. As a verb there is always voice and tense and there may be cases. But any given anarthrous predicate participle may be either supplementary (complementary) or circumstantial (additional) or wholly independent (as indicative or imperative). The articular participle is ruled out of this three-fold alternative, though it still has voice, tense and governs cases. The articular participle is always attributive (or substantival). The lines thus cross and recross in the nature of the case. But a clear statement of all the essential facts can be made by taking the adjectival and the verbal aspects separately. In any given instance there is thus a double problem. Both sides of the given participle must be noted.

4. ADJECTIVAL ASPECTS OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) **Declension**. The free declension of the participle in number and gender and case (cf. *per contra* the infinitive) makes the task of noting the adjectival aspects comparatively simple. There are anomalies of agreement in these three points as with other adjectives. Thus in Rev. 3:12 ἡ καταβαίνουσα in apposition with τῆς καινῆς Ἰερ. does not conform in case. There is a difficulty of both case and gender in πεπυρωμένης in Rev. 1:15. See also πλῆθος κράζοντες (Ac. 21:36) where the number and gender both vary. In Mk. 4:31 note ὅς ὂν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων where ὄν takes the gender of σπέρμα. Cf also ἦν καθήμεναι (Mt. 27:61).

[1] The Part. in Acts, p. 5.

[2] Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 249.

But these matters are discussed adequately in chapter on The Sentence.

(b) **Attributive Participle.**

(a) *Anarthrous*. The article is not of course necessary with the attributive participle any more than with any other attributive adjective. Thus we have ὕδωρ ζῶν (Jo. 4:10), 'living water,' which is just as really attributive as τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν (Jo. 4:11). When the article is used there is no doubt abort the participle being attributive. When it is absent, it is an open question to be examined in the light of the context. Note also 1 Cor. 13:1, χαλκὸς ἠχῶν ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον. This construction (the anarthrous attributive) is not so common as the other uses of the participle,[1] and yet it is not wholly absent from the N. T. See ἦχος ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας (Ac. 2:2) and θύρα ἠνεῳγμένη (Rev. 4:1). It is not always easy to draw the line between the anarthrous attributive participle and the predicate participle of additional statement. Cf. ἀνὴρ γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῷ πόλει ταύτῃ (Ac. 22:3). If ὁ occurred before these participles, we should have the articular-attributive participle which is equivalent to a relative.[2] So in Ac. 10:18, we have ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος, but in 10:32, ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος. Cf. Lu. 6:48, ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν, with Mt. 7:24, ἀνδρὶ οἵστις ᾠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν. See also Lu. 6:49. Cf. Ro. 8:24, ἐλπὶς βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς. Cf. Mt. 27:33. The problem is particularly real in Mk. 5:25, 27. W. H. indicate by the comma after ἐλθοῦσα that they regard the participles with γυνή (οὖσα, παθοῦσα, δαπανήσασα, ὠφεληθεῖσα, ἐλθοῦσα) up to that point as attributive. They describe the woman who comes. Then the sentence proceeds with the predicate-circumstantial participles (ἀκούσασα ἐλθοῦσα) before ἥψατο. Luke (8:43) makes the matter plainer by putting a relative clause after the first participle. The anarthrous attributive participle is closely bound to the substantive or pronoun even when it is an additional statement. See Mt. 12:25, πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ᾽ ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται. See also Lu. 6:0; 2 Th. 2:4; Rev. 2:15. In Mt. 13:19, παντὸς ἀκούοντος, we probably have the genitive absolute and so predicate circumstantial, but even here αὐτοῦ occurs, though remote. Cf. πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων (Mt. 7:26) and πᾶς ὅστις ἀκούει (7:24), where we see how nearly these constructions approach each other.[3] But the anar-

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 330. [2] Blass, Gr. of Nf T. Gk., p. 242.

[3] This use of πᾶς without art. occurs occasionally in class. Gk. See K.-G., II, p. 608 f.

throus indefinite participle is clearly found in Jas. 4:17, **εἰδότι οὖν καλὸν ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι, ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ ἐστιν.** This passage may throw some light on Mt. 12:25. In Mt. 13:35, **διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος**, we probably have the articular attributive participle, since the Greeks did not always place the attributive participle between the article and the substantive.[1] The use of **ἔχων** is interesting in Rev.15:1, **εἶδον ἀγγέλους ἑπτὰ ἔχοντας πληγάς**. The anarthrous indefinite participle is seen also in a few constructions like **προσετίθεντο πιστεύοντες τῷ κυρίῳ** (Ac. 5:14), where the participle means 'believing men' and has **πλήθη** in apposition with it. See also **φωνὴ βοῶντος** (Mk. 1:3, LXX), **ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος** (Mt. 2:6, LXX), **οὐκ ἔστιν συνίων** and **οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκζητῶν** (Ro. 3:11, LXX) where **ὁ** is morel common, **ἔχεις ἐκεῖ κρατοῦντας** (Rev. 2:14). It is worth noting in this connection also the fact that occasionally a preposition occurs with an anarthrous participle (cf. infinitive). So **χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος** (Ro. 10:14). Here the idea is not 'without preaching,' but 'without one preaching,' 'without a preacher.' For 'without preaching' we must have **χωρὶς τοῦ κηρύσσειν**. See once (more **χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων** (12:15) and **ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας** (1 Pet. 3:12). In 1 Cor. 15:27, **ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος**, we have the usual articular construction.

(β) *Articular*. The articular participle occurs a few times in Homer.[2] In general the Book of Acts has the articular participle in about the same proportion as the great Attic writers.[3] All articular participles are, of course, attributive. But the matter has some points of interest and cannot be dismissed with this general statement. The examples are very numerous. The substantives may be expressed as in **τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν** (Mt. 25:34); **οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες** (Mk. 3: 22). Like other articular adjectives, the participle may come between the article and the substantive, as in **τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ** (1 Tim. 1:10); **τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος** (Mt. 2:7); **τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς** (Heb. 12:2). Cf. Jude 3. The substantive may precede and the article may be repeated, as **τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν** (Jo. 4:11); **τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον** (1 Cor. 15:37); **τῷ θεῷ τῷ διδόντι** (1 Cor. 15: 67). Cf. Mt. 26:28; 27:44; Jam. 5:1; Ro. 2:10. In Mk. 12:38 the article is repeated as in 1:40 (apposition) when the nominative reminds us of the common anacoluthon in Revelation.

[1] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 330.
[2] Vogrinz, Gr. des hom. Dialektes, 1889, p. 184.
[3] Williams, The Part. in the Book of Acts, p. 46.

With proper names note **Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός** (Mt. 1:16); **ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος** (Ac. 10:18). Cf. 1 Th. 1:10; 2 Tim. 1: 8 f. For a long passage see **ὁ — διδάσκων** (Ac. 21:28). The order of the words is not insisted on and in long passages the participle may follow without the repetition of the article, as in Mt. 6:30, **τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ σήμερον ὄντα καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον.** See also Ac. 12:10; 13:32; 26:4, 6; Heb. 2:2; Heb. 12:3, where in the long clause the participle with **τοιαύτην**, comes in between **τὸν** and **ὑπομεμενηκότα** and a good distance from **ἀντιλογίαν**. Sometimes the article is, used with the participles but not with the substantive, as in **παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις** (Lu. 7: 32); **χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου** (1 Pet. 1:7); **ὄνομα τὸ δεδομένον** (Ac. 4:12); **πολὺς ἀριθμὸς ὁ πιστεύσας** (Ac. 11:21); **πολλοὶ πλάνοι οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες** (2 Jo. 7); **ἄνθρωποι οἱ--ἀρνούμενοι**, (Jude 4, where note the series of participles and one adjective **ἀσεβεῖς** parallel with the participles). Cf. also 1 Cor. 2:7. The articular participle also occurs with pronouns,[1] as in **σὺ ὁ ἐρχόμενος** (Mt. 11: 3); **τινὰς τοὺς πεποιθότας** (Lu. 18:9); **τις ὁ συλαγωγῶν** (Col. 2:8); **αὐτοῖς τοῖς πιστεύουσιν** (Jo. 1:12); **σὺ ὁ κρίνων** (Jas. 4:12); **τινὲς οἱ ταράσσοντες** (Gal. 1:7); **πολλοὶ οἱ φρονοῦντες** (Ph. 3:18. f.). Particularly in address do we find the articular participle, as in Mt. 7:23; 27:40; Lu. 6:25 (but note dative in 6:24); Ac. 2: 14; 13:16. The use of the articular participle with **πᾶς** is common, as **πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος** (Mt. 5:22); **πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων** (Mt. 7:26), **πᾶς ὁ λέγων** (7:21). This is equal to the relative clause **πᾶς ὅστις** (Mt. 7:24). In Ro. 2:1 **πᾶς ὁ κρίνων** is used with **ἄνθρωπε**. Cf. **πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες** in Ac. 9:21. Here also **ὁ πορθήσας**, is continued by **καὶ ἐληλύθει** as if it were a relative clause. The articular participle sometimes occurs where it is followed by an infinitive. Here it is still further complicated, but it is clear. See **τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι** (Ro. 8:18); **τὰ δοκοῦντα μέλη—ὑπάρχειν** (1 Cor. 12:22). Cf. also 2 Pet. 3:2. The use of **ὁ ὤν** in Acts calls for special remark. In Ac. 13:1, **κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν,** we see this idiom, which Moulton[2] translates 'the local church.' Note 14:13 D, **τοῦ ὄντος Διὸς Προπόλεως** (or **πρὸ πόλεως**). Cf. Ramsay's remark (*Ch. in Rom. Emp.*, p. 52, quoting J. A. Robinson), that in Acts **ὁ ὤν**, "introduces some technical phrase, or some term which it. marks out as having a technical sense (cf. 5:17; 13:1 28:17), and is almost equivalent to **τοῦ ὀνομαζονμένου**." An ingenious person might apply this in Eph. 1:1 to the text with **ἐν ἘΕφέσῳ** absent; but the usual view needs no defence against such an alternative.

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 243. [2] Prol., p. 228.

With αἱ οὖσαι in Ro. 13:1 we may compare Par. P. 5 (ii/B.C.), ἐφ᾽ ἱερέων καὶ ἱερειῶν τῶν ὄντων καὶ οὐσων. So N. P. 49 (iii/A.D.), τοῦ ὄντος μηνός 'the current month.' The passage in Ac. 5:17 reads ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις, and 28:17 has τοὺς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρώτους. Moulton agrees, we may note, with Sanday and Headlam (in loco) in taking ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων (Ro. 9:5) as referring to Jesus. As is well known, the difficulty here is a matter of exegesis and the punctuation of the editor will be made according to his theology. But it may be said in brief that the natural way to take ὁ ὤν and θεός is in apposition to ὁ **Χριστός**. It is a very common thing in the N. T., as already noted, to have ὁ and the participle where a relative clause is possible. But this idiom is common in the older Greek. See Ac. 10:18, 32, and chapter on Article. It remains then to speak of the frequent use of thearticular participle without a substantive or pronoun. This idiom is too common for exhaustive treatment, but some examples are given. Cf. Mt. 10: 40, ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. Note also ὁ δεχόμενος and the next verse and ὃς ἂν ποτίσῃ in verse 42. See further Mt. 10:37; Ac. 10:35; Rev. 1: 3. The question of the tense is interesting in some of these examples, as in ὁ εὑρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν in Mt. 10:39, but that will be discussed a bit later. Like a relative clause, the articular participle may suggest[1] the notion of cause, condition, purpose, etc., as in Mt. 10:37, 39, 40, 41; Lu. 14:11; Ro. 3:5. But this notion is very indefinite.

(c) **Predicate Participle**. From the adjectival standpoint all participles that are not attributive are predicate. This aspect of the participle must be elucidated further. The verbal aspect comes into special prominence with all the predicate participles. They will be touched very lightly here and receive full discussion under Verbal Aspects. It may be said at once that all the supplementary and circumstantial participles are predicate. One must not confuse the articular participle in the predicate like σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Lu. 7:19) with the real predicate participle. Cf. Lu. 16:15; 22:28.[2] The predicate participle is simply the adjective in the predicate position. That is, it is not attributive. There are obviously many varieties of the predicate participle. But the predicate adjective has had adequate treatment. Cf. ἔχε με παρῃτημένον (Lu. 14:18). Cf. also Heb. 5:14; Ac. 9:21.

(d) **The Participle as a Substantive**. The adjective, though a variation from the substantive, is sometimes used as a substantive

[1] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 167. [2] Ib., p. 169.

as in τὸ ἀγαθόν. It is not strange, therefore hat the participle also shows substantival uses. These are sometimes anarthrous, as in ἄρχων, (Mt. 9:18), ἡγούμενος (Mt. 2:6). But, as a rule, the participle as a substantive is articular. Cf. Lu. 12:33, τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν, where the genitive shows the substantival character of this participle. Cf. further 2:27 τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου, (1 Cor. 7:35) πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν συμφέρον, (Ph. 3:8) διὰ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως, (Mt. 14:20) τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων (Ro. 7:23) τῷ ὄντι (Heb. 12:11) πρὸς τὸ παρόν, etc. There are also the many examples where ὁ and the part. is used without a subst. or pron., as in Mt. 10:39, ὁ εὑρών and ὁ ἀπολέσας (cf. ὁ ἀγαθός, ὁ κακός). The substantive use of the participle is a classic idiom.[1] The use of the neuter participle as an abstract substantive is not so common in the N. T. as in the ancient Greek.[2] But see further τὸ γεγονός (Lu. 8:56), τὰ γινόμενα (9:7), τὸ ἀπολωλός (19:10), τὰ ἐρχόμενα (Jo. 16:13), τὸ νῦν ἔχον (Ac. 24:25), τὰ μὴ ὄντα, τὰ ὄντα (1 Cor. 1:28), τὸ αὐλούμενον (14:7), τὸ δεδοξασμένον (2 Cor. 3:10 f.), τὸ δοκοῦν (Heb. 12:10), etc. In Lu. 22:49 note τὸ ἐσόμενον. One is not to confuse with this idiom the so-called "substantive participle" of some grammars, which is a term used for the substantivizing of the verbal force of the participle, not the adjectival. Thus Burton[3] calls the supplementary participle like that in Ac. 5:42, οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες, and in Lu. 8:46, ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, the "substantive participle." I confess that I see nothing to be gained by applying "substantive" to the purely verbal aspects of the participle. Confusion of thought is the inevitable result. See 5, (d), (δ).

(e) **The Participle as an Adverb.** The formation of adverbs from participles is due to its adjectival function. Cf. ὄντως (Mk. 11:32), ὁμολογουμένως (1 Tim. 3:16), ὑπερβαλλόντως (2 Cor. 11:23). Besides, the participle itself (cf. neuter adjective πολύ, etc.) sometimes has an adverbial force. In particular note τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6). See also ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν (Mk. 14:72). This obscure participle expresses coincident action (cf. Moulton, *Prol.*, p. 131). Cf. ἦλθαν σπεύσαντες (Lu. 2:16), σπεύσας κατάβηθι and σπεύσας κατέβη (19:5 f.). We cannot always draw a distinction between this use and the circumstantial participle of manner. The verbal and the adjectival standpoints come together. A number of the grammars apply the term "adverbial" to all the circumstantial participles.[4] But it is more than doubtful if

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 331.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 244.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 175 f.
[4] So Burton, N. T. and T., p. 169 f.

one gains as much as he loses thereby. It is true that logically a sort of adverbial relation may be worked out, an adverbial addition to the sentence.[1] But it does not help much from the syntactical point of view to insist on this fact in the exposition of the circumstantial participle. As to form the circumstantial participle is still adjectival. The adverbial notion is inferential and purely logical. There is something, however, to be said for the adverbial aspect of the redundant participle in βλέποντες βλέπετε (Mt. 13:14, LXX), which is on a par with ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε. are attempts to translate the Hebrew inf. absolute. Moulton[2] has found the idiom in AEschyluls and Herodotus, but the N. T. usage is clearly due to the LXX, where it is very common. Cf. also ἰδὼν εἶδον (Ac. 7:34), εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω (Heb. 6:14), from the LXX again. Blass (*Gr. of the N. T. Gk.*, p. 251) calls this construction "thoroughly un-Greek." There are other pleonastic participles like the common ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (Mt. 3:15) which is somewhat like the vernacular "He ups and says" (Moulton *Prol.*, p. 15 f.). Cf. also τοῦτο εἰπὼν λέγει (Jo. 21:19), ἀπελθὼν πέπρακεν (Mt. 13:46), 'he has gone and sold.' So also ἀναστὰς ἦλθεν (Lu. 15:20), 'he arose and came.' Once again note λαβοῦσα ἐνέκρυψεν (Mt. 13:33), 'she took and hid.' This idiom is more Aramaic than Hebraic and is at any rate picturesque vernacular. But it is also Greek. Pleonasm belongs to all tongues. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 179) quotes Herod. VI, 67, 10, εἶπε φάς; VI, 68, 5, ἔφη--λέγων. Mr. Dan Crawford finds in the Bantu language "dying he died" for the, irrevocableness of death. We now turn to the verbal aspects of the participle, which are more complex.

5. VERBAL ASPECTS OF THE PARTICIPLE.

(a) **Voice**. There is nothing of al distinctive nature to say about the voice of the participle in addtion to what has already been said (see ch. on Voice). The voices run in the participles precisely as in the verb itself. We find the voice in the earliest Greek as in the Sanskrit. All the nuances of the voices appear in the participle. Cf. the active in διδάσκων (Lu. 13:10), ζῶν, (Jo. 4:10); the middle in προσδεχομένοις (Lu. 2:36), ἐπικαλεσάμενος (Ac. 22: 16), σπασάμενος (Mk. 14:47); the passive in λυπούμενος (Mt. 19: 22), τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην (1 Cor. 2:7), ἀπολελυμένον (Heb. 13:23), ἐπιστραφείς (Mk. 5:30), κωλυθέντες (Ac. 16:6). We may note in particular ἔχε με παρῃτημένον (Lu. 14:18 f.), ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι (Mt. 10:22) and ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες (1 Cor. 14:9). In Mk. 5:26,

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 523. [2] Prol., pp. 14,

παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν, the active participle has the construction of the passive, but this is due to the verb πάσχω, not to the voice. Cf. also Gal. 4:9, **γνόντες θεὸν μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ.**

(b) **Tense**.

(a) *Timelessness of the Participle*. It may be said at once that the participle has tense in the same sense that "the subjunctive, optative and imperative have, giving the state of the action as punctiliar, linear, completed. In the beginning[1] this was all that tense meant in the participle. The participle was timeless. Indeed the participle in itself continued timeless, as is well shown by the articular participle.[2] Thus in Mk. 6:14, **Ἰωάνης ὁ** βαπτίζων, it is not present time that is here given by this tense, but the general description of John as the Baptizer without "regard to time. It is actually used of him after his death. Cf. **οἱ ζητοῦντες** (Mt. 2:20). In Mt. 10:39, **ὁ εὑρὼν ἀπολέσει**, the principal verb is future while the participle is aorist, but the aorist tense does not mean past or future time. So in Mt. 25:20 and 24 **ὁ** λαβών and **ὁ εἰλη-φώς** have no notion of time but only the state of the action. But the tenses of the participle may be used for relative time. In relation to the principal verb there may be suggested time. Thus **ὁ εὑρὼν ἀπολέσει** above implies that **εὑρών** is antecedent to **ἀπολέσει** which is future. In Ac. 24:11, ἀνέβην προσκυνήσων the principal verb is past, but the participle is relatively future, though absolutely past. The relative time of the participle approximates the indicative mode and is able to suggest antecedent (aorist, present, perfect tenses), simultaneous (aorist, present tenses) and subsequent (present, future tenses) action. The tenses of the participle must be studied with this distinction in mind. But this notion of relative time "is deeply imbedded in the nature of the participle and the use is universal."[3] Certainly this notion of relative time is more obvious in the Greek participle than in the Latin or in the modern languages.[4] In the chapter on Tense the participial tenses were treated with reasonable clompleteness,- but some further remarks are necessary at this point. A word needs to be said about the idiom **οὗτος ἦν ὁ εἰπών (**Jo. 1:15), **οὗτος ἦν ὁ -- καθήμενος** (Ac. 3:10), where the principal verb is thrown into the past.

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 522.

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 126. He notes Heb. 10:14, **τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους,** as a good ex. of the timelessness of the part.

[3] Gildersl., Synt. of Class. Gk., Pt. I, p. 139.

[4] W.-M., p. 427.

(β) *The Aorist*. The *Aktionsart* of the aorist participle is sufficiently illustrated in the discussion of the aorist tense. There is, of course, no reason for not having the constative, ingressive or effective aorist in the participle.[1] Schaefer[2] argues that in most cases the participle uses the effective aorist. That may be true, though there is nothing in the nature of the participle itself to cause it. Blass[3] thinks that the aorist participle contains the idea of completion, but even so that motion may be merely constative or ingressive. Goodwin[4] holds that the aorist participle generally represents the action as antecedent to the principal verb. Burton[5] has it more nearly correct when he insists that the aorist participle conceives of the event indefinitely or simply. So Blass[6] denies that the aorist tense implies antecedent action. It is usually assumed that the proper use of the aorist participle is antecedent action and that only certain verbs (as exceptions) may occasionally express simultaneous action. But this is a misapprehension of the real situation. It is doubtless true, as Burton[7] notes, that the antecedent use furnishes the largest number of instances, but that fact does not prove priority or originality of conception. "The aorist participle of antecedent action does not denote antecedence; it is used of antecedent action, where antecedence is implied, not by the aorist tense as a tense, but in some other way."[8] Moulton[9] is equally explicit: "The connotation of past time was largely fastened on this participle, through the idiomatic use in which it stands before an aorist indicative to qualify its action. As point action is always completed action, except in the ingressive, the participle naturally came to involve past time relative to that of the main verb." It is probable that the original use of the aorist participle was that of simultaneous action. From this was developed quite naturally, by the nature of the various cases, the antecedent notion. Cf. νηστεύσας ἐπείνασεν (Mt. 4:2) where the fasting expressed by the participle is given as the reason for the hungering expressed by the principal verb. For further examples of anteceden action see Mt. 2:14; 2:16; 27:3; 2 Cor. 2:13. For the articular aorist see Mt. 10:39; Lu. 12:47; Jo. 5:15. While this came to be the more common idiom

[1] Schaefer, Das Partizip des Aoristes bei den Tragikern, 1894, p. 5.
[2] Ib.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 197.
[3] M. and T., p. 48. So Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 48.
[5] N. T. M. and T., p. 59.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 197.
[8] Ib.
[7] N. T. M. and T., p. 61.
[9] Prol., p. 130.

from the nature of the case, the original use of the aorist participle for simultaneous action continued. One has no ground for assuming that antecedent action is a necessary or an actual fact with the aorist participle.[1] The aorist participle of simultaneous, action is in perfect accord with the genius and history of the Greek participle. For numerous examples of both uses see the chapter on Tense. A good instance is seen in Mt. 27:4, **ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῷον**. So also **ὑπολαβὼν εἶπεν** (Lu. 10:30). See Ac. 2:23, **τοῦτον προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε**, where the slaying was manifestly done by the impaling on the cross. The two actions are identical *per se*. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 131) observes that when the verb precedes the aorist participle it is nearly always the participle of coincident action. He (Prol., p. 132) cites 0. P. 530 (ii/A.D.), **ἐξ ὧν δώσεις—λυτρώσασά μου τὰ ἱμάτια**. It so happens that the N. T. shows a great number of such examples. See Mk. 15:30 **σῶσον καταβάς**, (Lu. 2:16) **ἦλθαν σπείσαντες**, (Ac. 10:33) **καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος**. Cf. Mt. 26:75. In Ac. 10:29, **ἦλθον μεταπεμφθείς**, the participle is antecedent in idea. Acts, however, is particularly rich in examples of the coincident aorist participle which follows the verb. See 10:39; 11:30; 13:33; 15:8, 9; 19:2; 23:22, 25, 30; 25:13; 26:10. It is in point of fact a characteristic of Luke's style to use frequently the coincident participle (both aorist and present) placed rater the principal verb. This fact completely takes away the point of Sir W. M. Ramsay's argument[2] for the aorist of subsequent action in Ac. 16:6, where, however, it is more probably antecedent action, as is possible in Ac. 23:22. The argument made against it under Tense need not be repeated here.[3] Burton assents[4] to the notion of the aorist of "subsequent" action in the participle, but no real parallels are given. I have examined in detail the N. T. examples adduced and shown the lack of conclusiveness about them all. See chapter on Tense. It is even claimed that subsequent action is shown by the participles (present as well as aorist) in Ac. 5:36; 6:11; 8:10, 18; 14:22; 17:26; 18:23; 28:14, but with no more evidence of reality. Actual examination of each passage shows the action to be either simultaneous or antecedent. See also Lu. 1:9, **ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναόν**, where it is obviously coincident. The same thing is true of Heb. 11:27, **κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβηθείς**. Cf. also Ac. 7:35 **ὃν ἠρνήσαντο**

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 131. [2] St. Paul the Traveller, p. 212.
[3] See Ballentine, Biblibtheca Sacra, 1884, p. 7S7, for discussion of N. T, exx.
[4] N. T. M. and T., p. 65.

εἰπόντες, (13:22) εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας. A case like 1 Pet. 1:20 f. is not, of course, pertinent. However, the common use of the aorist participle in indirect discourse (as with all the supplementary participles) without any notion of time is to the point. So Ac. 9:12, εἶδεν ἄνδρα εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα. So ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν πεσόντα (Lu. 10:18). The action is purely punctiliar with no notion of time at all. It is true that the articular participle is occasionally used (see chapter on Tense) for time past to the time of the writer, but future to the time of the principal verb. As a matter of fact this aorist participle is timeless, as is shown by the use of ὁ παραβούς in Mt. 10:4 and ὁ παραδιδούς in 26:25. So ὁ ειπών in Jo. 5:12; ὁ ποιήσας 5:15; ἡ ἀλείψασα 11:2. It is the action alone that is under consideration, not the time of its performance. See, *per contra,* ὁ γνούς—καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποοιήσας δαρήσεται (Lu. 12:47) where the aorist participle gives the simple action with a future verb. Cf. Lu. 6:49 for the articular aorist part. with the present indicative. Burton[1] feels the weakness of his contention for "subsequent" action in the aorist participle when he explains that it is "perhaps due to Aramaic influence." There is no need for an appeal to that explanation, since the fact does not exist. It is only in the circumstantial participle that any contention is made for this notion. It is certainly gratuitous to find subsequent action in Ro. 4:19, μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει κατενόησεν, not to mention 4:21; Ph. 2:7; Heb. 9:12. Burton reluctantly admits that, though in 1 Pet. 3:18 ζωοποιηθείς is "clearly subsequent to ἀπέθανεν," yet it "is probably to be taken together with θανατωθείς as defining the whole of the preceding clause." This latter view is, of course, true, since the order of the participles is θανατωθείς ζωοποιηθείς. The timelessness of the aorist participle is well shown in Jo. 16:2, ὁ ἀποκετίνας [ὑμᾶς] δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ. Cf. also ἀγαγόντα—τελειῶσαι. (Heb. 2:10). This coincident use of the aorist participle is by no means so rare in the ancient Greek as is sometimes alleged.[2] The action was specially likely to be coincident if the principal verb was also aorist.[3] Like the other articular participles, the aorist participle may be the practical equivalent of the relative. So in Lu. 12:8 f. ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσει and ὁ ἀρνησάμενος are used side by side.

[1] N. T. M. and T., p. 66.

[2] See Leo Meyer, Griech. Aor., p. 125.

[3] Gilders1., Synt., Pt. I, p. 140. See Seymour, The Use of the Gk. Aorist Part., Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc., XII, p. 88 f.

(γ) *The Present*. As the aorist participle timeless and punctiliar, so the present participle is timeless and durative. The participle is thus, like the infinitive, ahead of the present indicative, which does not distinguish between punctiliar and durative action. A careful treatment of the force of the present participle has been given under Tense. The real timelessness of this participle is shown in the fact that it is used indiscriminately with past, present or future tenses of the indicative. So **πωλοῦντες ἔφερον** (Ac. 4:34); **ἀποθνήσκων εὐλόγησεν** (Heb. 11:21); **καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς ἔμαθεν** (Heb. 5:8); **μεριμνῶν δύναται** (Mt. 6:27); **ἔσεσθε λαλοῦντες** (1 Cor. 14:9). The articular present especially shows the absence of time. So **οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο** (Gal. 2:6); **προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους** (Ac. 2:47); **ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται** (Mt. 10:40); **ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα** (Lu. 10 :8) ; **ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ ἀποδώσει** (Mt. 6:18). There will be *Aktionsart* in this participle also. Some of these words are really punctiliar (**δέχομαι**, for instance). But, in general, the present participle gives linear action. The present participle may have relative time. This relative time is usually simultaneous or coincident. This is only natural. Sometimes, however, this relative time may be antecedent action, a classic idiom.[1] Example of this idiom were given under Tense, but add Jo. 9:8, **οἱ θεωροῦντες τὸ πρότερον** where the adverb of time helps to throw the participle back of **ἔλεγον,** as **ἄρτι** with **βλέπω** makes the verb later than **τυφλὸς ὤν** in 9: 25. Cf. also Gal. l:23, **ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτὲ νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται**, where both participle and verb have adverbs of time by way of contrast. For other instances like these see Mt. 9:20 Mk. 5:25 Lu. 8: 43; Jo. 5:5; Ac. 24:10; Eph. 2:13; Col. 1:21; 1 Tim. 1:13, etc. There are also undoubted instances of the present participle to express the notion of purpose, futuristic in conception, though present in form. Add to the instances already given the following: Mk. 3:31, **ἔξω στήκοιντες ἀπέστειλαν καλοῦντες**. Here the first participle is only noticeable as the usual linear action (with aorist indicative). The second participle, however, is practically purpose. 'They sent to him calling him.' 'They sent to call him.' So also Lu. 13:6 **ἦλθεν ζητῶν**, (13:7) **ἔρχομαι ζητῶν**. It is not strictly true that here the present participle means future or subsequent time. It is only that the purpose goes on coincident with the verb and beyond. This prospective present part. (cf. present ind.) appears in Ac. 21:3, **ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον**. 'The ship was appointed to unload her cargo.' Cf. Mt. 6 : 30;

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 47; Gildersl., Synt., Part 1, p. 139.

11:3; 26:28; Lu. 7:19; 1 Chr. 15:57; Jas. 5:1; Ac. 3:26. The future is "simulated"[1] also by the present participle when it is used for conative action. It is, of course, not the participle that brings out this notion. See (Mt. 23:14) **οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν** (27:40) **ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν** (Ac. 28:23) **πείθων αὐτούς**. The notion of repetition (iterative present) occurs also as in Ac. 2:47, **προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους**, 'kept adding those saved from time to time.' So **πωλοῦντες ἔφερον καὶ ἐτίθοουν** (Ac. 4: 34). 'They would from time to time sell and bring and place at the feet of the apostles.' There is thus a sharp contrast from the specific instance of Barnabas, of whom it is said: **πωλήσας ἤνεγκεν** (4:37). It is not clear, (however, why the present participle occurs in 3:8, **ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει**, unless it is to note that he kept on leaping and walking (alternately). Cf. this notion in verse 8, **περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος**. Cf. also in 5:5, **ἀκούων πεσὼν ἐξέψυξεν**, where **πεσών** is antecedent to the verb, but **ἀκούων** is descriptive (linear). The notion of distribution is perhaps present in Heb. 10:14, **τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους**, 'the objects of sanctification.'[2] Certainly **ὁ κλέπτων** is iterative in Eph. 4:28. Cf. Ac. 1:20; Col. 2:8. It is interesting to note the difference between the present and the aorist participle in Mt. 16:28, **ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον**, and in Ac. 9:12, **εἶδεν ἄνδρα εἰσελθόντα**. The perfect participle of the same verb and in the same construction occurs in Mk. 9:1, **ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει**. The three tenses of the participle of **πίπτω** may also be illustrated by the punctiliar notion of the aorist in **πεσόντα** in Lu. 10:18, the durative notion **πιπτόντων** in Mt. 15:27 and of **πίπτοντες** in Mk. 13:25, the perfect notion of **πεπτωκότα** in Rev. 9:1.

(5) *The Perfect.* This tense brings little that is distinctive in the participle. Cf. **τετελειωμένοι (**Jo. 17:23), **πεποιηκότες** (18: 18), **προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα** (Ac. 18:2), **κεκοπιακώς** (Jo. 4:6), **πεπτωκότα** (Rev. 9:1), **ἐληλυθότα** (1 Jo. 4:2), **ὁ εἰληφώς** (Mt. 25:24). The distinction between intensive and extensive was drawn under Tense. Some of the intensive uses have lost the notion of completion (punctiliar) and hold on to the linear alone in the present sense. Cf. **ἑστώς εἰμι** (Ac. 25:10), **εἰδώς** (Mt. 12:25) with which contrast **οἱ ἐγνωκότες** (2 Jo. 1), **συνειδυίης** (Ac. 5:2), **τεθνηκώς** (Lu. 7:12), **παρεστηκώς** (Jo. 18:22). The periphrastic use of the perfect participle in past, present and future time has been sufficiently illustrated already. So has the rare com-

[1] Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 140. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 127.

bination of perfect and present participle in Eph. 4 : 18; Col. 1:21. The perfect participle also is either articular or anar--throus, attributive or predicate. For the predicate use see in particular Lu. 13:6 **συκῆν εἶχέν τις πεφυτευμένην**, (Heb. 5:14) **τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων**. It needs to be noted again that the perfect participle has no time in itself. In th nature of the case the act will be antecedent except where the tense has lost its true force as in **ἑστώς, τεθνηκώς, εἰδώς**. But it is only relative time, not absolute, and the leading verb may itself be punctiliar, linear or perfect, in the past, present or future.[1] Just as the present participle may suggest antecedent action and so be a sort of "imperfect" participle (past time), so the perfect participle is sometimes[2] used where a sort of past perfect sense results. The action was finished and is now no longer the fact, though the state represented by the perfect once existed. So **ἐπὶ τῷ συμβεβηκότι αὐτῷ** in Ac. 3:10. Cf. Mk. 5:15, **θεωροῦσιν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον ἱματισμένον κὰ σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν**. This is a most instructive passage. The historical present and the aorist indicative here occur side by side. The attributive and the predicate participles appear side by side. The present and the perfect participles come together. Of the two per-fect participles, one, **ἱματισμένον**, is still true (punctiliar plus linear) and describes the man's present state; the other, **τὸν ἐσχηκότα**, is no longer true and describes the state of the man before Jesus cast out the demon, which casting-out is itself in the past. This participle is therefore a sort of past perfect. Cf. also Jo. 8:31. Another striking example is Jo. 11:44, **ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκὼς δεδεμένος**. Here **δεδεμένος** is still true, though **τεθνηκώς** is not. Lazarus had been dead, but is not now. We see the same situation in 1 Cor. 2:7, **τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην**. The wisdom of God is no longer hidden. The point is still clearer in Ro. 16:25 **μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν**, where the long silence is now expressly said to be broken. Note the sharp contrast in the aorist participle with **νῦν**. This distinction between the perfect and aorist participle is often clearly drawn. See 2 Cor. 12:21 **τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων**, (1 Pet. 2:10); **οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες**. The same act may be looked at from either standpoint. One may not always care to add the linear aspect to the punctiliar. Cf. **ὁ γεγενημένος** and **ὁ γεννηθείς** in 1 Jo. 5:18, **τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα** in Mk. 5:15 and **ὁ δαιμονισθεί** in 5:18,

[1] Cf. Gildersl., Synt., Pt. I, p. 142.
[2] Cf. Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 72.

ὁ λαβών in Mt. 25:18 and ὁ εἰληφώς in 25:24. Cf. ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ (Lu. 8:46) aud ἐπιγνοὺς τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν (Mk. 5:30). Adverbs lof time may occur with the perfect as with other tenses of the participle. Cf. Jo. 19:33, ἤδη τεθνηκότα. There is a sort of harmony in ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν (19:35). The difference between the perfect and present tenses after εἶδον is strikingly shown in Revelation. Cf. εἶδον τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων (6:9), ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα (7:2), ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεπτωκότα (9:1). Cf. also Mk. 5:33, φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἰδυῖα. One must not confuse the perf. part. in Gal. 2:11 and Rev. 21:8 with a present like ψηλαφωμένῳ in Heb. 12:18 ('touchable').

(ε) *The Future.* The future participle, like the future tense in general, was later in its development than the other tenses. It is usually punctiliar also and has something of a modal value (volitive, futuristic) like the subjunctive (aorist).[1] See discussion under Tense. The future participle is always subsequent in time to the principal verb (cf. the present participle by suggestion), not coincident and, of course, never antecedent. Hence the future participle comes nearer having a temporal notion than any of the tenses. But even so it is relative time, not absolute, and the future participle may occur with a principal verb in the past, present or future. This idiom grew out of the context and the voluntative notion of the future tense.[2] This point is well illustrated by the parallel use of μέλλων to express intention. Cf. ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν (Jo. 6:64) and ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι (12:4). As already shown, the future participle is much less frequent in the N. T. (as in LXX) than in the κοινή generally (as in the papyri). Another rival to the future participle is ἐρχόμενος (Jo. 1:9), ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Lu. 7:19). Both μέλλω and ἐρχομαι (cf. εἶμι) are anticipatory presents.[3] Cf. ἐνεστῶτα and μέλλοντα in Ro. 8:38. Nearly all the N. T. examples of the future participle (see chapter on Tense for discussion) are in Luke and Paul and Hebrews (the three best specimens of literary style in the N. T.). But see Mt. 27:49, σώσων; Jo. 6:64, ὁ παραδώσων; 1 Pet. 3: 13, ὁ κακώσων. For the Gospel of Luke see 22:49, τὸ ἐσόμενον. The rest of his examples are in the Acts, as 8:27, προσκυνήσων, (20:22) τὰ συναντήσοντα (22:5) ἄξων, (24:11) προσκυνήσων, (24:17) ποιήσων. For Paul see Ro. 8:34, ὁ κατακρινῶν (a

[1] Cf. Delbruck, Synt. Forsch., IV, p. 97.
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 523.
[3] There is an expectant note in τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον (Mt. 26:23).

question of editing, but cf. ὁ ἀποθανών, 1 Cor. 15:37, τὸ γενησόμενον. For Heb. see 3:5, τῶν λαληθησομένων, (13:17) ἀποδώσοντες. We find ὡς in Heb. 13:17. In conclusion one must note that the future part. disappeared wholly from the later Greek. The modern Greek does not know it at all. Instead it uses νά and the subjunctive.[1] But in general in the N. T. the participle is still used in thorough accord with the ancient idiom so far as the tenses are concerned.[2] In the papyri I note it more frequently than in the N. T. Cf. κοινολογησόμενον, P. Goodsp. 4 (ii/B.C.); τὰ — [σ] ταθησόμενα, P. Tb. 33 (B.C. 112).

(c) **Cases**. There is no need to tarry here tp prove the verbal force of the participle as to cases. Precisely the same cases occur with the participle as with the finite modes of the verb. Cf. ἐκβαλὼν πάντας (Mk. 5:40) and κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου (5: 41). These illustrations illustrate the point and that is enough.

(d) **The Supplementary Participle.** The term supplementary or complementary is used to describe the participle that forms so close a connection with the principal verb that the idea of the speaker is incomplete without it. The participle does not differ in reality from the adjective in this respect, and it is still an adjective like πιστὸς μένει (2 Tim. 2:13). But it is the verbal aspect of the participle that is here accented. The participle fills out the verbal notion.

(a) *The Periphrastic Construction*. The general aspects of this idiom were treated in chapter on Tense (cf. also Conjugation of Verbs). It is only necessary here to stress the close connection between this participle and the principal verb as in ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον κωφόν (Lu. 11:14). In Ac. 19:36, δέον ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν, we have two examples of this idiom. Cf. Lu. 13:11. Sometimes we find the periphrastic participle alone without the copula as in ἐξόν (Ac. 2:29), εἰ δέον (1 Pet. 1:6). But note ἐξὸν ἦν (Mt. 12:4) and δέον ἐστίν (Ac. 19:36). So πρέπον ἐστίν (Mt. 3:15). Particularly interesting is εἰσιν γεγονότες (Heb. 7:23). The periphrastic participle, as already noted, was far more common in the N. T. and the LXX than in the older Greek. But the reverse is true of certain verbs frequently so used in the Attic. Radermacher[3] thinks that the commonness of the periphrastic participle in the N. T. is due to the rhetorical tendency.

[1] Cf. Jebb in V. and D., p. 335.

[2] The fut. part. is rare in the inscr. Cf. Granit, De Inf. et Partic. in Inscr. Dial. Grace. Questiones Synt., 1892, p. 122.

[3] N. T. Gk., p. 166.

This might apply to Hebrews, but surely not to the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 226) admits that the Semitic sources of part of the Gospels and Acts account for the frequency of the periphrastic imperf. (cf. Aramaic). Certainly the LXX is far ahead of the classic Greek and of the **κοινή** in general. The papyri (Moulton, *Prol*., p. 226) show it often in fut. perfects and in past perfects. Schmid (*Attic*., p. 113 f.) finds it rare in literary **κοινή** save in fut. perfects. Moulton finds periphr. imperf. in Matthew 3 times, Mark 16, Luke 30, John 10, Acts (1-12) 17, Acts (13-28) 7, Paul 3. And even sb some of these examples are more adjectival than periphrastic. Cf. Ph. 2:26. See p. 888.

(β) *A Diminution of the Complementary Participle.* This decrease is due partly to the infinitive as with **ἄρχομαι, δοκέω**. See discussion in this chapter on Relation between the Inf. and the Participle. But it is due also to the disappearance of the personal construction and the growth of the impersonal with **ὅτι** or **ἵνα**. In Mk. 2:1, **εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ δι᾽ ἡμερῶν ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν,** the personal construction is retained even with the circumstantial participle. Cf. also 2 Cor. 3:3, **φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ**. But it is vanishing with the verbs where it was once so common. See under Infinitive, 5, (e), for further remarks. Jannaris[1] has made a careful study of the facts in the later Greek. It may be noted that **οἴχομαι** does not occur at all in the N. T., though the LXX (and Apocrypha) has it 24 times, twice with the inf. it disappeared from the vernacular. As to **τυγχάνω** it occurred only once with the participle (2 Macc. 3:9). It has the inf. as well as **ἵνα** (**να**) in the later Greek, though it is very abundant with the participle in the papyri.[2] Cf. **τ[υγ] χάνει Νεῖλος ῥέων**, P. B. M. 84 (ii/A.D.). But **τυγχάνω φίλος** without **ὤν** occurs also in the **κοινή** (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 169). Curiously enough **λανθάνω** appears once with the participle in the LXX (Tob. 12:13) as in the N. T. (Heb. 13:2). In the **κοινή** the inf. supplants the part. as it had already gained a foothold in the old Greek.[3] Note also the adverb as in **λάθρᾳ ἐκβάλλουσιν** (Ac. 16:37). **Φθάνω** continued in use through the **κοινή** but with the sense of 'arrive,' 'reach,' not the idiomatic one 'arrive before.' This latter notion appears in **προφθάνω** (cf. **προλαμβάνω**), which has it once only in the N. T. (Mt. 17:25), while the inf. is seen in **προέλαβεν μυρίσαι** (Mk. 14:8). As early as Thucydides the inf. is found with **φθάνω**, and see also 1 Ki. 12:18. It is, common in the **κοινή**.[4] The

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 493.
[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 228.
[3] Jain., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 493.
[4] Ib., p. 494.

tendency to reverse the construction by using one of these verbs in the participial form is seen in **τυχόν** (participial adverb) in 1 Cor. 16:6. It is possible that **φαίνομαι** still shows the participial construction in Mt. 6:16, 18, but not in Ro. 7:13, where the participle is circumstantial, not complementary. The impersonal construction gains[1] on the personal in the **κοινή**. In the N. T. we no longer have **δῆλος εἰμί** nor **φανερός εἰμί**. But we do have **εὑρέθη ἔχουσα** in Mt. 1:18. **᾽Αρχομαι** has lost the part. in the N. T., but **ὑπάρχω** holds on to it, but not in the sense of 'begin,' rather of 'existing.' Cf. both adjective and part. in Jas. 2:15 and 1 Tim. 4:3. It tends to sink into the level of **εἰμί** as an auxiliary verb with the periphrastic participle, as in Ac. 8:16; 19:36. The same thing is true of **προϋπάρχω** in Lu. 23:12, but not in Ac. 8:9 where **μαγεύων** is circumstantial. We have seen that **παύομαι** is true to the part. (cf. Lu. 5:4; Ac. 5:42, etc.) and that the part. occurs also with **ἐπιμένω** (Jo. 8 :7), **τελέω** (Mt. 11:1), and that **διατελέω** has the adj. without **ὤν** (Ac. 27:33). Cf. also **διαλείπω** in Lu. 7 :45. See also the part. with **ἐγκακέω** in Gal. 6:9; 2 Th. 3:13. The part. with **καρτερέω** in Heb. 11:27 is circumstantial, as is that with **ἀνέχομαι** in 1 Cor. 4:12 and with **κάμνω** in Heb. 12:3. The doubtful participle with **μανθάνω** in 1 Tim. 5:13 has already been discussed (Relation between Inf. and Part., 3, (d)). Moulton[2] is positive that the absolute construction advocated by Weiss is intolerable and that we must either admit the supplementary participle here or boldly insert **εἶναι** with Blass. Moulton[3] is probably right in opposing the incorrectness of the part. with **εὖ πράσσω** in Ac. 15:29, **ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ πράξετε**. At bottom this is the same idiom as we have in 10:33, **καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος**. Cf. also Ph. 4:14; 2 Pet. 1:19; 3 Jo. 6. Blass[4] is right in including here **τί ποιεῖτε λύοντες** (Mk. 11:5), **τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες** (Ac. 21:13), **ἥμαρτον παραδούς** (Mt. 27 :4).

(γ) *Verbs of Emotion*. As a matter of fact it is not beyond controversy that the part. with these verbs of emotion is the supplementary and not the circumstantial participle. At any rate the idiom comes to the border-line between the two constructions. I do not wish to labour the point and so treat the construction as complementary. The connection is not, however, so close with these verbs as is true of those in the two preceding lists. Indeed, the connection varies with different verbs and with the same verb in different contexts. It seems clear enough in

[1] Ib.
[2] Prol., p. 229,
[3] Ib., p. 228 f.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 245.

Ac. 16:34, ἠγαλλιάσατο πεπιστευκώς, and in 2 Pet. 2:10, οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. The examples with ἀγανακτέω (Mt. 21:15, etc.) and χαίρω (Mt. 2:10, etc.) all seem to be circumstantial.[1] The same thing is true of λυπέω. The participle does not occur in the N. T. with αἰσχύνομαι. The step over to the circumstantial participle of manner or cause is not very far to take.[2]

(δ) *Indirect Discourse*. This participle is clearly supplementary and in the N. T. is usually connected with the object of the principal verb. The nom.[3] of the part. ἔχουσα appears with the passive εὑρέθη in Mt. 1:18 as noted above. The active in the N. T. would have had ὅτι and the ind., if the reference was to Mary. The classic Greek could have said εὗρεν ἔχουσα, but the N. T. Greek, εὗρεν ὅτι ἔχει. Cf. also εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος in Ph. 2:8. But 1 Tim. 5:13 has to be noted. This subject was treated in detail under Indirect Discourse (see Modes). See that discussion for details about the different verbs, some of which, besides the participial construction, may instead use the inf. or ὅτι and the indicative. Here it is sufficient to give enough illustrations of this participle in indirect discourse with verbs of mental action to show the real complementary nature of the participle. The tense, of course, represents the tense of the direct. With most of these verbs (especially[4] οἶδα, μανθάνω, ὁμολογέω) the participle is giving way to the inf. or ὅτι, but still the idiom is common enough to attract notice in all parts of the N. T. Cf. γείνωσκε σαυτὸν ἔξοντα, P. B. M. 356 (i/A.D.). It is common to explain this participle as the object of the principal verb after the analogy of the inf. in indirect discourse. So Jannaris[5] calls it "the objective participle" and Burton[6] "the substantive participle as object." Blass[7] more correctly perceives that it is the substantive or pronoun that is the object while the participle is a predicate adjective agreeing with this object. It is easy to see this point where no indirect discourse occurs, as in Heb. 7:24, ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην, where ἔχω does not mean to 'opine' and where the verbal adj. occurs. But see the participle in 5:14, τῶν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων, or, still better, Lu. 14:18, ἔχε με παρητημένον, where ἔχω means 'consider' and we have the participle.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 245. [2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 495.
[3] Blass, ib., p. 247.
[4] The pap. show the same tendency. Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 229. See Radermacher, N. T. Gr., p. 169.
[5] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 497.
[6] N. T. M. and T., p. 176. [7] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 246.

Cf. Mk. 3:1; Ac. 9:21, **ἵνα δεδεμένους αὐτοὺς ἀγάγῃ**. See also 24:27. Then note Ph. 2:3, **ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας**.[1] The addition of **ὡς** does not change the real construction as in **τοὺς λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας**, 2 Cor. 10:2; **ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε** 2 Th. 3:15. In principle it is the double accusative, too common with some verbs, only the second ace. is a predicate adj., not a substantive. Cf. Ro. 10:9 (margin of W. H.), **ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς κύριον Ἰησοῦν**, and 2 Jo. 7, **ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί**. The presence or absence of the copula does not materially change the construction when an adj. or substantive is the second ace. Thus note 2 Cor. 8:22, **ὃν ἐδοκιμάσαμεν σπουδαῖον ὄντα**, and Mk. 6:20, **εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον**. So we have no part. after **εἶδον** in Jo. 1:50; Mt. 25:37, 38, 39; Ac. 8:23; 17:16. Blass[2] calls this an "ellipse" of the participle, an idiom common in classical Greek. It is hardly necessary to appeal to the "ellipse" to explain it. The predicate force of **ὄντα**, comes out well in Ac. 8:23. If no substantive or adjective is used, the participle is itself the full predicate and represents the predicate of the direct discourse. Cf. Mk. 12:28 **ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συνζητούντων** (Lu. 8:46) **ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.** The point to note is that even here in indirect discourse, where the participle represents the verb of the direct, the participle is still an adjective though the verbal force has become prominent. The examples are too numerous to discuss in detail or even to quote in full. As representative examples see Mt. 16:28 after **εἶδον (ἐρχόμενον**, but Mk. 9: 1 has **ἐληλυθυῖαν**), Mk. 5:30 after **ἐπίσταμαι**, 7:30. after **εὑρίσκω** (cf. also Lu. 23:2), Lu. 10:18 after **θεωρέω** (cf. in particular Ac. 7:56), Jo. 1:38 after **ἐπίσταμαι**, 7:32 after **ἀκούω**, Ac. 19:35 after **γινώσκω**, 24:10 after **ἐπίσταμαι**, Heb. 2:9 after **βλέπω**, Heb. 13:23 after **γινώσκω**, 2 Cor. 8:22 after **δοκιμάζω**, Ph. 2:3 after **ἡγέομαι**, 2 Jo. 7 after **ὁμολογέω**. The punctiliar idea is present as in **πεσόντα** in Lu. 10:18, or the linear as in **ἐγγίζουσαν** (Heb. 10:25), or the perfected state as in **πεπτωκότα** (Rev. 9:1). Cf. also Ac. 2:11; 24:18; Mk. 9:38; 1 Jo. 4:2. Burton[3] explains as "the substantive participle" (see 4, (d)) also Jo. 4:39, **τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης** and Heb. 8:9, **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου**. The first example is really the attributive participle liken **τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος** (Mt. 21:4). The second example is more difficult, but it is a quotation from the LXX (Jer. 31:32) and is not therefore a model of Greek. The **μου** has to be taken with **ἡμέρᾳ** and the

[1] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 359
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 246.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 176.

participle would be a circumstantial temporal use. It is probably suggested by the original Hebrew, as Moulton (*Prol*., p. 47) admits. Cf. Barn. 2:28, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου σου αὐτῷ. Cf. ἐπὶ παροῦσιν ὑμεῖν, B. G. U. 287 (A.D. 250). The reference of Burton to Josephus, *Ant*. 10, 4. 2, does not justify the interpretation which he gives.

(e) **The Circumstantial Participle or Participial Clauses.**

(a) *The General Theory*. There is but one difference between the supplementary and the circumstantial participle. It lies in the fact that the circumstantial participle is an additional statement and does not form an essential part of the verbal notion of the principal verb. The circumstantial participle may be removed and the sentence will not bleed. It is still a true participle, predicate adjective as well as circumstantial addition to the verb. In point of agreement the circumstantial may be related to the subject of the principal verb or the object, or indeed any other substantive or pronoun in the sentence. It may have also an independent construction with a substantive or pronoun of its own (genitive or accusative absolute) or have no substantive or pronoun at all. Once again the participle may be so independent as to form a sentence of its own and not merely be a subordinate clause. See the section on The Independent Participle as a Sentence. Here we are dealing with the independent participle in a subordinate clause with various stages of independency from mere addition and agreement with a substantive or pronoun to complete isolation though still subordinate. Some of the grammars, Burton[1] for instance, call this the "adverbial" participle. There is a slight element of truth here, but only so far as there is a sort of parallel with the subordinate conjunctional clauses which are adverbial (cf. ὅτε, ἵνα, ὡς, etc.). But it is distinctly misleading to treat this participle as adverbial. In fact, there is a constant tendency to read into this circumstantial participle more than is there. In itself, it must be distinctly noted, the participle does not express time, manner, cause, purpose, condition or concession. These ideas are not[2] in the participle, but are merely suggested by the context, if at all, or occasionally by a particle like ἅμα, εὐθύς, καίπερ, ποτέ, νῦν, ὡς. There is no necessity for one to use the circumstantial participle. If he wishes a more precise note of time, cause, condition, purpose, etc., the various subordinate clauses (and the infinitive) are at his command, besides the co-ordinate clauses. The vernacular increasingly

[1] N. T. M. and T., pp. 166

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 247.

preferred the co-ordinate or the subordinate clause with conjunctions to the rather loose circumstantial participle.[1] We see the triumph of this analytic tendency in the modern Greek.[2] But it remains true that the participial clause was one of the great resources of the Greek language and in contrast the Latin seems very poor.[3] The English comes next to the Greek in its rich use of the circumstantial participle. Moulton[4] notes the failure of the English, even with the help of auxiliary verbs, to express the precise difference between λύσας and λελυκώς (ὁ λαβών and ὁ εἰληφώς, for instance, in Mt. 25:18, 24). He rightly also calls attention to the weakness of the Greek because of its wealth of participles, since so much ambiguity is possible. Does a given circumstantial participle bear the notion of 'because' or 'although'? Only the context can tell, and men do not always interpret the context correctly. One more remark is necessary. By means of the circumstantial participle the sentence may be lengthened indefinitely. Good illustrations of this freedom may be seen in the periodic structure in Thucydides, Isocrates, Lysias and Demosthenes. But the N. T. itself has examples of it as is seen in 2 Pet. 2:12-15, βλασφημοῦντες, ἀδικούμενοι, ἡγούμενοι, ἐντρυφῶντες.

(β) *Varieties of the Circumstantial Participle.* Here are treated only those examples which have syntactical agreement in case with some substantive or pronoun in the sentence. It may be repeated that this participle does not express the ideas called by the usual classification into participles of time, manner (means), cause, purpose, condition, concession. Hence it is proper to group the examples together. The classification is only justified by the context and occasional use of a particle.[5] The same classification is possible also for the absolute use of the participial clause. The examples are too numerous for exhaustive treatment. A few must suffice.

Time. It is not the tense that is here under discussion, though naturally the different tenses will vary in the way that time is treated (antecedent, simultaneous, future), as already shown. The point more exactly is whether a given circumstantial parti-

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 499.

[2] Jebb, in V. and D., p. 333.

[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 229.

[4] Ib. Cf. Alexander, Partic. Periphrases in Attic Orators (Am. Jour. of Philol., IV, p. 291 f.).

[5] Certainly we cannot admit the idea that the part. itself has different meanings. Cf. Paul, Prin. of the Hist. of Lang., p. 158.

ciple occurs in a context where the temporal relation is the main one rather than that of cause, condition, purpose, etc. It is usually a mistake to try to reproduce such participles by the English 'when,' 'after,' etc., with the indicative. To do this exaggerates the nuance of time as Moulton[1] observes. It is generally sufficient to preserve the English participle or to co-ordinate the clauses with 'and.' The slightness of the temporal idea is well seen in the pleonastic participles ἀναστάς (Mt. 26:62), ἀποκριθείς (Mt. 3: 15, very common in the Synoptic Gospels. John usually has ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν as in 1:49), ἀπελθών (Mt. 13:46), λαβών (13: 31, cf. verse 33), πορευθέντες (21:6). Here the notion is temporal, but very slightly so. Cf. also προσθεὶς εἶπεν in Lu. 19:11. The use of ἀρξάμενος as a note of time is seen in Mt. 20:8 f.; Lu. 23: 5; 24:47; Ac. 1:22. In Ac. 11:4, ἀρξάμενος **Πέτρος** ἐξετίθετο αὐτοῖς καθεξῆς, the part. is slightly pleonastic,[2] but note contrast with καθεξῆς as with ἕως τῶν πρώτων in Mt. 20: 8. Cf. ἐρχόμενος[ς] ἔρχου, P. Tb. 421 (iii/A.D.). Sometimes the temporal idea is much more prominent, as in διοδεύσαντες (Ac. 17:1), ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον (Jo. 16:8). So also Mt. 6:17, σὺ δὲ νηστεύων ἄλειψαι. Here the descriptive force of the participle is distinctly temporal. In examples like Mk. 1:7 κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα, Ac. 21:32 παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας κατέδραμεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, there is precedence in order of time, but it is mere priority with no special accent on the temporal relation.[3] Cf. Mt. 2:16; 13:2. In Ac. 24:25 f. we have some interesting examples of the participle. In διαλεγομένου αὐτοῦ we see the temporal notion of 'while' with the genitive absolute. In τοῦ μέλλοντος the temporal notion in this attributive part. is due to μέλλω. In γενόμενος it is mere antecedence with ἀπεκρίθη (almost simultaneous, in fact). In τὸ νῦν ἔχον the attributive participle again has the temporal idea due to the words themselves. In μεταλαβών we have antecedence emphasized by καιρόν. In ἅμα καὶ ἐλπίζων we have the linear notion stressed by ἅμα. In πυκνότερον αὐτὸν μεταπεμπόμενος ὡμίλει αὐτῷ the note of repetition in πυκνότερον reappears in participle and verb. An interesting example is also seen in Heb. 11:32, ἐπιλείψει με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος, where in a poetic way time is described as going off and leaving the writer discoursing about Gideon and the rest. In 1 Pet. 5:10, ὀλίγον παθόντας, the adverb of time makes it clear. The note of time may appear in any tense of the participle and with any tense in the principal verb. It is not always easy to

[1] Prol., p. 230.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 249. [3] Ib., p. 248.

discriminate between the temporal participle and that of attendant circumstance or manner. Moulton[1] and Blass[2] make no distinction. These two uses are the most frequent of all. A good example of this ambiguity occurs in Ac. 21:32, where παραλαβών (cf. λαβών in ancient Greek) may be regarded as merely the attendant circumstance. So also the notion of occasion wavers between time and cause. Cf. ἀκούοντες (Lu. 4:28). For ὡς with this participle see 1 Cor. 7:29

Manner. The ancient use of ἔχων in the sense of 'with' occurs in Mt. 15:30 ἔχοντες μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν χωλούς, Mk. 14:3 ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου, Ac. 21:23 εὐχὴν ἔχοντες ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν. Cf. also φέρων in Jo. 19:39. In Jo. 18:3 we have λαβών used in practically the same sense as μετά in Mt. 26:47. Cf. also λαβών in Mt. 25:1. In Lu. 1:64, ἐλάλει εὐλογῶν, the part. is one of manner, as in Mt. 19:22 ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος, (Mk. 1:22) ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, where ὡς makes the point plainer, (1:4) κηρύσσων, where the participle is not the periphrastic construction with ἐγένετο, (1:5) ἐξομολογούμενοι, (Ac. 3:5) ἐπεῖχεν αὐτοῖς προσδοκῶν τι, (a picturesque bit of description), (2 Th. 3:11) μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους (a real pun). It is hard to tell how to classify a participle like that in Gal. 6:3, μηδὲν ὤν. It makes sense as temporal, causal or modal. But there is no doubt in a case like Lu. 19:48 . ἐξεκρέμετο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων or Ac. 2:13 διαχλευάζοντες ἔλεγον or ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων (1 Cor. 9: 26). This notion of manner appears in the participles that have an adverbial notion like σπεύσας (Lu. 19:5 f.),. ἐπιβαλών (Mk. 14:72), τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6), βλέποντες (Mt. 13:14); προσθεὶς εἶπεν (Lu. 19:11). Cf. also ἀναβλέψας εἶπεν in verse 5. So also the pleonastic participles like ἀποκριθείς (see above) may be looked at either as temporal or modal or even adverbial. See further κριμάσαντες (Ac. 5:30), συμβιβάζων (9:22) as good examples of the modal participle. Burton[3] makes a separate division for the participle "of attendant circumstance," but this is not necessary and leads to overrefinement. These examples are either temporal as in ἐξελθόντες (Mk. 16:20), ἐκλεξαμένους (Ac. 15: 22) or modal as δοξαζόμενος (Lu. 4:15), ἀναλαβών (2 Tim. 4:11) or pleonastic as ἀπεκρίθησαν λέγουσαι (Mt. 25:9). Blass' term "conjunctive" (*Gr. of N. T. Gk.*, p. 249) throws no particular light on the point. In 1 Tim. 1:13 ἀγνοῶν is manner. In Ac.

[1] Prol., p. 230. [2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 248.

[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 173. Cucuel and Riemann (Rêgles Fondamentales de la Synt. Grecque, 1888, p. 110) consider this notion an "exception," but it is not necessary to do that.

18:18, κειράμενος, we have in truth both the temporal and the modal. But it is easy to split hairs over the various circumstantial participles and to read into them much more than is there. Cf. 2 Cor. 4:1 f. See βαπτίζοντες and διδάσκοντες in Mt. 28:19 f. as modal participles. So ἀγνοῶν in 1 Tim. 1:13. Cf. κατὰ ἄγνοιαν in Ac. 3:17.

Means. It is usual[1] to distinguish means from manner in the participle. There is a real point, but it is not always clear where manner shades off into means. But some instances are clear. Cf. Mt. 6:27, τί μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι; So also μαντευομένη in Ac. 16:16. Thus the maid furnished the revenue for her masters. In Heb. 2:10 ἀγαγόντα and 2:18 πειρασθείς we may also have instances of this notion, but the first may be temporal and the second causal. Jannaris[2] blends the treatment of manner and means and notes how this participle disappears in the later Greek.

Cause. The ground of action in the principal verb may be suggested by the participle. Cf. δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι ἐβουλήθη, Mt. 1:19; ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα, 27:4; ἐχάρησαν ἰδόντες, Jo. 20: 20. As a matter of fact this idiom is very frequent. Cf. further Mt. 2:3, 10; Jo. 4:45; 21:12; Ac. 4:21; 9:26; 24:22, εἰδώς—εἶπας, Ro. 6:6, γινώσκοντες, and εἰδότες; 2 Pet. 3:9; Col. 1:3 f.; 1 Tim. 4:8; Jas. 2:25. For ὡς with this participle see 1 Cor. 7:25, ὡς ἠλεημένος. In Ac. 24:22 εἰδώς may be taken as 'wishing to know,' though Felix may also have actually had some knowledge of Christianity (cf. Paul's appearance before Gallio). So also εἰδώς (24:22) may mean 'wishing to know.' The N. T. no longer has ἅτε, οἷον, οἷα with the part. as classic Greek did.[3] In Jo. 5:44 a 'causal participle λαμβάνοντες is coordinate with ζητεῖτε.

Purpose. The use of the participle to express aim or design has already been discussed several times from different points of view (Tense, Final Clauses, Tense of the Participle). This fine classic idiom is nearly gone in the N. T. Purpose is expressed chiefly by ἵνα or the inf. For the future part. of purpose see Mt. 27:49; Ac. 8:27; 22:5; 24:11, 17. In Heb. 13:17, ὡς ἀποδώσοντες, there is as much cause as purpose. Blass[4] wrongly accepts ἀσπασόμενοι in Ac. 25:13. The present part. is also used in the sense of purpose where the context makes it clear. So Ac. 3:26, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα. Cf. Lu. 13:6 f.; Ac. 15:

[1] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 333.
[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 504.
[3] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., p. 335.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 248.

27; RO. 15:25. But it is not absent from the papyri. Cf. P. Goodsp. 4 (ii/B.C.) ἀπεστάλκαμεν—κοινολογησόμενόν σοι. So also the present part., P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66), διακονοῦ[ν] τα καὶ ποιο[ῦ] ντα.

Condition. The use of the conditional disappeared more rapidly than the temporal and causal in the later Greek.[1] It is only the protasis, of course, which is here considered. It is still a common idiom in the N. T. In Mt. 16:26 we have ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, while in Lu. 9:25, we find κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον. Here it is the condition of the third class plainly enough. See ποιήσας ἔσῃ κτλ., in B. G. U. 596 (A.D. 84). In 1 Cor. 11:29, μὴ διακρίνων, it may be the first class condition with εἰ that is the equivalent, but one cannot always be certain on this point. Cf. Ro. 2:27, τελοῦσα; Gal. 6:9, μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι; 1 Tim. 4:4, λαμβανό-μενον; Heb. 2:3, ἀμελήσαντες; 7:12, μετατίθεμένης. Moulton[2] denies that the participle stands in the N. T. for a condition of the second class (unreal condition). In Lu. 19:23, κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν αὐτὸ ἔπραξα, the participle is part of the apodosis, while the condition is implied in the 'preceding question. Moulton[3] rightly notes that one can no longer decide by the presence of μή with the participle that it is conditional or concessive, since μή has come in the κοινή to be the usual negative of participles. There is no instance of ay with the participle in the N. T., though Moulton (*Prol*., p. 167) quotes one in a κοινή inscr., I. M. A. iii, 174, διακιότερον ἂν σωθέντα (in a despatch of Augustus). For ὡς ἄν see Particles with Participles.

Concession. This is also a frequent construction. Cf. Mt. 14:9, λυπηθείς. The context calls for the adversative idea in 7:11, πονηροὶ ὄντες. See further Mt. 26:60; 14:5; Mk. 4:31; Jo. 12:37; 21:11; Jas. 3:4; Ac. 13:28; Ro. 1:21, 32; 9:22; 1 Cor. 9:19; Jude 5. To avoid ambiguity the Greek often used particles to make the concessive idea plain, and this idiom survives in the N. T. Cf. καί γε—ὑπάρχοντα (Ac. 17:27), καί τοι γενηθέντων, (Heb. 4:3), καίπερ more frequently as in Ph. 3:4; Heb. 5:8; 7:5; 12:17; 2 Pet. 1:12. In Heb. 11:12 we also have καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου. Καίτοιγε occurs only with the finite verb as in Jo. 4:2.[4] So κοίτοι in Ac. 14:17. It is worth while to note the survival of οὐ with καί γε in Ac. 17:27.[5] Moulton (*Prol*., p. 231), admits Wellhausen's (*Einl*., p. 22) claim that λαλεῖ βλασφημεῖ. (Mk. 2:7) is an Aramaism for two Aramaic participles,

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 502.
[2] Prol., p. 230.
[3] Ib., p. 229.
[4] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 248.
[5] Moulton, Prol., p. 230,

"the second of which should appear as a participle" as in: Lu. 22:65, βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον. But W. H. punctuate λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ.

(γ) *The Absolute Participle in Subordinate Clauses.* It is not strange that the participle should have been used in clauses that stand apart from the rest of the sentence. There it has its adjectival agreement. It is but a step further than the ordinary circumstantial participle which makes an additional statement. All the varieties of the circumstantial participle can appear in the absolute participle.

Nominative Absolute. It is possible thus to explain some examples of anacolutha in ancient Greek[1] and the N. T., though Blass[2] demurs. Cf. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ--ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν (Jo. 7:38) ; ἐπιγνόντες, δὲ --φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων (Ac. 19:34); ὁ νικῶν δώσω αὐτῷ (Rev. 3:21). Cf. also τῶν θελόντων and οἱ κατέσθοντες (Mk. 12:40). So Mk. 7:19; Rev. 2:26. At any rate it is the *nominativus pendens*, and there is not any special difference. In the modern Greek (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 169) the nominative absolute with the participle occurs, though rare, and usually a conjunctional clause has supplanted the genitive absolute.

Accusative Absolute . This construction was used with impersonal verbs or phrases like δέον, ἐξόν, παρόν. It was probably an appositional addition to the sentence.[3] It has nearly, if not quite, disappeared from the N. T. The adverb τυχόν (1 Cor. 16:6) is really an instance of it, but not so ἐξόν in Ac. 2:29, where ἐστίν is probably to be supplied. Cf. ἐξὸν ἦν (Mt. 12:4) and δέον ἐστίν (Ac. 19:36). Cf. also οὐ συμφέρον μέν in 2 Cor. 12:1. But a possible accusative absolute is γνώστην ὄντα (Ac. 26:3), though it is very rare to see the accusative absolute with a substantive of its own.[4] In such instances it was usual to have also ὡς or ὥσπερ.[5] The accusative is an old idiom, appearing in the oldest Greek title known to us.[6] But it came to be rather common in Thucydides.[7] It was rare in the Attic orators. Luke avoids the accusative absolute in Ac. 23:30, by an awkward[8]

[1] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 259.

[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 251. He calls it "antiquated." It was never very common.

[3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 524.

[4] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 339. [5] Thompson, Synt., p. 261.

[6] Deiss., Exp. Times, 1906, Dec., p. 105.

[7] Lell, Der Absolut-Akkusativ im Griech. bis zu Arist., 1892, p. 17.

[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 252.

use of the genitive absolute, **μηνυθείσης δέ μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα ἔσεσθαι**. The papyri use **ἐξόντος** rather than **ἐξόν**.[1] We do not have the acc. absolute in Ph. 1:7, since **ὑμᾶς ὄντας** is a resumption (apposition) of **ὑμᾶς** before.

Genitive Absolute. It is by no means certain that the case is always genitive. Indeed, it is pretty clear that some of these examples are ablative. Probably some are real genitives of time.[2] The Sanskrit uses chiefly the locative in these absolute constructions. It is possible that the Latin ablative absolute may sometimes be locative or instrumental.[3] The use of the true genitive in the Greek idiom is probably to be attributed to expressions of time in the genitive case with which participles were used. Then the temporal circumstantial participle was right at hand. It is in Attic prose, particularly the orators, that we see the highest, development of the idiom.[4] The accusative absolute was just as idiomatic as this genitive-ablative construction, but it did not get the same hold on the language.[5] See Cases for further remarks. The **κοινή** shows a rapid extension of the genitive absolute. "In the papyri it may often be seen forming a string of statements, without a finite verb for several lines."[6] In the N. T. different writers vary greatly, John's Gospel, for instance, having it only one-fourth as often as the Acts.[7] The most frequent use of the idiom is when the substantive (or pronoun) and the participle stand apart with no syntactical connection with any part of the sentence. Cf. Mk. 4:17, **εἶτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζονται**; Ac. 12:18, **γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἦν τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος**; 18:20; 7:5; Eph. 2:20; Mk. 8:1; 2 Pet. 3:11; Heb. 9:6-8, 15, 19. These are perfectly regular and normal examples. But sometimes the genitive absolute occurs where there is already a genitive in the sentence. So Mt. 6:3, **σοῦ δὲ ποιοῦντος—ἡ ἀριστερά σου**; Jo. 4:51; Ac. 17:16. In Mk. 14:3 we find a double gen. absolute **ὄντος αὐτοῦ—κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ.** Even in the classical Greek the genitive absolute is found when the participle could have agreed with some substantive or pronoun in the sentence.[8] It was done apparently to make the

[1] **Οὐκ ἐξόντος**, P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66).
[2] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 524. [3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 167 f.
[4] Cf. Spieker, The Genitive Abs. in the Attic Orators, Am. Jour. of Philol., VI, pp. 310-343.
[5] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 251. [6] Moulton, Prol., p. 74.
[6] Gildersl., Styl. Effect of the Gk. Part., Am. Jour. of Philol. 1888, p. 153.
[8] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 338.

participial clause more prominent. The papyri show illustrations. of the same thing,[1] as in B. U. 1040 (ii/A.D.) **χαίρω ὅτι μοι ταῦτα ἐποίησας, ἐμοῦ μεταμελομένου περὶ μηδενός**. It is fairly common in the N. T. We have it even when the part. refers to the subject of the verb, as in Mt. 1:18, **μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας— εὑρέθη ἔχουσα**. In Ro. 9:1 the construction is regular, though **μοι** and **μου** occur. In Mt. 8:1 we find **καταβάντος αὐτοῦ— ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ**. Cf. 5:1; 9:18; 17:22; 2 Cor. 4:18, etc. Likewise the genitive and the accusative come together as in Jo. 8:30, **αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος—ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν**. Cf. also Mt. 18:25; Ac. 28:17. Quite unusual is Ac. 22:17 where we have **μοι ὑποστρέψαντι, προσευχομένου μου** and **γενέσθαι με**. The N. T. occasionally uses the participle alone in the genitive absolute according to the occasional classic usage.[2] In the papyri it is more frequent than in the N. T.[3] In particular note the common **ἐξόντος**, P. Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). Cf. also **δηλωθέντος**, B. U. 970 (ii/A.D.). See Mt. 17:14, **ἐλθόντων**; 17:26, **εἰπότος**; Ac. 21:31, **ζητούντων**. In Lu. 12:36, **ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος εὐθέως ἀνοίξωσιν αὐτῷ**, we have the genitive participle although **αὐτῷ** is present. Cf. B. G. U. 423 (ii/A.D.) **ὅτι μου κινδυνεύσαντος εἰς θάλασσαν ἔσωσε**, where **με** the object of **ἔσωσε** is not expressed.

(f) **The Independent Participle in a Sentence**. There is no doubt that the use of the absolute participle (nominative, accusative, genitive-ablative) is a sort of "implied predication."[4] It remains to be considered whether the participle ever forms an independent sentence. We have seen that the inf. is occasionally so used. It is but a step from the independent clause to the independent sentence. Did the participle take it? The nominative absolute as a sort of anacoluthon appears in the ancient Greek. Cf. Plato, *Apol*. 21 C, **καὶ διαλεγόμενος αὐτῷ ἔδοξέ μοι ὁ ἀνὴρ εἶναι σοφός**. As the genitive-absolute, like other circumstantial participles, retreated before the conjunctional clauses, there was an increasing tendency to blur or neglect the grammatical case agreements in the use of the participles. The N. T., like the **κοινή** in general, shows more examples of the anacoluthic nominative participle than the older Greek.[5] The mental strain of so many participles in rapid conversation or writing made anacolutha

[1] Cf. Moulton, Prol., pp. 74, 236; Cl. Rev., XV, p. 437.
[2] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 338.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 74. This idiom is common in Xen. Roche, Beitr., p. 128.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 167.
[5] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 259.

easy.[1] "Hence even writers of systematic training could not but occasionally blunder in the use of the circumstantial participle." Jannaris had thus concluded that the late Greek showed an independent use of the participle as anacoluthon.[2] Blass[3] would go no further than this. Viteau[4] found abundant illustration of the independent use of the anacoluthic participle in the LXX. Viteau explains it as a Hebraism. But Moulton[5] claims that the subject is removed from the realm of controversy by the proof from the papyri. Thumb[6] finds the idiom in classical Greek and in the **κοινή** (in the LXX, N. T., papyri, inscriptions, etc.). It is easy to be extreme on this point of dispute. In the chapter on Mode (the Imperative) adequate discussion appears concerning the participle as imperative. That discussion need not be repeated. It may be insisted, however, again that the participle in itself is never imperative nor indicative, though there seem to be examples in the N. T., as in the papyri, where, because of ellipsis or anacoluthon, the participle carries on the work of either the indicative or the imperative. In examples like 2 Cor. 1:3, **εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός**, either **ἐστίν** or **ἔστω** may be supplied with the verbal adjective. It must not be forgotten that this is the work of the interpreter to a large extent rather than of the grammarian. The manuscripts often vary in such examples and the editors differ in the punctuation. But the grammarian must admit the facts of usage. The papyri and the N. T. show that sometimes the participle was loosely used to carry on the verbal function in independent sentences.[7] Cf. **ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ** (Ro. 12:9), for instance, where we have a complete sentence without connection with anything else. The preceding sentence is **ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος** (an independent sentence itself) and it is followed by a series of independent participles (verses 10-13). In verse 14 we have abruptly **εὐλογεῖτε—καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε** (imperatives) and then the absolute infinitive **χαίρειν** (imperatival also). The point seems to be incontrovertible. Cf. also Col. 3:16. It is only necessary to add a word about the independent participle in the midst of indicatives, since this use is far more frequent than the imperative idiom just noted. In general it may be said that no participle

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p 505.
[2] Ib., pp. 500, 505.
[3] Gr. of Gk. N. T., p. 283.
[4] Le Verbe, pp. 200
[5] Prol., pp. 180 ff., 222 ff.
[6] Hellen., p. 131.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 180, cites Meisterh., pp. 244-246, for the use of the imp. part. in decrees. It is the *nominativus pendens* applied to the part.

should be explained in this way that can properly be connected with a finite verb. In Ro. 12:6, **ἔχοντες δέ** it is clear that we cannot carry on the participle as subordinate to **ἔχομεν** or **ἐσμεν** in the preceding verses. W. H. boldly start a new sentence. In either case, whether we have comma or period before, we must take **ἔχοντες** as imperatival or indicative, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, supply **ἐσμέν** or **ὦμεν** as **ποιεῖτε** is supplied in Ro. 13: 11 with **καὶ εἰδότες τὸν καιρόν**.[1] But other examples leave no such alternative. We may first summarize Moulton's satisfactory exposition of the matter. There is a striking similarity between the third person plural indicative and the participle in the Indo-Germanic tongues (**bheronti, ferunt,* **φέρουσι**, *bairand*, etc.). The frequent ellipsis of *est* in the Latin perfect and passive is to be noted also. The probability that the Latin second plural middle indicative is really a participle which has been incorporated into the verb inflection (cf. *sequimini* and **ἑπόμενοι**) is also suggestive. This fact may point to the prehistoric time when the Latin used the participle as indicative. The papyri re-enforce the argument strongly. We quote a bit from Moulton[2]: "Tb. P. 14 (ii/B.C.), **τῶι οὖν σημαινομένωι Ἡρᾶτι παρηγγελκότες ἐνώπιον,** 'I gave notice in person' (no verb follows). Tb. P. 42 (ib.), **ἠδικημένος** (no verb follows). A. P. 78 (ii A.D.) **βίαν πάσχων ἑκάστοτε**, etc. (no verb)." This may serve as a sample of many more like it. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 223) adds that use of the part. as ind. or imper. in the papyri is "not at all a mark of inferior education." See 1 Pet. 2: 12 where **ἔχοντες** does not agree with the **παροίκους**. We may now approach the passages in dispute between Winer[3] and Moulton.[4] Moulton passes by Winer's suggestion that in 2 Cor. 4:13 **ἔχοντες** is to be taken with **πιστεύομεν**. This is probable, though awkward. So in 2 Pet. 2:1 the participles can be joined with **παρεισάξουσιν**. But in Ro. 5:11 it is, Moulton argues, somewhat forced to take **οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι** otherwise than as independent. If we once admit the fact of this idiom, as we have done, this is certainly the most natural way to take it here. Moulton is silent as to **στελλόμενοι** in 2 Cor. 8:20. Winer connects it with **συνεπέμψαμεν** in verse 18 and he is supported by the punctuation of verse 19 as a parenthesis by W. H. But even so in verse 19 we have **οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ χειροτονηθείς** (cf. Ro. 5:11) stranded with no verb. Moulton also passes by Heb. 6:8 and 2 Pet. 3:5. In Heb. 7:1 Moulton follows W. H. in reading **ὁ** (not

[1] Moulton, Prol., pp. 180, 183 f.
[2] Ib., pp. 223 f.
[3] W.-Th., p. 351 f.
[4] Prol., p. 224 f.

ὃς) συναντήσας on the authority of C*LP against ℵABC²DEK 17. So he sees no necessity for taking ἑρμηνευόμενος as an indicative. In Heb. 8:10; 10:16, Moulton takes διδούς as parallel with ἐπιγράψω, whereas Winer would resolve ἐπιγράψω into a participle. Here Moulton is clearly right. In Ac. 24:5, εὑρόντες γάρ, we have anacoluthon as both Winer and Moulton agree. Moulton adds: "Luke cruelly reports the orator *verbatim*." Moulton omits to comment on Winer's explanation of the parenthetical anacoluthon in 2 Pet. 1:17, λαβὼν γάρ. It is a violent anacoluthon and Winer does not mend it. Note 2 Cor. 5:6, θαρροῦντες, where after a parenthesis we have θαρροῦμεν δέ (resumptive). But Moulton takes 2 Cor. 7:5 θλιβόμενοι as an example of the "indicative" participle. So does he explain Ro. 12:6 ἔχοντες, and ἔχων in Rev. 10:2. In Ac. 26:20 the MSS. vary between ἀπαγγέλλων and ἀπήγγελλον. In Heb. 10:1 ἔχων will also be independent if δύναται be read. In Ph. 1:30 ἔχοντες has ὑμῖν, above and halts in the case agreement. On the whole, therefore, we may conclude that, while every instance is to be examined on its merits, a number of real examples of the idiom may be admitted in the N. T. Viteau[1] has entirely too large a list of such instances. Many of them admit a much simpler explanation as in Ph. 1:30 above. In Revelation, it is true, there is more than usual laxity in the agreement of the participle, especially when it is in apposition. There is also a change from nominative to accusative between ἰδού and εἶδον as in Rev. 4:1-5; 7:9; 14:1-3; 14:14, etc. But there are real examples in Rev., as καὶ ἔχων (1:16), λέγων, (11:1). With all this development along a special line we must not forget that the participle is both adjective and verb. Blass[2] has a careful discussion of "the free use of the participle." In Col. 1:26 he notes that the participle ἀποκεκρυμμένον is continued by the indicative ἐφανερώθη. Cf. Jo. 5:44.

(g) **Co-ordination between Participles**. Blass[3] uses the term "conjunctive" participle instead of a special use of the "circumstantial" participle. It is not a particularly happy phrase. But it does accent the notion that this participle, though an addition to the principal verb, is still joined to it in grammatical agreement. Blass[4] shows clearly how identity of action may be expressed by two finite verbs, as well as by the pleonastic participle of identical action. Cf. Jo. 1:25 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν (Mt. 15:23 ἠρώτουν λέγοντες), 12:44 ἔκραξεν καὶ εἶπεν

[1] Le Verbe, pp. 201
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 284 f.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 247.
[4] Ib., p. 250.

(Mt. 8:29 ἔκραξαν λέγοντες), 13:21 ἐμαρτύρησεν καὶ εἶπε (Ac. 13: 22 εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας), 18:25 ἠρνήσατο καὶ εἶπεν, (Mt. 26:70 ἠρνήσατο λέγων), where John prefers the particularity of the finite verb. But see also Lu. 6:48, ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν, 'he dug and deepened'= 'he dug deep.' Cf. Jo. 8:59. There remains the relation of participles to each other when a series of them comes together. There is no rule on this subject beyond what applies to other words. Two or more participles may be connected by καί as in Ac. 3:8, περιπατῶν καὶ ἁλλόμενος καὶ αἰνῶν τὸν θεόν. But we have asyndeton[1] in Ac. 18:23, διερχόμενος τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, στηρίζων τοὺς μαθητάς. Cf. Lu. 6:38, μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυννόμενον δώσουσιν. Sometimes καί occurs only once as in Mk. 5:15, καθήμενον ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα. may be a subtle reason for such a procedure as in Ac. 18:22, κατελθὼν εἰς Καισαρίαν, ἀναβὰς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος, where the first participle stands apart in sense from the other two. Cf. also Mk. 5: 32. In a list of participles one may be subordinate to the other as in Mk. 5:30, ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν ἐπιστραφείς. This accumulation of participles is only occasional in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Mt. 14:19; 27:48; and, in particular, Mk. 5:25-27), but very common in Acts and the Pauline Epistles. Blass[2] concedes to Luke in Acts "a certain amount of stylistic refinement" in his use of a series of participles, while with Paul it is rather "a mere stringing together of words," an overstatement as to Paul. Luke was not an artificial rhetorician nor was Paul a mere bungler. When Paul's heart was all ablaze with passion, as in 2 Corinthians, he did pile up participles like boulders on the mountain-side, a sort of volcanic eruption. Cf. 2 Cor. 3:8-10; 6:9 f.; 9:11ff. But there is always a path through these participles. Paul would not let himself be caught in a net of mere grammatical niceties. If necessary, he broke the rule and went on (2 Cor. 8: 20). But Moulton[3] is right in saying that all this is "more a matter of style than of grammar." It is rhetoric.

(h) **Οὐ and μή with the Participle**. It is worth noting that in Homer[4] **οὐ** is the normal negative of the participle, **μή** occurring only once, *Od*. 4. 684, and in an optative sentence of wish. It cannot be claimed that in Homer has won its place with the participle. In modern Greek **μή** alone occurs with the present participle (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 200). It is generally said that

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 250.
[2] Ib., p. 251.
[3] Prot., p. 231.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 262 f.

in classical Attic **οὐ** is always the negative of the participle unless condition or concession is implied when the negative is **μή**. But if one looks at all the facts up to 400 B.C. he will go slow before he asserts that **μή** is proof that the participle shows a conditional or concessive force.[1] Jannaris[2] claims the rule only for Attic, "though even here **οὐ** is not rarely replaced by **μή**," that is to say, the rule does not apply even in Attic. The use of "replaced" is wholly gratuitous when it is admitted that the rule does not apply outside of Attic. It is so hard to be historical always even in an historical grammar. If one takes the long view, from Homer with its one use of to the modern Greek with nothing but **οὐ** he sees a steady progress in the use of **μή** which gradually ousted **οὐ** altogether. The Attic marks one stage, the **κοινή** another. It is true that in the Attic there is a sort of correspondence between **οὐ** and the participle and the indicative with **οὐ** on the one hand, while, on the other, **μή** and the participle correspond to the subjunctive or the optative with **μή**. But **οὐ** occurred in Homer with the subj. and persisted with the indicative. The lines crossed and the development was not even, but on the whole **μή** gradually pushed **οὐ** aside from the participle. In the N. T., as in the **κοινή** generally, the development has gone quite beyond the Attic. In the Attic the use of **οὐ** was the more general, while in the **κοινή** the use of **μή** is normal. In the N. T. there is no need to explain **μή** with the participle. That is what you expect. Cf. Lu. 12:33 **μὴ παλαιούμενα**, Jo. 5:23 **ὁ μὴ τιμῶν** Ac. 17:6 **μὴ εὑρόντες**, Heb. 11:13 **μὴ κομισάμενοι**. In the N. T. it is **οὐ** that calls for explanation, not **μή**. But it may be said at once that the N. T. is in thorough accord with the **κοινή** on this point. Even in a writer of the literary **κοινή** like Plutarch[3] one notes the inroads of **μή**. The papyri go further than Plutarch, but still have examples of **οὐ**, like **οὐ κεκομισμέναι** P. Par. (B.C. 163), **τὸν οὐκ ἐν λευκαῖς ἐσθῆσιν ἐν θεάτρῳ καθίσαντα** O. P. 471 (ii/A.D.), **ὀδέπω πεπληρωκότων** O. P. 491 (ii/A.D.), **οὐ δυνάμενος** A. P. 78 (ii/A.D.).[4] Moulton[5] thinks that in many of these papyri examples there is "the lingering consciousness that the proper negative of a downright fact is **οὐ**." In general it may be said of the **κοινή** that the presence of a with the participle means that the negative is clear-cut

[1] Howes, The Use of **μή** with the Part., Harv. Stu. in Class. Philol.,1901, pp. 277-285.

[2] Hist. Gk. Cr., p. 430. [3] Blass, Cr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.

[4] See further exx. in Moulton, Prol., p. 231.

[5] Prol., p. 232.

and decisive. Cf. Mt. 22:11 **οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου**, (Lu. 6: 42) **οὐ** βλέπων, (Jo. 10:12) **ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμήν**, (Ac. 7:5) **οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου** (17:27) **καί γε οὐ μακρὰν –ὑπάρχοντα**, (26: 22) **οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων**, (28:17) **οὐδὲν ποιήσας**, (1 Cor. 4:14) **οὐκ ἐντρέπων**, (9:26) **ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων**, (2 Cor. 4:8) **ἀλλ᾽ οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι**, (Ph. 3:3) **καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες**, (Col. 2:19) **καὶ οὐ κρατῶν**, (Heb. 11:1) **πραγμάτων οὐ** βλεπουμένων, (11:35) **οὐ προσδεξάμενοι**, (1 Pet. 1:8) **οὐκ ἰδόντες** (2:10) **οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι**. In all these we have no special departure from the Attic custom, save that in Ac. 17:27 the participle is concessive. But we have just seen that the Attic was not rigid about **οὐ** and **μή** with the participle. In two of the examples above **οὐ** and **μή** come close together and the contrast seems intentional. Thus in Mt. 22:11 we have **οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου**, while in verse 12 we read **μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου**. The first instance lays emphasis on the actual situation in the description (the plain fact) while the second instance is the hypothetical argument about it. In 1 Pet. 1:8 we read **ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶτε**. Here **οὐ** harmonizes with the tense of **ἰδόντες** as an actual experience, while **μή** with **ὁρῶντες** is in accord with the concessive idea in contrast with **πιστεύοντες.** Cf. Hort *in loco* who holds that the change of particles here is not capricious. "Though Blass thinks it artificial to distinguish, it is hard to believe that any but a slovenly writer would have brought in so rapid a change without a reason."[1] It may be admitted further that "in Luke, Paul and Hebrews we have also to reckon with the literary consciousness of an educated man, which left some of the old idioms even where **μή**) had generally swept them away."[2] See also **τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα** (Ro. 1:28) and Text. Rec. **τὰ οὐ ἀνήκοντα** (Eph. 5:4). Cf. **μή** and **οὐ** in Ac. 9:9. Blass[3] notes that the Hebrew **לֹא** is regularly translated in the LXX by **οὐ** without any regard to the Greek refinement of meaning between **οὐ** and **μή** with the participle. Hence in the N. T. quotations from the LXX this peculiarity is to be noted. Moulton[4] observes also that, while this is true, the passages thus quoted happen to be instances where a single word is negatived by **οὐ**. Cf. Ro. 9:25 **τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην**, (Gal. 4:27) **ἡ οὐκ τίκτουσα, ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα**. A case like Ac. 19:11, **οὐ τὰς τυχούσας**, is, of course, not pertinent. It is a "common vernacular phrase,"[5] besides the fact that **οὐ** is not the

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 232.
[2] Ib.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.
[4] Prol., p. 232.
[5] Ib., p. 231.

negative of. the participle[1] any more than it is in Ac. 19:11; 28: 21. Moulton[2] also rules out **οὐκ ἐξόν** (2 Cor. 12:4) on the ground that it is the equivalent of the indicative. The copula is not expressed. But note **οὐκ ἐξόντος**, Oxy. 275 (A.D. 66). On this count the showing for **οὐ** with the participle is not very large in the N. T. Luke has **οὐ** five times with the participle (Lu. 6:42; Ac. 7:5; 17:27; 26:22; 28:17). Paul leads with a dozen or so (Ro. 9:25; Gal. 4:27 twice; 1 Cor. 4:14; 9:26; 2 Cor. 4:8, 9; Ph. 3:3; Col. 2:19; 1 Th. 2:4). Hebrews has two (11: 1, 35) and Peter three (1 Pet. 1:8; 2:10; 2 Pet. 1:16, **οὐ--** ἀλλά). Matthew has only one (22:11), and note **μὴ ἔχων** in the next verse. The MSS. vary also between the negatives as in Mt. 22:11, where C[3]D have **μή** which Blass[3] adopts with his whimsical notions of textual criticism. At any rate Matthew, Luke (Gospel) and John use **μή** almost exclusively with the participle, while Mark, James, the Johannine Epistles and Revelation do not have **οὐ** at all with the participle. In Ro. 8:20, **οὐχ ἑκοῦσα**, the old participle is merely an adjective as in Heb. 9:11. In Ro. 9:25, **τὸν οὐ λαόν**, the negative occurs with a substantive (quotation from LXX). The ancient Greek would usually have added **ὄντα**.

(i) **Other Particles with the Participle.** The ancient Greek[4] had quite a list of adverbs (particles) that were used with the circumstantial participle on occasion to make clearer the precise relation of the participle to the principal verb or substantive. Some of these (like **ἅτε, οἷον, οἷα)** no longer occur with the part. in the N. T. But some remain in use. These particles, it should be noted, do not change the real force of the participle. They merely sharpen the outline. The simplest form of this usage is seen in the adverbs of time like **τὸ πρότερον** (Jo. 9:8); **ποτέ** (Gal. 1:23. Cf. Eph. 2:13; Lu. 22:32); **πυνότερον** (Ac. 24: 26). In Mk. 9:20; Jo. 5:6 note other expressions of time. More idiomatic is the use of **εὐθύς** as in **εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθύς** (Mk. 6:25). Cf. also **ἤδη ὀψίας γενομένης** (Mk. 15:42), **ἔτι ὤν** (2 Th. 2:5) and **ἄρτι ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου** (1 Th. 3:6). Blass[5] denies that **ἅμα** with the participle in the N. T. suggests simultaneousness or immediate sequence. He sees in **ἅμα καὶ ἐλπίζων** (Ac. 24:26) only 'withal in the expectation,' not 'at the same time hoping.' I question

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255 f. [2] Prol., p. 231.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255. Cf. Gildersleeve, Encroachments of **μή** on **οὐ** in later Gk., Am. Jour. of Philol., I, p. 45 f.
[4] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 340 ff. [5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 252.

the correctness of Blass' interpretation on this point. Cf. also ἅμα ἀνέντες (27:40); προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν (Col. 4:3), where it requires some overrefinement to refuse the classic idiom to Luke. Under the concessive participle we saw examples of καί γε (Ac. 17:27), καίτοι (Heb. 4:3), καίπερ (Heb. 5:8, etc.). There is also the use of ὅμως in the principal sentence to call attention to the concessive force of the participle (1 Cor. 14:7). So οὕτως points back to a participle of time or manner (Ac. 20: 11). Worth noting, besides, is καὶ τοῦτο as in Ro. 13:11, though here a finite verb may be implied. So also καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου (Heb. 11:12). There remain ὡς, ὡσί, ὥσπερ. The use of ὡσεί (Ro. 6:13) and of ὥσπερ (Ac. 2:2) is limited to condition or comparison. It is only with ὡς that there is any freedom or abundance. Blass[1] notes the absence of the accusative absolute with ὡς in the N. T. and its absence from the future participle save in Heb. 13:17, where it is not strictly design. There is nothing specially significant in the phrase οὐχ ὡς, 'not as if,' in Ac. 28:19; 2 Jo. 5. The N. T., like the classical Greek, uses ὡς without the participle in abbreviated expressions like ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ (Col. 3:23); ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ (Ro. 13:13); ὡς δι᾽ ἡμῶν (2 Th. 2:2), etc., where the participle is easily supplied from the context.[2] In some instances one must note whether the particle does not belong with the principal verb. But, common as ὡς is with the participle, it does not change the nature of the participle with which it occurs.[3] The participle with ὡς may be causal, temporal, conditional, manner, etc. Then again ὡς may be used to express the notion of the speaker or writer as well as that of one who is reported. In truth, cos implies nothing in itself on that point. The context alone must determine it.[4] The various uses of ὡς itself should be recalled. There may be nothing but comparison, as in ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων (Mk. 1:22); ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων (1 Cor. 9:26). So also Mk. 6:34; 2 Cor. 6: 9 f.; 1 Pet. 2:13, 16. In Lu. 22:26 f. observe ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. The causal idea is prominent in ὡς ἠλεημένος (1 Cor. 7:25). Cf. Heb. 12:27 and D in Ac. 20:13, ὡς μέλλων. The concessive or conditional notion is dominant in 1 Cor. 7:29 f.; 2 Cor. 5:20, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι᾽ ἡμῶν. So also in Ac. 3:12; 28:19; 2 Jo. 5. In Lu. 16:1, ὡς διασκορπίζων, the charge is given by Jesus as that of the

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253. [2] Ib.

[3] Fuhrer, De Particulae ὡς cum Participiis et. Praepositionibus punctae Usu Thucydideo, 1889, p. 7.

[4] Goodwin, M. and T., p. 343.

slanderer (διεβλήθη) and the context implies that it is untrue (only alleged).[1] Pilate makes a similar use of ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν in Lu. 23:14. He declines by the use of ὡς to accept the correctness of the charge of the Sanhedrin against Jesus. For a similar use see ὡς μέλλοντας (Ac. 23:15); ὡς μέλλων (23:20); προφάσει ὡς μελλόντων (genitive absolute 27:30). But in 2 Cor. 5: 20 (see above) Paul endorses the notion that he is an ambassador of God and ὡς is not to be interpreted as mere pretence. God is speaking through Paul. There is no instance of ἄν with the participle in the N. T. as appears in classic Greek. Winer[2] notes two instances of ὡς ἄν with the participle in the LXX (2 Macc. 1:11; 3 Macc. 4:1). To these Moulton[3] adds another (2 Macc. 12:4) and a genitive absolute example in the papyri, Par. P. 26 (11/B.C.), ὡς ἂν εὐτακτηθησομένων. Cf. also ib., ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ τῆς λιμῆς διαλυόμενοι. The inscrs. show it also, 0. G. I. S. 90, 23 (ii/B.C.), ὡς ἂν—συνεστηκυίας. Blass[4] finds a genitive absolute with ὡς ἄν Barnabas 6:11. All this is interesting as foreshadowing the modern Greek use of σάν as a conjunction.[5]

[1] Cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253.
[2] W.-M., p. 378.
[3] Prol., p. 167.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253.
[5] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 167; Hatz., Einl., p. 217.

CHAPTER XXI

PARTICLES (**ΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΘΗΚΑΙ**)

I. Scope. The word particle is a Latin diminutive, *particula* (cf. French *particule*) from *pars*. It is a small part of something. Longinus terms this part of speech παραθήκη with the notion that it was a word placed beside another. No portion of syntax is treated with so little satisfaction in the grammars. The grammarians are not agreed as to what parts of speech should be called "particles." Riemann and Goelzer[1] treat under this term (*Les Particules*) negative particles, particles of comparison and prepositions. Jannaris[2] includes prepositions, conjunctions and negative particles. Kuhner-Gerth[3] here discuss conjunctions, prepositions and the modal adverbs, though they use the phrase "die sogenannten Partikeln." Blass[4] almost confines the discussion of particles to conjunctions. He makes the two terms equivalent: "Particles (Conjunctions)." Winery uses the word broadly to cover all adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Monro[6] limits the designation to certain conjunctions and adverbs "that are mainly used to show the relation between other words and between clauses." But he does not treat all conjunctions (paratactic and hypotactic) nor all modal adverbs. He passes by prepositions. Brugmann[7] sees clearly that, as there is no real distinction between adverbs and prepositions, so there is no fast line ("keine feste Grenze") between "particles" and other adverbs. All languages have a large group of words that pass over into the category of particles, but Brugmann cuts the Gordian knot by declaring that it is not a function of scientific grammar to delimit these words. That is a matter of subjective standpoint. He takes little interest in the various subdivisions of the particles, but he extends the term to its widest sense to

[1] Synt., pp. 802-820.
[2] Hist. Gk. Gr., pp. 365-433.
[3] II, pp. 113-347.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., pp. 259-275.
[5] W.-Th., pp. 356-512.
[6] Hom. Gr., pp. 240-269.
[7] Griech. Gr., pp. 525-550.

cover all modal adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Brugmann notes that many of these particles go back to the Indo-Germanic time and hence their etymology is unknown. He treats the particles from the standpoint of their origin so far as known. Hartung[1] takes a much narrower view of particles. He discusses the paratactic conjunctions and the intensive particles. He[2] conceives that the greater portion of the particles have no meaning in themselves, but are merely modifications on other words or on whole sentences. This is not strictly correct. We are not always able to discover the original import of these words, but it is probable that they originally had a definite meaning. It is true that the particles are all subordinated to other words in various ways. In a broad way it may be stated that there are four classes of words (verbs, nouns, pronouns, particles) in the sentence. From this point of view the word particle covers all the adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. But it is impossible, as Brugmann holds, to make a perfectly scientific treatment of the particles without much overlapping. The interjections in one sense do not belong to grammar. The negative and the interrogative particles cannot be properly treated under adverbs, though they are adverbs. So also conjunctions are adverbs, but a good deal more. Intensive particles again are adverbs, but more. It is not worth while to recount the story of the adverbs and the prepositions at this stage. They are particles, but they have received sufficient discussion in special chapters. In the same way the construction of hypotactic conjunctions came in for somewhat careful treatment in connection with subordinate sentences under Mode. Hence, hypotactic conjunctions do not here demand as much discussion as the paratactic conjunctions. One has to be, to a certain extent, arbitrary in this field, since the ground is so extensive and so much remains to be clone. There is still need of a modern and exhaustive treatise on the Greek Particles. It was in 1769 that the Dutch scholar Hoogeveen[3] wrote his book. He was followed by Hartung.[4] Klotz[5] reworked the writings of Devarius. In

[1] Lehre von den Partikeln der griech. Spr., Tl. I, 1832; Tl. II, 1S33.

[2] Ib., Tl. I, p. 37. Schroeder (Uber die formelle Untersch. der Reclet., 1874, p. 35 f.) writes well on the obscurity of the origin of particles and the use of the term.

[3] Doctrina Particularum Linguae Graecae. Ed. Secunda, 1806.

[4] See above.

[5] De Graecae Linguae Particulis, vol. I, 1840; II, 1842.

1861 Baumlein produced his *Untersuchungen uber griech. Partiheln.* Paley[1] has carried the work on, as has Navarre.[2] There are, to be sure, a great number of monographs on special groups or on single particles.[3] "If any particular section of Greek grammar were taken as a specimen to illustrate the historical evolution of the Greek language, no better representative could be selected than the section of the particles."[4] Jannaris speaks thus, not because the grammars have treated the particles with such skill, but because the particles best show the growth and decay of parallel words before other new synonyms that are constantly coming into existence. The particles come to a sharp point and gradually lose the edge and whittle down into platitudes. Then they give way to others with more freshness. In general, the particles mark the history of the effort to relate words with each other, clause with clause, sentence with sentence, paragraph with paragraph. They are the hinges of speech, the joints of language, or the delicate turns of expression, the nuances of thought that are often untranslatable. We must here confine our attention to Intensive Particles, Negative Particles, Interrogative Particles, Conjunctions and Interjections. This order is chosen for logical reasons simply, not because this was the order of development. That we do not know. The particles that are linked to single words logically come before conjunctions which have to do with clauses and sentences. Interjections stand apart and so are put last in the list. Some of the particles are employed with words, clauses and sentences (like **ἄρα, δέ, οὖν**), so that a strict division on this basis is not possible.[5]

II. Intensive or Emphatic Particles (**παραθῆκαι ἐμφατικαί** or **παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι** *according to Dionysius Thrax*).

1. LIMITATIONS. Here again there is no absolute agreement as to what particles are considered "emphatic" or "intensive." Winer, indeed, has no separate discussion of the intensive particles like **γε, περ**. He admits[6] that, while the Greek of the N. T. uses adverbs well in an *extensive* sense, it is defective in the *intensive* use. Adverbs of place, time, manner, all come in abundance in the N. T. Thompson[7] follows Winer in the absence of discussion of the intensive particles. The intensive particles, in

[1] The Gk. Particles, 1881.
[2] Etudes sur les particules grecques, R. E. A., VII, pp. 116-130.
[3] Cf. Hubner, Grundr. zu Vorlesungen uber die griech. Synt., pp. 70-87.
[4] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 365.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 240.
[6] W.-Th., p. 462.
[7] Synt. of Attic Gk.

fact, as a rule receive poor handling in the grammars.[1] But Paley[2] properly sees that they are "an elaborately finished part of a most complex and beautiful machinery." Poetry, especially tragic poetry, uses these emphatic particles more than other kinds of writing. In Homer "they sustain and articulate the pulses of emotion. By them alone we can perceive that Greek was the language of a witty, refined, intellectual, sensitive and passionate people. It would be impossible in any book to tabulate the delicate shades of meaning, the subtle, intricate touches of irony or pathos, the indescribable grace and power which the particles lend to many of the grandest passages in ancient literature."[3] It is only by a close study of the entire context that these can be felt. They can never be fully translated from one language to another. Thus it is impossible to reproduce in English the various shades of meaning of **μέν** and δέ when in contrast. "The attempt to translate a particle leads to curious results. Dr. Cyril Jackson used always to render **Τρῶές ῥα** by 'the Trojans, *God help them*,' and a former head-master of Eton always distinguished between **σοι**, 'Sir, to you', and **τοι**, 'at your service' (Coleridge, *Greek Classic Poets*, p. 221).[4] Indeed, it is not possible to put into mere written language all that the look, the gesture, the tone of voice, the emphasis of the accent carried when heard and seen. Cf. a Frenchman in conversation. The spoken vernacular thus has all the advantage of the written style. All the vernacular cannot be reproduced on the page. Cf. the charm of the actual speech of Jesus and Paul. The N. T. is in the vernacular **κοινή**, but even so it does not reproduce to any great extent the witchery of the old Greek particles. Time has worn them down very much. Still, we do find them here and there. There is a good example in Ph. 3:8, **ἀλλὰ μέν οὖν γε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι**. So also **εἴ πως ἤδη ποτέ** (Ro. 1:10) and **τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς** (3:7). Cf. P. B. M. 42 (B.C. 168) **οὐ μὴν ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεὶ καί** and 0. P. 1164, 5 (vi/vii A.D.) **οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καί**. This shows that Paul at least knew how to indicate the finer shades of thought by means of the Greek particles. Blass[5] notes that, in comparison with the Semitic languages, the N. T. seems to make excessive use of the particles, poor as the showing is in comparison with the classic period. "Modern Greek has lost the classical Greek wealth of connective and other particles which lend nicety and

[1] Paley, The Gk. Particles, p. vi.
[2] Ib., p. ix.
[3] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 195.
[4] Ib.
[5] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 259.

precision of thought. Only **καί (οὔτε, οὐδέ)**, **ἤ** and the less commonly used conjunctions **ἀλλά, πλήν, ὅμως** have been retained. The loss of **γάρ, ἄρα** has been compensated by new formations; but the ancient Greek **τέ, δέ, μέν—δέ, μέντοι, μήν, οὖν** (**γοῦν**), **ἔτι, δή, γέ, πέρ** have left no successors" (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 185). The papyri seem barren of intensive particles in comparison with the older Greek. Jannaris[1] observes how these postpositive particles (**γέ, δή, μέν πέρ, τοί** and their compounds) tend in the later Greek either to disappear or to become prepositive. The N. T. is in harmony with this result. The same thing occurs with **ἄρα**, which sometimes becomes prepositive, but that is not true of **γάρ, δέ οὖν**. Dionysius Thrax[2] has a very extensive list of "expletive particles" or **παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι** (**εἰσὶ δὲ οἵδε· δή, ῥά, νύ, τοῦ, τοί, θήν ἄρ, δῆτα, πέρ, πώ, μήν, ἄν, αὖ, νῦν, οὖν, κέν, γέ, ἀλλά, μήν, τοίνυν, τοιγαροῦν**). Some of these (like **ἄρα, οὖν, ἀλλά**, and one might add **γάρ, δέ**) are so prevailingly conjunctival that they are best treated under conjunctions. Others (like **κέν, ῥά**) belong to earlier stages of the language. The discussion of **ἄν** could have come here very well, since it is undoubtedly intensive whatever its actual meaning, whether it is blended with **εἰ** into **ἐάν** or used with **ὅς, ὅστις, ἵνα, ὅπως, ὡς**, etc., or used with the verb itself in the apodosis of a condition. It is a modal adverb of emphasis (now definite as in Rev. 8:1, now indefinite as in Mt. 23: 18). It is like a chameleon and gets its colour from its environment or from its varying moods. This fickleness of meaning is true of all the intensive particles. Indeed, Dionysius Thrax is rather slighting in his description of these words, **ὅσοι παρόντες οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖν δύνανται οὔτε μὴν χωρισθέντες λυμαίνονται**. He contradicts his disparagement by the use of **μήν** in this very sentence.

The adverbial nature of the intensive particles is well shown by the variety of usage of the modal adverb **οὕτως**. See Thayer's *Lexicon* for the N. T. illustrations, which are very numerous (some 200). In Jo. 4:6, **ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ**, we have a good example of the possibilities of **οὕτως**. The local adverb **πού** dwindles from 'somewhere' (Heb. 2:6) to 'somewhat' in Ro. 4:19. Cf. also **δή που** (‘surely’) in Heb. 2:16. Some of the temporal adverbs also at times approach the emphatic particles. Cf. **τὸ λοιπόν** in Ph. 3:1; 4:8 (see Kennedy *in loco*) almost[3] =**οὖν**. But in the N. T. **ἄρτι** and **ἤδη** are always strictly temporal. How-

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 400.
[2] Cf. Uhlig's ed., p. 96, and Schol. Dion. Thrax in Bekk. An., 970. 10.
[3] So mod. Gk., Thumb, Handb., p. 184.

ever, ποτέ sometimes loses its notion of 'once upon a time' (Gal. 1:23) and fades into that of 'ever' as in 1 Cor. 9:7; Eph. 5: 29. In ἤδη ποτέ (Ro. 1:10; Ph. 4:10) it is more the notion of culmination ('now at last') than of time. But in μή ποτε the notion of time may be wholly gone before that of contingency ('lest perchance'), as in Lu. 12:58. In the N. T. we find undoubted instances of the non-temporal use of νῦν and νυνί where the sense differs little from δή or οὖν. Some of the passages are in doubt. But the logical and emotional use, as distinct from the temporal, is clear in Jo. 15:22, 24 where νῦν δέ gives the contrast to the preceding conditions, 'but as it is.' Cf. also 1 Jo. 2:28, καὶ νῦν τεκνία, where John's emotional appeal is sharpened by the use of νῦν. Cf. likewise καὶ νῦν δεῦρο in Ac. 7:34 (LXX). Cf. καὶ νῦν, B. U. 530 (i/A.D.). In general, the N. T. language, like the English, leaves most of the emotion and finer shades of thought to be brought out by the reader himself. "The historical books of the N. T., and especially their dialogues and discourses, are only fully and truly intelligible to us in reading them in high voice in the original Greek text, and in supplying the intonation, the gestures, the movement, that is to say, in reconstituting by the imagination the scene itself."[1]

2. THE N. T. ILLUSTRATIONS.

(a) **Γέ.** We may begin with γέ. The origin of γέ is by no means certain. In the Boeotian, Doric and Eleatic dialects it is γά. It seems to correspond[2] to the *k* in the Gothic *mi-k* (German *mi-ch*). Cf. Greek ἐμέ-γε. Brugmann sees also a kinship to the *g* in the Latin *ne-g-otium, ne-g-legere, ne-g-are*. Hartung[3] connects it with the adverb ζά**.** It may also be the same word as the Vedic Sanskrit *gha*, which is used in the same way.[4] Cf. further *qui* in the Latin *qui-dem*. It is not so common in the κοινή as in the classic Attic (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr*., p. 29). Its function is to bring into prominence the particular word with which it occurs. It is enclitic and so postpositive. The feelings are sharply involved when γέ is present. It suits the Greek,[5] which "delights in pointed questions, irony and equivocal assent." But there is no English equivalent and it frequently cannot be translated at all. Hartung[6] sees in γέ a comparative element, while

[1] Viteau, Etude stir le grec, 1896, p. ii.
[2] Cf. Brun., Griech. Gr., p. 541.
[3] Partikellehre, I, p. 344 f. Cf. K.-G., II, pp. 171-178.
[4] K.-G., II, p. 171.
[5] Paley, The Gk. Particles, p. 14.
[6] Partikellehre, I, p. 326.

καί is cumulative and arithmetical. As a matter of fact, γέ brings to the fore the idea of the word with which it is used, but adds no distinctive notion of its own.[1] Hubner[2] calls it a concessive particle on a par with ὅμως. But that is not always true of γέ. The distinction made by γέ may be either the least important or the most important (Thayer). The resultant idea may be 'at least,' this much if no more, a concessive notion. We find this to be the significance of γέ in Lu. 11:8, διά γε τὴν ἀναιδίαν αὐτοῦ. Here, however, the γέ more properly belongs to ἀναιδίαν, since that is the point, not the preposition διά. The same slight variation from the classic idiom appears in 18: 5, διά γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόπον τὴν χήραν ταύτην. The concessive minimizing idea comes out clearly in Jo. 4:2, καίτοιγε Ἰησοῦς αὐτός. See further ἄρα γε and καί γε in Ac. 17:27, and, in particular, ἀλλά γε ὑμῖν εἰμί (1 Cor. 9:2) where again the ancient idiom would prefer ὑμῖν γε, 'to you at least' (if not to others). Once more note εἴ γε in Eph. 3:2; 4:21; Col. 1:23, and εἰ δὲ μή γε in Mt. 6:1; 9:17, etc. There is a keen touch of irony in Ro. 9:20, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, μενοῦνγε σὺ τίς εἶ; Cf. ἄραγε in Mt. 17:26. On the other hand γέ means 'this much,' 'as much as this,' in other contexts. So in Lu. 24:21, ἀλλά γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις, where the ascensive force is accented by καί, σύν and ἀλλά (affirmative here, not adversative), and the climax of the *crescendo* is reached in γέ. The same climacteric force of the particles occurs in Ph. 3:8, ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν γε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι. 'I go,' says Paul, 'as far as to consider all things to be loss.' Cf. ἄραγε in Mt. 7:20 and καί γε in Ac. 2:18 (Joel 3:2). So we have ἆρά γε in Ac. 8:30. A fine example is ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο (Ro. 8:32). So 10:18. There is irony again in καὶ ὄφελόν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε (1 Cor. 4:8), and note the position of γέ apart from καί. In Homer γέ is very common with the pronouns,[3] but in the N. T. we have only ὅς γε (Ro. 8:32). We no more find ἔγω γε, but ἐγὼ μέν (Mt. 3:11), ἐγώ--σύ (3:14), ἐγὼ δέ (5:22), αὐτὸς ἐγώ (Ro. 9:3). Indeed all of the thirty examples of γέ in the N. T. occur with conjunctions (paratactic or hypotactic) or other particles except those in Lu. 11:8; 18:5; Ro. 8:32. Cf. ἁμαρτία γέ ἐστιν ('indeed it is sin') in Hermas, *Vis*., i, 1.8. The particles with which γε is found in the N. T. are ἀλλά γε (Lu. 24:21); ἄρα γε (Mt. 7:20); ἆρά γε (Ac. 8:30); εἴ γε (Eph. 3:2); εἰ δὲ μή γε (Mt.

[1] Baumlein, Griech. Partikeln, 1861, p. 54.

[2] Grundr., p. 85. Cf. also Nagelsbach, Comm. de particulae γέ usu Hom. 1830, p. 4.

[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 258.

6:1); **καί γε** (Ac. 17:27); **καίτοιγε** (Jo. 4:2); **μήτιγε** (1 Cor. 6: 3); **ὄφελον γε** (1 Cor. 4:8); **μενοῦνγε** (Ro. 9:20). Cf. **διά γε** in Lu. 11:8; 18:5. **Γάρ** is compounded of **γέ** and **ἄρα**, but it will be treated under conjunctions, though it is sometimes not much more than an intensive particle. Cf. **τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν** (Mt. 27:23).

(b) **Δή**. It has likewise an uncertain etymology.[1] It appears in the Attic poets as **δαί** (cf. **νή, ναί**) and is seen in composition with **δῆ-τα, δή-που, ἐπει-δή, ἤ-δη.**[2] In **ἤ-δη** we probably have[3] **ἦ** and **δή**. It was originally temporal in idea and goes back to the Indo-Germanic period. Jannaris[4] thinks **δέ** that and **δή** are one and the same word (cf. **μέν** and **μήν**) and holds that the difference is due to the transliteration from the old to the new alphabet when alone a distinction was made between **ε** and **ε** (**η**). Thus the spelling **δή** was confined to the intensive particle, while **δέ** was the form for the conjunction. It is certain that in Homer there is confusion between and before vowels.[5] In Homer also **δή** may begin a sentence, but in the N. T. as elsewhere all the examples are postpositive (but not enclitic). Blass[6] does not treat it as an intensive particle, but as a consecutive particle. It is hard to follow Blass' theory of the particles. Like the other intensive particles it has no English or German equivalent and is a hard word to translate. It is climacteric and indicates that the point is now at last clear and may be assumed as true.[7] Cf. Latin *jam nunc*, **νῦν—ἤδη** (1 Jo. 4:3); **ἤδη ποτέ** (Ro. 1:10). The similarity in sense between **δή** and one usage of **δέ** may be seen in Ac. 6:3, **ἐπισκέψασθε δέ (δή)**, where W. H. put **δή** in the margin. Cf. **καὶ σὺ δέ** in Lu. 1:76. **Δή** is not genuine in 2 Cor. 12:1. There are left only six N. T. illustrations, counting **δή που** in Heb. 2:16, **οὐ γὰρ δή που ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται**. In Mt. 13:23, **ὅς δὴ καρποφορεῖ**, it occurs in a relative sentence, 'who is just the man who.'[8] The other examples are all with the hortatory subjunctive (Lu. 2: 15; Ac. 15:36) or the imperative (Ac. 13:2; 1 Cor. 6:20) in accord with the classical idiom. There is a note of urgency in **ἀφορίσατε δή** (Ac. 13:2) and **δοξάσατε δή** (1 Cor. 6:20). The passage with **δή ποτε** in Jo. 5:4 has disappeared from the critical text.

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 547.
[2] Prellwitz, Et. Worterbuch, p. 73.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 256.
[4] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 410.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 256.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 273 f.
[7] Klotz ad Devar., II, p. 392.
[8] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 274.

(c) **Εἶ μήν, νή** *and* **ναί**. Somewhat akin to the positive note in δή is the use of **ἦ μήν** which is read by many MSS. in Heb. 6:14. The etymology of this adverb is again quite uncertain, though it is possible that it may have the same root as **ἤ** (**ἦ***F***ε, ἠ***F***έ**).[1] Cf. **ἦ** δή (**ἤδη**). In **ἤπερ** (Jo. 12:43) and **ἤτοι** (Ro. 6:16) we have the comparative or disjunctive **ἤ**. In Homer it was often used in connection with other particles.[2] We may pass **μήν** for the present. If **ἦ** were genuine in Hebrews the usage would be in strict accord with classic construction for a strong asseveration. But certainly **εἶ μήν** is the true text. This queer idiom appears a few times in the LXX (Ezek. 33:27; 34:8; 38:19, etc.). It occurs also in the papyri and the inscriptions[3] after iii/B.C. Cf. **εἶ μήν** P. Oxy. 255 (A.D. 48). So that it is mere itacism between **ἦ** and **εἶ**. The Doric has **εἶ** for **ἦ** where Moulton[4] holds against Hort[5] that the distinction is strictly orthographical. See further chapter VI, Orthography and Phonetics, ii, (c). So then **εἶ μήν** has to be admitted in the **κοινή** as an asseverative particle. It is thus another form of **ἦ μήν**. Jannaris[6] gives a special section to the "asseverative particles" **νή** and **μά**. We do not have **μά** in the N. T. and **νή** only once in 1 Cor. 15:31, **καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν. Νή** is a peculiarity of the Attic dialect and is used in solemn asseverations (oaths, etc.) and means 'truly,' 'yes.' It is probably the same word as **ναί**, the affirmative adverb which occurs over thirty times in the N. T. **Ναί** may be simply 'yes,' as in Mt. 13:51. It may introduce a clause as 'yea' or 'verily,' as in Mt. 11:9. It is used in respectful address, **Ναί, Κύριε** (Jo. 11:27). It may be used as a substantive (like any adverb) with the article (2 Cor. 1:17) or without the article (Mt. 5:37), where it is repeated. It occurs with **ἀμήν** in Rev. 1:7. It stands in contrast with **οὐ** in Mt. 5:37 and 2 Cor. 1:17. There was an old form **ναί-χι** (cf. **οὐ-χί**). But we do not know the etymology, though Brugmann[7] compares it with the Latin *ne* and *nae* and possibly also with the old Indo-Germanic **να-να** ('so — so').

(d) **Μέν**. We know a little more about which is postpositive, but not enclitic. It is only another form of **μήν** which occurs in the N. T. only in Heb. 6:14. The Doric and Lesbian use **μάν** and the Thessalian **μά--δέ.** So then it seems probable[8] that **μάν**

[1] Cf. Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 541; K.-G., II, p. 144.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 248.
3 Moulton, Prol., p. 46.
[4] Ib., p. 46.
[6] App., p. 151.
[6] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 410.
[7] Griech. Gr., p. 544.
[8] Ib.

(μά used with words of swearing after a negative), **μήν** and **μέν** are one and the same word. Indeed, in Homer[1] all three forms occur in the same sense. That original sense is affirmative, meaning 'surely,' 'indeed,' 'in truth.' It is overrefinement to find in **μέν** (**μήν**) the subjective confirmation and in δή the objective attestation.[2] It is probable that in the change from the old alphabet to the new the transcribers adopted the two ways of spelling, common in Attic and Ionic (**μέν** and **μήν**) with a notion that **μήν** was merely emphatic with single words, while **μέν** was correlative (forwards or backwards) or antithetical.[3] Questions of metre may also have entered into the matter. But there is no doubt at all that in itself **μέν** does not mean or imply antithesis. The original use was simply emphatic confirmation of single words, usually the weightiest word in the sentence. This use was gradually left more and more to **μήν** and other particles, but it is not anacoluthic, as Winer[4] holds, for **μέν** to occur without the presence of δέ or ἀλλά. The older language is naturally richer[5] in this original idiom with **μήν**, but it survives in the N. T. and is not to be regarded as unclassical or uncouth. For an example in the papyri see B. U. 423 (ii/A.D.), **πρὸ μέν πάντων**. The old idiom survived best in the vernacular and in poetry, while the literary prose was more careful to use the antithetical or resumptive **μέν**. This **μέν**, *solitarium*, as the books call it, may have a concessive or restrictive force.[6] Cf. **εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος** (2 Cor. 11:4), where there is no thought of δέ or ἀλλά. It is seen also rather often in the Acts. Cf. 1:18 **οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτήσατο χωρίον**, (3:13) **ὃν ὑμεῖς μὲν παρεδώκατε** (cf. **ὑμεῖς** δέ in next verse which is copulative, not adversative), (3:21) **ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι**, (3:22) **Μωυσῆς ἄνθρωπος μέν** (17:12) **πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπίστευσαν**, (21:39) **ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος μέν εἰμι**, (23:18) **ὁ μὲν οὖν παραλαβών** (cf. also 23:31), (27:21) **ἔδει μέν**, (28:22) **περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἱρέσεως ταύτης**, and the instances of **οἱ μὲν οὖν** Acts 1:6; 2:41; 5:41; 8:25, where no contrast is intended. See **εἰ μέν οὖν** in Heb. 7:11; **ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία** in Ro. 10:1; **ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμὶ ἐγώ** in 11:13. Cf. 2 Cor. 12:12; 1 Th. 2:18, **ἐγὼ μέν.** Cf. also the single instance of **μενοῦν** as one word (Lu. 11:28) which is obviously without contrast. The same thing is true of **μενοῦνγε** (Ro. 9:20; 10:18; Ph. 3:8) however it is printed. The main word is sharpened to a fine point and there is a hint of contrast in Ph. 3:8. Indeed, most

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 251.
[2] K.-G., II, p. 135.
[3] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 409.
[4] W.-Th., p. 575.
[5] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 409.
[6] Hartung, Partikellehre, II, p. 404.

of the instances of μέν οὖν in the N. T. are resumptive, not correlative or antithetical.[1] There remain the instances where μέν implies contrast. It is just a step in advance of the original idiom. Cf. Mt. 8:21, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν, where there is nothing to correspond to πρῶτον. The ἔπειτα is involved in what precedes. So with πρῶτον and τε—καί in Ro. 1:16 and πρῶτον — καί in 2 Cor. 8:5. The καί does not answer to the πρῶτον.[2] Just so we have τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον in Ac. 1:1 without a δεύτερον δέ though the clear implication is that the Acts is the second book. In 1 Cor. 11:18, πρῶτον μὲν γάρ, the contrast is implied[3] in verses 20 ff., but in Ro. 1:8, πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ, there is no hint of other grounds of thanksgiving. This instance may be a change of thought on Paul's part (anacoluthon), or it may be the original use of μέν, meaning 'first of all in truth.' Cf. πρῶτον μέν in Ro. 3:2. In Ro. 7:12, ὁ μὲν νόμος, there is no contrast stated, but in verse 14 it is given by δέ, yet without μέν. In Col. 2:23, ἅτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας, the antithesis is really stated in οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ, κτλ. without an adversative particle. In 1 Cor. 5:3 the μέν stands alone, while ἀπών and παρών are contrasted by δέ. In Heb. 12:9 there is contrast between the μέν clause and the next, which has no particle (only πολὺ μᾶλλον). In Ac. 26:4, 6, μέν is followed by καὶ νῦν by way of contrast and by τὰ νῦν in 17:30. Cf. μέν –καὶ in 1 Th. 2:18, μέν — τέ in Ac. 27:21, where there is practically no contrast. But see ὃ μέν—καὶ ἕτερον in Lu. 8: 5 ff., ὃ μέν—καὶ ἄλλο in Mk. 4:4 ff. We have μέν—ἔπειτα in Jo. 11:6; Jas. 3:17; 1 Cor. 12:28. These are all efforts to express antithesis. We see this also in μέν—πλὴν in Lu. 22:22 and in μέν—ἀλλά in Ac. 4:16; Ro. 14:20; 1 Cor. 14:17. In Mk. 9: 12 f. ἀλλά, is independent of the μέν. But it is the μέν—δέ construction that is the most frequent in the N. T. as in the Attic Greek. There are two and a half pages of examples of μέν in its various uses in the N. T. given in Moulton and Geden's Concordance, but even so the particle has made a distinct retreat since the Attic period.[4] It is wholly absent from 2 Peter, 1, 2 and 3 John, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, Titus (critical text) and Revelation. It occurs thrice in Jude, only once in Eph. (4:11), Col. (2:23), 1 Th. (2:18), Jas. (3:17). It is most frequent in Matthew, Acts,

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 267. Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 410) gives a very large list of illustrations of the original use of μεν, from anc. Gk.

[2] Cf. W.-Th., p. 576.

[3] But Blass (Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 267) takes it to be 'from the very outset' and so the original use of 1.47).

[4] Ib., p. 266,

Romans, 1 Corinthians and Hebrews. Paley[1] thinks that **μέν** and δέ may contain the roots of one (**μία**) and two (**δύο**). But certainly the correlative antithesis is not necessary to either of them, though with δέ there is the notion of addition. Cf. in this connection **μέν — καί** (Mk. 4:4; Lu. 8:5) and **τότε μέν** (Jo. 11:6). There are varying degrees of contrast where **μέν** and δέ occur together. There may be no emphasis on the **μέν** and very little on the which is not essentially adversative. The **μέν** may preserve almost its original idiom while δέ has slight contrast. So Lu. 11:48, **ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτοὺς ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰλκοδομεῖτε.** The whole sentence is quoted to show that it is agreement (correspondence), not opposition, that is here accented. In verse 47 we have 8, but not **μέν**, which is hardly felt in 48. See also Ac. 13:36 f.; Ph. 3:1; Heb. 7:8. In particular we note this slight contrast when a whole is distributed into its parts as in Mt. 25:14 ff.; 1 Cor. 9:25. Cf. also Ac. 18:14 f. But the distribution may amount to sharp division, as in 1 Cor. 1:12, **Ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, Ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ, Ἐγὼ δὲ Κηρᾶ, Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ**. It is thus the context that decides how pointed is the contrast. It is not the words **μέν** and δέ that inherently mean opposition. Indeed, the contrast may be indicated by δέ alone as in Mt. 5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44; 25:46; Ac. 12:9; Heb. 2:8; 4:13; 6:12.[2] We see a good illustration of clear antithesis in John's words about his baptism and that of Christ in Mt. 3:11, **ἐγὼ μέν—ὁ δέ.** See further 20:23; 22:8; 23:28; 25:33, **καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ δὲ ἐρίφια ἐξ εὐωνύμων**. The examples are numerous. See **οἱ μέν –οἱ** δέ (Ph. 1:16 ff.); **οὓς μέν—οὓς** δέ (Jude 22); **τινὲς μέν—τινὲς** δέ (Ph. 1:15); **εἷς μέν—εἷς** δέ (Heb. 9:6 f.); **οἱ μέν—ἄλλοι** δέ (Mt. 16:14); **ἄλλη μέν--ἄλλη** δέ (1 Cor. 15:39); **τοῦτο μέν—τοῦτο** δέ (Heb. 10:33); **πρῶτον μέν ---ἔπειτα** δέ (Heb. 7:2); **εἰ μὲν οὖν—εἰ** δέ (Ac. 19:38 f.); **εἰ μέν—νῦν** δέ **(**Heb. 11:15 f.), etc. These examples fairly exhibit the N. T. usage of **μέν**. It is often a matter of one's mood how much emphasis to put on **μέν** and δέ**,** as in Mt. 9:37 and Mk. 14:38. In **μέντοι** there is always strong contrast. As examples of **μέν** –ἀλλά in sharp contrast see Ro. 14:20; 1 Cor. 14:17. So also **μέν—πλήν** (Lu. 22:22).

(e) **Πέρ**. It is probably a shortened form of **περί** (cf. perfect) or **πέρι** more exactly.[3] It is both postpositive and enclitic and is usually in the N. T. printed as a part of the word with which it

[1] The Gk. Particles, p. 34.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 266.
[3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 545.

occurs. But in Homer this is not true, while πέρ follows καί only once.[1] There is no doubt about the etymology of this particle.[2] Some[3] even connect it directly with πέραν or πέρα. Cf. περαιτέρω (critical text in Ac. 19:39). But this idea does not conflict with the other, for πέρι, is the locative of πέρα. It is an Indo-Germanic root and the original notion of πέρι occurs in περι-πίμπλημι, περι-πλεθής, *nu-per, per-manere, per-tinax, sem-per*, etc. It means then to do a thing to the limit (beyond), thoroughly. There is a note of urgency in πέρ. It is *intensive* as γέ but probably tends to be more extensive also.[4] Sometimes the emphasis in πέρ is in spite of opposition[5] as in καίπερ which occurs six times in the N. T. (Ph. 3:4; Heb. 5:8; 7:5; 12:17; 2 Pet. 1:12), and always with participles, as καίπερ ὢν υἱός (Heb. 5:8). The Textus Receptus has ὅνπερ in Mk. 15:6, but W. H. read only ὅν, but διόπερ appears twice as an inferential conjunction (1 Cor. 8:13; 10:14). See ἅσπερ, 0. P. 1125, 6 (iii/A.D.). The other examples are all with conjunctions, as ἐάνπερ (Heb. 3:14; 6:3); εἴπερ (a half-dozen times, all in Paul, as Ro. 8:9; 1 Cor. 15:15); ἐπείπερ (some MSS. in Ro. 3:30, but the best MSS., as W. H. give, have εἴπερ); ἐπειδήπερ (only Lu. 1:1); ἤπερ (only the critical text in Jo. 12:43); καθάπερ (some 17 times, all in Paul save Heb. 4:2), καθώσπερ (Heb. 5:4 and *a varia lectio* in 2 Cor. 3:18), ὥσπερ (some 36 times, chiefly in Matthew, Luke and Paul, as Mt. 6:2), ὡσπερεί (once only, 1 Cor. 15:8).

(f) **Τοί** does not occur alone in the N. T., but only in composition. It is enclitic as in **ἤτοι, καίτοι, μέντοι**, but it comes first in τοιγαροῦν and τοίνυν. The etymology is not certain. Brugmann[6] takes it to be a fixed form of the ethical dative σοί (τοί). Others[7] take it as the locative of the demonstrative τό. Kuhner-Gerth[8] consider it the locative of the indefinite τὶ. There seems no way of telling for certain. But it seems to have the notion of restriction and in Homer[9] is often combined with adversative particles. In the N. T. we find ἤτοι, once (Ro. 6:16), καίτοι twice (Ac. 14: 17; Heb. 4:3), καίτοιγε once (Jo. 4:2), μέντοι eight times, five in John's Gospel as Jo. 4:27 and once in Paul (2 Tim. 2:19), τοιγαροῦν twice (1 Th. 4:8; Heb. 12:1), τοίνυν three times (Lu. 20:25; 1 Cor. 9:26; Heb. 13:13). Ὅμως is an adversative par-

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 257.
[2] Hartung, Partikellehre, I, p. 327.
[3] Baumlein, Partikeln, p. 198.
[4] K.-G., II, p. 168.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 257.
[6] Griech. Gr., pp. 402, 525.
[7] Cf. Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 252
[8] II, p. 149.
[9] Hom. Gr., p. 252.

tide that occurs three times in the N. T. (Jo. 12:42, here with **μέντοι**; 1 Cor. 14:7; Gal. 3:15), twice with a participle.

III. Negative Particles (στερητικαὶ παραθῆκαι). The use of the negative particles has been discussed already in various parts of the grammar in an incidental way in connection with the modes, verbal nouns and dependent clauses. But it is necessary at this point to treat the subject as a whole. It is not logical negative that one, has here to deal with. Many words are negative in idea which are positive in form. Thus "empty" is negative, "cold" is negative, "death" is negative. Aristotle uses στερητικός for this negative conception. It is in reality an ablative idea as στερέω implies. But the grammarian is concerned simply with those words that are used to make positive words (or clauses) negative. This is the grammatical negative. There are, indeed, in Greek, as in English, negative post-fixes.[1] But there is a common negative Greek prefix ἀ(ν) called alpha privative, Sanskrit *a*(*n*), Latin *in*, Gothic *un*, English *un*. In Sanskrit this prefix does not occur with verbs and is rare with substantives. It is there found chiefly with adjectives and participles.[2] In Greek it occurs with verbs, but chiefly denominative verbs like ἀτιμάζω.[3] The use of ἀ– (ἀν– before vowels) is in the Greek still more common with adjectives and verbals. See the chapter on Formation of Words for details. Cf. **ἀδόκιμος, ἀδικία, ἀπειθής, ἀσύνετος, ἀσύνθετος, ἄστοργος, ἀνελεήμων** (Ro. 1:28-30).

1. THE OBJECTIVE **Οὐ** AND ITS COMPOUNDS.

(a) Origin. This is unknown. Hubschmann[4] sees a connection with the Latin *haud* as do other scholars.[5] Fowler[6] takes it as an original intensive particle like *pas* in the French *ne pas* and **–χί** (Indo-Ger. *–ghi*) in **οὐ-χί.** The Zend *ava* is also noted and the Latin *au* (*au-fero*).[7] But there is no doubt that a in the Greek took the place of the Sanskrit *na*, Latin *ne-* (*ne-que, ne-scio;* the relation of *ne ne-quidem, ne-quam* to this *ne* is not known), Gothic *ni*. The use of the Greek ou corresponds to the Sanskrit *na*.

[1] Anon., Notes on Negative Postfixes in Gk. end Lat., 1884, p. 6.

[2] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 447.

[3] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 529.

[4] Cf. Das indoger. Vol:al-System, p. 191.

[5] Cf. Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., XVIII, pp. 4, 123 f.; Horton-Smith, ib., pp. 43 ff.; Brug., Griech. Or., p. 52S.

[6] The Negatives of the Indo-Europ. Lang., 1896. Cf. Delbruck, Grundr., IV, p. 519.

[7] But Draegcr (Hist. Synt., p. 133) says that this connection with the Lat. *haud* cannot be shown.

(b) **History**. As far back as Greek goes we find **οὐ**, but a did not hold its own with **μή** in the progress of the language. Within the past century **οὐ** has become obsolete in modern Greek outside of a few proverbs save in the Laconian and the Pontic dialects.[1] The Pontic dialect uses **κί** from Old Ionic **οὐκί**. But modern Greek has **οὐδέ** and **οὔτε** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 200). In the Boeotian dialect, it may be noted, **οὐ** never did gain a place. We have seen **οὐδέν** used as an adverb, an idiom that goes back to Homer.[2] Jannaris[3] explains that the vernacular came to use **οὐδέν** and **μηδέν**, for emphasis and then on a par with **οὐ** and **μή.** Then **οὐδέν** dropped **οὐ** and **μηδέν** lost **δέν**, leaving **δέν** and **μή** for the modern Greek. At any rate this is the outcome. **Δέν** is the negative of the ind. in modern Greek except after **νά**, and final clauses when we find **νὰ μή** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 200). And **δέν** is the regular negative in the protasis of conditional sentences both with ind. and subj.[4] The distinction between **οὐ** and **μή** did become more or less blurred in the course of time, but in the N. T., as in the **κοινή** generally, the old Greek idiom is very well preserved in the main. Buttmann[5] even thinks that the N. T. idiom here conforms more exactly to the old literary style than in any other point. **Δέν** may represent **μηδέν** (Rendel Harris, Exp., Feb., 1914, p. 163).

(c) **Meaning**. **Οὐ** denies the reality of an alleged fact. It is the clear-cut, point-blank negative, objective, final.[6] Jannaris[7] compares **οὐ** to **ὅτι** and **μή** to **ἵνα**, while Blass[8] compares **οὐ** to the indicative mode and **μή** to the other modes. But these analogies are not wholly true. Sometimes, indeed, **οὐ** coalesces with the word as in **οὔ φημι** = not merely 'I do not say,' but 'I deny.' So **οὐκ ἐάω** (Ac. 16:7) = 'I forbid.' Cf. **οὐ θέλω** (Mk. 9:30); **οὐκ ἔχω** (Mt. 13:12); **οὐκ ἀγνοέω** (2 Cor. 2:11). See also **τὸν οὐ λαόν** in Ro. 9:25 (LXX) where **οὐ** has the effect of an adjective or a prefix. Delbruck[9] thinks that this use of **οὐ** with verbs like the Latin *ne-scio* was the original one in Greek. In the LXX **οὐ** translates **לֹא**.

(d) **Uses**. Here it will be sufficient to make a brief summary, since the separate uses (pp. 917 f., 929 f., etc.) are discussed in detail in

[1] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 182; Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 425.
[2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 259. [3] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 426.
[4] Thumb, Handb., p. 194 f.; Jebb, in V. and D., p. 339.
[5] Gr. of the N. T. Gk., Thayer's Transl., p. 344.
[6] Cf. Thouvemin, Les Negations dans le N. T., Revue de Philol., 1894, p. 229. [7] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 427.
[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253. [9] Synt. Forsch., IV, p. 147.

the proper places. The point here is to show how all the varied uses of **οὐ** are in harmony with the true meaning of the particle.

(i) ***The Indicative.*** We meet **οὐ** with the indicative in both independent and dependent clauses.

(a) *Independent Sentences.* Here the negative **οὐ** is universal with the indicative in declarative sentences. The force of **οὐ** (**οὐκ** before vowels, **οὐχ** before aspirate) is sometimes very powerful, like the heavy thud of a blow. Cf. **οὐκ ἐδώκατε, οὐκ ἐποτίσατε, οὐ συνηγάγετε, οὐ περιεβάλετε, οὐκ ἐπεσκέψασθε** (Mt. 25:42 f.). The force of all these negatives is gathered up in the one **οὐ** in verse 44. In verse 45 **οὐ** and **οὐδέ** are balanced over against each other. See **οὐκ ἔπεσεν**, in Mt. 7:25. Cf. **οὐ παρέλαβον** in Jo. 1:11. In Mt. 21:29 see the contrast between **ἐγώ, κύριε** and **οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν**. Note the progressive bluntness of the Baptist's denials till **οὔ** comes out flat at the last (Jo. 1:21 f.). In the N. T. **οὐ** alone occurs with the future indicative used as a prohibition, though the classic idiom sometimes had **μή**. Cf. **οὐ φονεύσεις** (Mt. 5:21); **οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί** (6:5), etc. Still, Blass[1] quotes **μηδένα μισήσετε** in Clem., *Hom.*, III, 69. The volitive subjective nature of this construction well suits **μή**, but **οὐ** is more emphatic and suits the indicative. In Mt. 16:22, **οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο**, we have **οὐ μὴ**) in the prohibitive sense. When **οὐ** occurs alone = 'no,' as at the end of a clause, it is written **οὔ** as in **οὔ, μή ποτε** (Mt. 13:29); **τὸ Οὔ οὔ** (2 Cor. 1:17).

But in interrogative (independent) sentences **οὐ** always expects the answer 'yes.' The Greek here draws a distinction between **οὐ** and **μή** that is rather difficult to reproduce in English. The use of a negative in the question seems naturally to expect the answer 'yes,' since the negative is challenged by the question. This applies to **οὐ**. We may leave **μή** till we come to it. **Οὐ** in questions corresponds to the Latin *nonne*. Cf. Mt. 7:22, **οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν κτλ.**, where **οὐ** is the negative of the whole long question, and is not repeated with the other verbs. See further Mt. 13:55; Lu. 17:17; 1 Cor. 14:23. In 1 Cor. 9:1 we have **οὐ** four times (once **οὐχί**). The form **οὐχί** is a bit sharper in tone. Cf. Mt. 13:27; Lu. 12:6. In Lu. 6:39 we have **μή** with one question, **μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν**; and **οὐχί** with the other (side by side) **οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπερσοῦνται**; There is a tone of impatient indignation in the use of **οὐ** in Ac. 13:10, **οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῦ κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας**; In Ac. 21:38, **οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος**; the addition of **ἄρα** means 'as I supposed,

[1] Gr. N. T. Gr., p. 254.

but as I now see denied.[1] In Mk. 14:60 note the measured use of **οὐ** and **οὐδέν** in both question, **οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν**; and the description of Christ's silence, **καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν**. In Lu. 18:7, **οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ--καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς**; we come near having **οὐ μή** in a question with the present indicative as well as with the aorist subjunctive. In a question like **μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν**; (1 Cor. 9:4) **οὐ** is the negative of the verb, while **μή** is the negative of the sentence. Cf. Ro. 10:18, 19. In 1 Cor. 9:8 we have **μή** in one part of the question and **οὐ** in the other, **μὴ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ, ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει**; In Mt. 22:17 (Lu. 20:22; Mk. 12:14) we have **ἢ οὔ;** as the alternative question, and Mark adds **ἢ μή**. Babbitt[2] holds that "**οὐ** is used in questions of fact, while in other questions (e.g. questions of possibility) **μή** is used." I doubt the correctness of this interpretation.

In declarative sentences the position of **οὐ** is to be noted when for emphasis or contrast it comes first. Cf. **οὐ** and **ἀλλά** in Ro. 9:8. So **οὐ γάρ—ἀλλ᾽ ὅ** in 7:15. In 7:18 f. note **οὔ· οὐ** side by side. Cf. also position of **οὐ** in Ac. 1:5; 2:15; Ro. 11:18 (**οὐ σύ--ἀλλά**). So **ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐγώ** in 1 Cor. 6:12.

(β) *Subordinate Clauses*. In principle the use of **οὐ** is the same as in independent sentences. But there are some special adaptations which have already been discussed and need only brief mention here.

In *relative* clauses with the indicative **οὐ** is almost the only negative used in the N. T., the examples of **μή** being very few as will be seen directly. This is true both with definite relative clauses where it is obviously natural, as in 2 Cor. 8:10, **οἵτινες οὐ μόνον—προενήρξασθε** (cf. Ro. 10:14; Jas. 4:14), and in indefinite relative clauses where **μή** is possible, but by no means necessary, as in Mt. 10:38, **ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει** (cf. Lu. 9:50; 14:33, etc.). The use of **οὐ** in the relative clause which is preceded by a negative is not an encroachment[3] on **μή**. Cf. **οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται** (Mt. 24:2). It is a common enough idiom in the old Greek, as we see it in 10:26 (Lu. 12:2), **οὐδέν ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται**. Cf. Lu. 8:17, where the second relative has **οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ** and Ro. 15:18 for the negative **οὐ** in principal and relative clause. In Mk. 4:25 note **ὃς ἔχει** and **ὃς οὐκ ἔχει**. Cf. **ὃ θέλω** and **ὃ οὐ θέλω** (Ro. 7:15, 19). Practically the same[4] construction is oh with the relative in a question, as **τίς**

[1] W.-Th., p. 511.
[2] Harv. Stu. in Class. Philol., 1901, The Use of Mid in Questions, p. 307.
[3] W.-Th., p. 451. [4] Thouvemin, Les Negations, etc., p. 233 f.

ἐστιν ὃς οὐ in Ac. 19:35; cf. Heb. 12:7. For further illustration of **οὐ** with relative clauses see Mt. 12:2= Mk. 2:24; Jo. 6:64; Lu. 14:27; Jo. 4:22; Ro. 15:21; Gal. 3:10; Rev. 9:4.

In *temporal* clauses with the indicative **οὐ** comes as a matter of course.[1] This is true of a definite note of time as in Ac. 22: 11, **ὡς οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον**, and of an indefinite period as in Jo. 4:21, **ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε** (cf. also 9:4, **νὺξ ὅτε οὐδείς).**

In *comparative* clauses with the indicative the negative comes outside in the principal sentence, since comparison is usually made with a positive note. So **οὐ καθάπερ** (2 Cor. 3:13); **οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίσαμεν** (8:5); **οὐκ εἰμὶ ὥσπερ** (Lu. 18:11); **οὐχ ὡς** (Ro. 5:15 f.). We do have **ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων**, in 1 Cor. 9:26 (participle) as in 2 Cor. 10:14 we have **οὐ γάρ, ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι,** where the two negatives are in good contrast.

In local clauses likewise the use of **οὐ** is obvious, as in **ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν** (Mt. 13:5); **ὅπου οὐ θέλεις** (Jo. 21:18. Here the **οὐ** is very pointed); **οὗ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος** (Ro. 4:15).

In *causal* sentences **οὐ** is not quite universal, though the usual negative. Cf. Mt. 25:45 **ἐφ᾽ ὅσον οὐκ ἐποιήσατε ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων**, (2:18) **ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν** (Heb. 6:13) **ἐπεὶ κατ᾽ οὐδενὸς εἶχεν**, (1 Cor. 14:16) **ἐπειδὴ οὐκ οἶδεν**. See further Lu. 1:34; Jo. 8:20, 37; Ro. 11:6. In Heb. 9:17 **ἐπεὶ μὴ τότε** [**μή ποτε** marg. of W. H.] **ἰσχύει** may be a question as Theophylact takes it, but W. H. do not print it so in the text. But it is not a departure from ancient Greek idiom to have **μή** with the ind. in causal sentences as will be shown. Cf. Jo. 3:18 with 1 Jo. 5:10.

In final clauses with the ind. **οὐ** does not occur. The reason for **μή** in clauses of purpose is obvious even though the ind. mode be used (cf. Rev. 9:4, 20). It is only with clauses *of apprehension* that **οὐ** is found with the verb when **μή** occurs as the conjunction. Cf. 2 Cor. 12:20, **φοβοῦμαι μή πως οὐχ εὕρω**. But this is the subj., not the ind. Cf. here **οὐχ οἵους θέλω** and **οἷον οὐ θέλετε**. Cf. also Mt. 25:9. In Col. 2:8 we have **βλέπετε μή τις ἔσται--καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν**. The **καὶ οὐ** is in contrast with **κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου**, though as a second negative it would properly be **οὐ** anyhow. But in Rev. 9:4 we have **ἵνα μὴ ἀδικήσουσιν—οὐδέ --οὐδέ**. This[2] does seem unusual and is almost an example of **ἵνα οὐ**. No example of a clause of result with a negative occurs in the indicative, but it would, of course, have **οὐ**.

The use of **οὐ** in conditional sentences has already received

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.

[2] Burton, N. T. M. and T., p. 181.

adequate treatment. See Conditional Sentences, ch. on Mode. The details need not be gone over again here. There is no doubt of the fact that **εἰ οὐ** made encroachments on **εἰ μή** in the later Greek.[1] Blass[2] puts it "in direct contradistinction to the classical language." Thouvemin[3] likewise treats this use of **εἰ οὐ** as "contrairement a l'usage classique — ou on le trouve exceptionnellement." It is only the frequency, the normality of **εἰ οὐ** in the N. T. that is remarkable. This is in full accord with the **κοινή** development, since[4] in the modern Greek **δέν** "is regularly used in the protasis of a conditional sentence, alike with the indicative and with the subjunctive mood." So **ἂ δὲν πήγαινα**, 'if I had not gone' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 195). See Mt. 26:42; Lu. 12:26; Jo. 1:25; 3:12; 5:47; 10:37; 2 Pet. 2:4; Ro. 8:9; 11:21; 1 Cor. 16:22; 2 Cor. 12:11; Heb. 12:25, etc. They are all conditions of the first class (determined as fulfilled) save one of the second class (determined as unfulfilled) in Mt. 26:24. In 26:42 **εἰ οὐ** and **ἐὰν μή** stand out sharply. It is so nearly the rule with conditions of the first class in the N. T. that it is hardly necessary to follow out the analysis of Winer[5] to bring the examples into accord with ancient usage. It is gratuitous to take **εἰ οὐδέ** as causal in Lu. 12:26, or to make **εἰ οὐκ εἰμί** in 1 Cor. 9:2 a denial of a positive idea. There are cases of emphatic denial, as **εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ** (1 Cor. 16:22). Cf. also 2 Jo. 10, **εἴ τις ἔρχεται καὶ οὐ φέρει**. Cf. also **εἰ οὐ ποιῶ** and **εἰ ποιῶ** in Jo. 10:37 f., where the antithesis is quite marked. See also the decisive negation in Jo. 1:25. But, when all is said, **εἰ οὐ** has made distinct inroads on **εἰ μή** in the later Greek.

As to the negative in *indirect discourse* with the indicative, it only remains to say that the use of **οὐ** is universal. Cf. Mt. 16: 12, **συνῆκαν ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν**. In 16:11 note **πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἄρτων εἶπον ὑμῖν**; where each negative has its own force. Cf. also 1 Cor. 6:9.

(ii) ***The Subjunctive***. In Homer **οὐ** was the negative with the futuristic subjunctive[6] as in **οὐ δὲ ἴδωμαι**, *Iliad*, I, 262. This futuristic use of the subj., as we have seen (Modes), largely passed over to the future indicative,[7] so that a disappears from the subjunctilre almost entirely both in principal and subordinate clauses.

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 429.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 254.
[3] Les Negations, etc., p. 233.
[4] Jebb, V. and D.'s Handb., p. 339.
[5] W.-Th., pp. 477 ff.
[6] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 198.
[7] Thompson, Synt. of Attic Gk., p. 498. Cf. W. G. Hale, The Anticipatory Subjunctive in Gk. and Lat., Cornell Stu., 1895.

One may compare the final disappearance of **οὐ** before **μή** with participles. In Jer. 6:8 B reads **ἥτις οὐ κατοικισθῇ** where **א**AQ* have **κατοικισθήσεται**. It is to be remembered also, as already noted, that in the modern Greek **δέν** occurs in the protasis with subjunctive as well as with the indicative, as a **ἂ δὲν πιστεύῃς** (Thumb, *Handbook*, p. 195). This is partly due, no doubt, to the obscuration of the **οὐ** in **δέν**, but at bottom it is the futuristic use of the subj. We have already noted the use of **μὴ οὐχ** in 2 Cor. 12:20 with **εὕρω** after **φοβοῦμαι**, where the **οὐ** is kept with the subj. (classic idiom) to distinguish it from the conjunctional **μή**. It is also a case of the futuristic subj., not volitive as in final clauses with **ἵνα** or **ὅπως**. In Mt. 25:9 the margin of W. H. has **μή ποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ** without a verb of fearing, though the notion is there. The text has **μή ποτε οὐ μή.** Jannaris[1] boldly cuts the Gordian knot by denying that **μή** in **οὐ μή** is a true negative. He makes it merely a shortening of **μήν**. If so, 'all the uses of **οὐ μή** with the subj. would be examples of **οὐ** with the subj. Some of these, however, are volitive or deliberative. This view of Jannaris is not yet accepted among scholars. It is too simple a solution, though Jannaris argues that **οὐ μήν** does occur as in Soph. El. 817, Eur. Hec. 401, and he notes that the negation is continued by **οὐ δέ,** not by **μὴ δέ.** *Per contra* it is to be observed that the modern Greek writes **μήν** as well as **μή,** as **νὰ μὴν εἶχε παράδες**, 'because he had no money' (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 200). But, whatever the explanation, we do have **οὐ μή** with the aorist subj. in the N. T. We have had to discuss this point already (Tense and Mode), and shall meet it again under Double Negatives. But in Jo. 18:11, **οὐ μὴ πίω**; the answer is in accord with **οὐ**.

(iii) ***The Optative.*** In the N. T. there are no instances of the use of **οὐ** with the optative. It is only in wishes (volitive) that the optative has a negative in the N. T. and that is naturally **μή**.[2] But this is just an accident due to the rapid disappearance of the optative. There is no reason why a should not be found with the potential optative (futuristic) or the deliberative which was always rare.

(iv) ***The Imperative***. The most striking instance is 1 Pet. 3:3, **ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ --κόσμος, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ κρυπτός, κτλ.** It is the sharp contrast with **ἀλλ᾽** that explains the use of **οὐχ**. Cf. also **οὐ μόνον** in 1 Pet. 2:18, where the participle stands in an imperative atmosphere.

[1] Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 433.
[2] Robertson, Short Gr. of the Gk. N. T., p. 200.

Cf. also **οὐ** with the inf. in the imperatival sense in 1 Cor. 5:10. Elsewhere with the imperative we have **μὴ μόνον** (Jo. 13:9; Ph. 2:12; Jas. 1:22). **Οὐ** is used in an imperatival connection with the fut. ind. (Mt. 5:21) and in questions of like nature (Ac. 13:10).

(v) ***The Infinitive***. It is common to say that in the N. T.[1] **οὐ** does not occur with the infinitive, not even in indirect assertion. In Homer and in the classic Attic we do find **οὐ** with the inf. in indirect assertion. This is usually explained on the ground that the **οὐ** belonged to the original indicative in the direct and is simply preserved in the indirect. Monro (*Hom. Gr*., p. 262) observes that in the old Sanskrit only finite verbs have the negative particles. This question received full discussion under Mode and Verbal Nouns. Only a brief word is allowed here. The oldest use of the negative in indirect discourse was in the form **οὔ φησιν δώσων** where **οὐ** formally goes with **φησιν**, but logically with **δώσειν**. From this use Monro conceives there came a with the inf. itself. But the situation in the N. T. is not quite so simple as Blass[2] makes it. In Jo. 21:25, **οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι χωρήσειν**, the negative does go with **οἶμαι**. But this is hardly true in Mk. 7:24, nor in Ac. 26:26. Besides **οὐ** occurs in a number of clauses dependent on the inf., as in Heb. 7:11; Ho. 8:12; Ac. 10:41; Ro. 7:6; 15:20; Heb. 13:9; 1 Cor. 1:17; Ac. 19:27. For the discussion of these passages see Infinitive, ch. XX, 5, (l). It is proper to say that in the N. T. we still have remnants of the old use of **οὐ** with the inf., though in general **μή** is the negative. In Ro. 15:20 **οὐχ ὅπου** after **εὐαγγελίζεσθαι** stands in sharp contrast with **ἀλλὰ καθώς**. In 2 Cor. 13:7 we have **μὴ ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς κακὸν μηδέν οὐχ ἵνα—ἀλλ' ἵνα** where the **οὐχ** is clearly an *addendum*. Burton[3] explains **εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθῆναι**, in Ac. 19:27, "as a fixed phrase," but even so it is in use. Besides, there is **μὴ λογομαχεῖν ἐπ' οὐδὲν χρήσιμον** in 2 Tim. 2:14. See also **καὶ οὐ** a after **ὥστε δουλεύειν** in Ro. 7:6. The use of **οὐδέν**, with the inf. after **οὐ** with the principal verb is common enough. Cf. Mk. 7:12; Lu. 20:40; Jo. 3:27; 5:30; Ac. 26:26, etc. Burton[4] notes that in the N. T. **οὐ μόνον** occurs always (cf. Jo. 11:52; Ac. 21:13; 26:29; 27:10; Ho. 4:12, 16; 13:5; 2 Cor. 8:10; Ph. 1:29; 1 Th. 2:8) except once **μὴ μόνον** in Gal. 4:18. The use of **οὐ μόνον** occurs both in limiting clauses and in the sentence viewed as a whole.

(vi) ***The Participle***. There is little to add to what was given on

[1] Cf. Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 430.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.
[3] N. T. M. and T., p. 184.
[4] Ib., p. 183 f.

the subject of **οὐ** and **μή** with the participle under the Verbal Aspects of the Participle (see Verbal Nouns). Galloway[1] thinks that it was with the participle that **οὐ** was first used (as opposed to the Sanskrit negative prefix) before the infinitive had **οὐ**. At any rate **οὐ** is well established in Homer. We may simply accent the fact that the encroachment of **μή** on **οὐ** with the participle gives all the greater emphasis to the examples of **οὐ** which remain. Cf. **ὁ οὐκ ὢν ποιμήν** (Jo. 10:12); **ὡς οὐκ δέρων** (1 Cor. 9:26). There is no trouble in seeing the force of **οὐ** wherever we find it with the participle in the N. T.

(vii) ***With Nouns.*** Here we see a further advance of the negative particles over the Sanskrit idiom which confined them to the finite verb. The Greek usually employs the negative prefix with nouns, but in a few instances in the N. T. we have **οὐ.** So **τὸν οὐ λαόν** in Ro. 9:25 (LXX), **οὐ λαός** in 1 Pet. 2:10 (LXX), **οὐκ ἔθνει** in Ro. 10:19 (**לֹא עָם**; Deut. 32:21). But this is by no means a Hebraism, since it is common in the best Greek writers. Cf. **ἡ οὐ διάλυσις** in Thuc. 1, 137. 4 and **ἡ οὐκ ἐξουσία** in 5, 50. 3. Cf. **οὐκ ἀρχιερέως** in 2 Macc. 4:13. As Thayer well says, **οὐ** in this construction "annuls the idea of the noun." The use of **οὐ** to deny a single word is common, as in **οὐ θυσίαν** (Mt. 9:13). Cf. **οὐκ ἐμέ** in Mk. 9:37. In general for **οὐ** with exceptions see **οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ** (1 Cor. 1:17), **οὐ μέλανι** (2 Cor. 3:3). In 2 Tim. 2:14, **ἐπ᾽ οὐδὲν χρήσιμον**, it is possible that **χηρσιμον** is in the substantival sense. There is, of course, nothing unusual in the use of **οὐ** with adjectives like **οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοί** (1 Cor. 1:26). What is noteworthy is the litotes so common in the N. T. as in the older Greek. Cf. **μετ᾽ οὐ πολύ** (Ac. 27:14); **μετ᾽ οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας** (Lu. 15:13); **οὐκ ὀλίγα** (Ac. 17:4); **οὐκ ἀσήμου** (21:39). Cf. **οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου** (Jo. 3:34); **οὐ μετρίως** (Ac. 20:12). **Οὐ** πᾶς and πᾶς **οὐ** have received discussion under Adjectives, and so just a word will suffice. **Οὐ** πᾶσα σάρξ (1 Cor. 15:39) is 'not every kind of flesh.' Cf. **οὐ** παντὶ τῷ λαῷ (Ac. 10:41); **οὐ** πάντες (Mt. 19:11); **οὐ** πάντως (1 Cor. 5:10). But **οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη** πᾶσα σάρξ (Mt. 24:22) means 'no flesh,' like the Hebrew **בל־לֹא**. The construction in both senses is more common in John than in the Synoptic Gospels. It is perhaps worth while to note the use of **οὐδέν** or **οὐθέν** (1 Cor. 13:2) as an abstract neuter in the predicate. In general, attention should be called to the- distinction made by the Greeks between negativing a word and a sentence. This is one reason why with the imper., subj. and inf. we find **οὐ** with

[1] On the Use of **Μή** with the Participle in Class. Gk., 1897, p. 6.

single words or phrases, where **μή** is the normal negative of the clause.

(e) **Καὶ Οὐ**. In general when a positive clause is followed by a negative we have **καὶ οὐ** as in classic Greek. Cf. Ro. 7:6 (with inf. as in Heb. 7:11). See also Col. 2:8, 19. So Lu. 8:14, **συνπνίγονται καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν**.[1] Cf. Mt. 9:13. Once, indeed, in a peculiar case, we find **καί** connecting two negative clauses, Lu. 6:37, **καὶ μὴ κρίνετε καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε.**

(f) ***Redundant or Pleonastic*** **Οὐ**. There is one instance of **οὐ** in indirect discourse where it is pleonastic according to the classic idiom (see also the French *ne*). It is in 1 Jo. 2:22, **ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν**. Some MSS. have the pleonastic **οὐ** in Mk. 9:39.

(g) ***Repetition of*** **Οὐ**. When the second is a single negative, the full force of each is retained. It is seldom that we find two examples of **οὐ** in the same clause, as in 1 Cor. 12: 15 f., **οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος,** 'It is not therefore not of the body.' There are instances of **οὐ** followed by **μή** where both preserve the full force, Ac. 4:20, **οὐ δυνάμεθα—μὴ λαλεῖν**. Cf. also **οὐ—μή** in 1 Cor. 9:6. So also **ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ** (1 Jo. 3:10). Cf. 5:12. The examples are numerous enough when the second a is in a dependent clause. So **οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται** (Mt. 10:26); **πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι οὐ, κτλ.** (16:11) **οὐ τολμήσεω τι λαλεῖν ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστός** (Ro. 15:18); **οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι—οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν** (1 Cor. 6:9). In Mt. 24:2 **οὐ** follows **οὐ μή**. See also Lu. 8:17. The uses of **μὴ οὐ** and **οὐ μή** are treated later. But note **οὗ, μή ποτε—ἐκριζώσητε** (Mt. 13:29) where **οὐ** stands alone. The solemn repetition of **οὐ—οὐ** in 1 Cor. 6:10 is rhetorical.

(h) **The Intensifying Compound Negative.** We have seen how **οὐ** can be made stronger by **χί** (**οὐχί**, as in Lu. 1:60). Brugmann[2] considers this an intensive particle and different from the Homeric[3] **κί (οὐ-κί)** which is like **τι (κις, κι, τις, τι).** So also **οὐδέ** was originally just **οὐ δέ** ('and not,' 'but not') and is often so printed in Homer.[4] In the sense of 'not even' see Mt. 6: 29. The form **οὐδείς** is intensive also, originally 'not one indeed'[5] and was sometimes printed **οὐδὲ εἷς** (Ro. 3:10) for even stronger emphasis. But **οὐ --τις** also occurs (Jo. 10:28). Cf. also **οὐδέ τις** (Mt. 11:27); **οὐ δύνῃ ἔτι** (Lu. 16:2); **οὔτε--τις** (Ac. 28:21);

[1] Cf. W. H. S. Jones., Cl. Rev., Mar., 1910.
[2] Griech. Gr., p. 528.
[3] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 259,
[4] Ib.
[5] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 528.

οὐ—ποτὲ (2 Pet. 1:21). The adverbial form **οὐδέν**, occasionally occurs in Homer. The form **οὐθείς** (cf. Ac. 26:26), which flourished for a limited period in the **κοινή** has already had sufficient discussion. Various other compound negatives were built up on **οὐ**, as **οὐδαμῶς** (Mt. 2:6); **οὐδέπω** (Jo. 20:9); **οὐδέποτε** (Mt. 7:23); **οὐκέτι** (Mt. 19:6). **Οὐκοῦν** was used so much in questions that it lost its negative force (Jo. 18:37), unless one writes it **οὔκουν.** **Οὔτε** is, of course, only **οὐ** and **τέ**. These compound negatives merely strengthen the previous negative. This emphatic repetition of the compound negative was once good vernacular in both English and German, but it gave way in literary circles before the influence of the Latin.[1] It was always good Greek. This discussion does not apply to subordinate clauses (as in Jo. 8:20) where each negative has its own force. The use of **οὐδέ** and **οὔτε** belongs to the discussion of conjunctions (cf. **οὔτε — οὔτε--οὐδέ** in Ac. 24:12 f.), but the examples in the N. T. of the other compound negatives with **οὐ** are numerous. Farrar[2] gives some good illustrations of old English. "No sonne were he never so old of years might not marry," Ascham, *Scholemaster*. Modern English vernacular refuses to give up the piling-up of negatives. "Not nohow, said the landlord, thinking that where negatives are good, the more you heard of them the better" (*Felix Holt*, ii, 198). Again: "Whatever may be said of the genius of the English language, yet no one could have misunderstood the query of the London citizen, Has nobody seen nothing of never a hat not their own?" So likewise the Hebrew uses two negatives to strengthen each other (cf. 1 Ki. 10:21; Is. 5:9). A good example is Mk. 5:3, **οὐδὲ οὐκέτι οὐδείς**. So **οὐδεὶς οὔπω** (11:2). The commonest kind of example is like **οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν** (Jo. 15:5). Cf. 2 Cor. 11:8. Another instance of triple negative is Lu. 23:53, **οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὔπω**. The **οὐ** is sometimes amplified[3] by **οὔτε**— are as in Mt. 12:32, as well as by **οὐδέ--οὐδέ** as in Jo. 1:25. Plato shows four negatives, **οὐδενὶ οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς οὐδεμίαν κοινωνίαν** (*Phaedo* 78 (I). The combinations with **οὐ μή** may also be noticed, as **οὐδὲν οὐ μή** (Lu. 10:19); **οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ᾽ οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω** (Heb. 13:5); **οὐκέτι οὐ μή** (Rev. 18:14). There is no denying the power of this accumulation of negatives. Cf. the English hymn

"I'll never, no never, no never forsake."

(i) **The Disjunctive Negative.** We frequently have **οὐ** "where one thing is denied that another may be established."[4] Here

[1] W.-Th., p. 499.
[2] Gk. Synt., p. 1S9.
[3] Cf. W.-Th., p. 499.
[4] Thayer's Lex., p. 461.

there is sharp antithesis. The simplest form is **οὐ** — **δέ** as in Jas. 2:11, or **οὐ** — **ἀλλά** as in Mt. 15:11; Mk. 15:11; Lu. 8:52; Ac. 5:4; 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 3:3, etc. In Jo. 7:22 we have **οὐχ ὅτι**—**ἀλλά**, as also in Ph. 4:17. In Ph. 4:11 **οὐχ ὅτι** occurs alone without **ἀλλά**. In 2 Cor. 7:9 we have **οὐχ ὅτι**—**ἀλλ' ὅτι**. In 1 Jo. 2:21 we have **οὐκ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ὅτι**—**ἀλλ' ὅτι** where more naturally we might expect **ἔγραψα οὐχ ὅτι**—**ἀλλ' ὅτι**. Winer[1] makes rather overmuch of the possible rhetorical distinctions between the varying shades of emphasis in the different contexts where **οὐ** — **ἀλλά**, occur. Cf. further **οὐχ ἵνα**—**ἀλλά** (Jo. 6:38); **οὐχ ἵνα**—**ἀλλ' ἵνα** (Jo. 3:17). We usually have a **μόνον**—**ἀλλὰ καί** (Jo. 5:18; Ro. 1:32, etc.), but sometimes merely **οὐ μόνον**—**ἀλλά** (Ac. 19:26; 1 Jo. 5:6). Sometimes the negative is not expressed, but is to be supplied in thought as in Mt. 11:7-9. Then again we may have only the negative as in **οὐ βρώμασιν** (Heb. 13:9), leaving the contrast to be supplied in the thought. The contrast may even be expressed by **καὶ οὐ** as in Mt. 9:13, **ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν** (A, LXX). But we have already entered the sphere of the conjunctions as in the parallel **οὔτε** — **καί** in Jo. 4:11. So 3 Jo. 10.

2. THE SUBJECTIVE NEGATIVE **Μή** AND ITS COMPOUNDS.

(a) **The History of Μή**. The Ionic, Attic and Doric dialects have **μή**, the Eleatic has **μά**, like the Sanskrit *ma*. In the old Sanskrit *ma* was used only in independent sentences, while *ned* occurred in dependent clauses.[2] In the later Sanskrit *ma* crept into the dependent clauses also. It was originally a prohibitive particle with the old *injunctive* which was in the oldest Sanskrit always negative with *ma*.[3] In the later Sanskrit *ma* was extended to the other modes. In the Greek we see **μή** extended to wish and then denial.[4] Wharton[5] undertakes to show that **μή** is primarily an interrogative, not a prohibitive or negative particle, but that is more than doubtful. Already in Homer "**μή** had established itself in a large and complex variety of uses, to which we have to appeal when we seek to know the true nature of the modal constructions as we come to them."[6] The distinction between **οὐ** and **μή** goes back to Indo-Germanic stock and has

[1] W.-Th., pp. 495 ff.

[2] Thompson, Synt., p. 448; Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 528.

[3] Thompson, ib., p. 499. [4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 260.

[5] The Gk. Indirect Negative, 1892, p. 1. Cf. also Babbitt, The Use of **Μή** in Questions, Harv. Stu. (Goodwin Vol.).

[6] Moulton, Prol., p. 170.

survived into modern Greek. But from the very start **μή** made inroads on **οὐ**, so that finally **μή** occupies much of the field. In the modern Greek **μή** is used exclusively with participle, in prohibitions and with the subj. except in conditions, and occurs with **νά** (**νὰ μή**) and the incl. Gildersleeve[1] has shown in a masterly way how **μή** made continual encroachments on **οὐ**. In the N. T., outside of **εἰ οὐ,** advance of **μή** is quite distinct, as Gildersleeve shows is true even of Lucian. So as to the papyri and the inscriptions. The exact Attic refinements between **οὐ** and **μή** are not reproduced, though on the whole the root-distinction remains.[2]

(b) **Significance of Μή**. Max Miller[3] gives an old Sanskrit phrase, *ma kaphalaya*, 'not for unsteadiness,' which pretty well gives the root-idea of **μή**. It is an "unsteady" particle, a hesitating negative, an indirect or subjective denial, an effort to prevent (prohibit) what has not yet happened. It is the negative of will, wish, doubt. If **οὐ** denies the fact, **μή** denies the idea. made one advance on **οὐ**. It came to be used as a conjunction. We see this use of *ma* in the late Sanskrit.[4] But the origin of this conjunctional of **μή** is undoubtedly paratactic in clauses of both fear and piirpose.[5] It is obviously so in indirect questions[6] where **μή** suggests 'perhaps.' Campbell[7] argues that "the whole question of the Greek negatives is indeterminate." This is an extreme position, but there is no doubt a border-line between **οὐ** and **μή** which is very narrow at times. One's mood and tone have much to do with the choice of **οὐ** or **μή**. Cf. Jo. 4:29, **μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός**; where a would have challenged the opposition of the neighbours by taking sides on the question whether Jesus was the Messiah. The woman does not mean to imply flatly that Jesus is not the Messiah by using **μή τι**, but she raises the question and throws a cloud of uncertainty and curiosity over it with a woman's keen instinct. In a word, **μή** is just the negative to use when one does not wish to be too positive. **Μή** leaves the question open for further remark or entreaty. **Οὐ** closes the door abruptly.[8] The LXX uses **μή** for **אַל**.

[1] Encroachments of **Μή** on **Οὐ** in Later Gk., Am. Jour. of Philol., I, pp. 45

[2] Moulton, Prol., p. 170. Cf. also Birke, De Particularum **μή** et **οὐ** Usu Polybiano Dionysmco Diodoreo Straboniano, 1897, p. 14 f.

[3] Oxford inaugural Lecture, Note C.

[4] Thompson, Synt., p. 448.

[5] Moulton, Prol. p. 192 f.

[6] Ib.

[7] On Soph. Truch., 90.

[8] Cf. Postgate, Contrasts of **Οὐ** and **Μή**, Cambridge Philol. Jour., 1886.

(c) **Uses of Μή**. In general we may follow the outline of **οὐ**.

(i) ***The Indicative.*** Blass[1] expounds the two negatives by saying that "**οὐ** negatives the indicative, **μή** the other moods, including the infinitive and participle." But, unfortunately, the case is not so simple as that. "In reviewing Blass, Thumb makes the important addition that in modern Greek **δέν** belongs to the indicative and **μή(ν)** to the subjunctive."[2] But **δέν** occurs in the protasis with the subj. in modern Greek, as we have seen. Besides, as Moulton[3] adds, "**μή** has not been driven away from the indicative" in the N. T. It may be said at once that with the indicative is as old as historic Greek.[4] The Sanskrit suggests that originally **μή** was not used with the indicative. But already in Homer **μή** occurs with the indicative in prohibition, wish, oath, fear, question.[5] "The essence of these idioms is the combination of the imperative tone — which shows itself in the particle — with the mood proper to simple assertion."[6] But in the N. T. we no longer have **μή** with the fut. ind. in prohibition, except in case of **οὐ μή.**

In independent sentences we have with the indicative only in questions. "It's use in questions is very distinct from that of **οὐ** and is maintained in the N. T. Greek without real weakening."[7] In Jo. 21:5, **παιδία, μή τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε;** we have a typical example with the answer Blass[8] expresses needless objection to this "hesitant question," as Moulton rightly expounds it. Cf. Jo. 4:33; 7:26; and Ro. 11:1, **μὴ ἀπώσατο;** with the answer in verse 2, **οὐκ ἀπώσατο**. See Jo. 7:51, where Nicodemus adroitly uses **μή** in a question and the sharp retort of the other members of the Sanhedrin **μὴ καὶ σύ**; The difference between **οὐ** and **μή** in questions is well shown in Jo. 4:33, 35. In the use of **μή** the answer in mind is the one expected, not always the one actually received as is illustrated in the question of the apostles at the last passover. They all asked **μή τι ἐγώ εἰμι, ῥαββεί**; The very thought was abhorrent to them, 'It surely is not I.'[9] But Judas, who did not dare use **οὐ**, received the affirmative answer, **σὺ εἶπας** (Mt. 26:25). **Μήτι** comes to be used intensively much like **οὐχί** (both chiefly in questions). In the case of **μὴ οὐ**

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 253. [2] Moulton, Prol., p. 170. [3] Ib.
[4] Vierke, De mil Particulae cum Indicativo Conjunetae Usu Antiquiore, 1876.
[5] Monro, Hom. Gr., pp. 260 ff. [6] Ib., p. 261.
[7] Moulton, Prol., p. 170 f. Moulton gives an interesting note on the use of παιδία as "lads" in the mod. Gk.
[8] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 254. [9] Ib., p. 254.

in question (Ro. 10:13 f.; 1 Cor. 9:4 f.; 11:22) **μή** is the interrogative article while **οὐ** is the negative of the verb.

In dependent clauses **μή** occurs with the indicative with the second class conditions (**εἰ μή**) always except in Mt. 26:24 (Mk. 14:21). Cf. **εἰ μή** in Jo. 15:22, etc. There are also five instances of **εἰ μή** with the ind. in conditions of the first class.[1] So Mk. 6:5; 1 Cor. 15:22 Cor. 13:5; Gal. 1:7; 1 Tim. 6:3. Cf. **μή** in a few relative clauses, as **ἃ μὴ δεῖ** (Tit. 1:11); **ᾧ μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα** (2 Pet. 1:9); **ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ**, (1 Jo. 4:3, W. H. text). Cf. Ac. 15:29 D. There is a certain loofness about **μή** here that one can feel as in Plato who, "with is sensitiveness to subtle shades of meaning, had in **μή** an instrument singularly adapted for purposes of reserve, irony, politeness of suggestion."[2] This use of with the relative and indicative is clearly a remnant of the literary construction.[3] This literary use of **μή** with the relative was often employed to characterize or describe in a subjective way the relative. There is a solitary instance of **μή** in a causal sentence, **ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν** (Jo. 3 18), which may be contrasted with **ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν** (1 Jo. 5:10). For **ὅτι μὴ ἔχεις** see Epictetus, IV, 10. 34, and **ὅτι σοι οὐ**, IV, 10. 35. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 171) quotes **φασὶν ὅτι μὴ δεῖ**, Diog. of Oinoanda, Fragm. IV, 1. 9. There is, besides, **ἐπεῖ μὴ τότε ἰσχύει** in Heb. 9:17, according to the text of W. H., though they give in the margin **ἐπεὶ μή ποτε—διαθέμενος**; In that case (the marginal reading) **μή ποτε** would introduce a question. See further Causal Clauses. In clauses of design we have **ἵνα μή** with the ind., as in Rev. 9:4, **ἵνα μὴ ἀδικήσουσιν**. The margin of W. H. in 13:17 has **ἵνα μή τις δύναται**. Moulton[4] explains **μή** with the ind. after verbs of apprehension as not originally a conjunction, but **μή** in the sense of 'perhaps' (paratactic, not hypotactic). So Lu. 11:35, **σκόπει μὴ τὸ φῶς—σκότος ἐστίν.** Cf. also Col. 2:8; Heb. 3:12; Gal. 4:11; 1 Th. 3:5. The papyri give abundant parallels. Moulton (*Prol.*, p. 193) cites **ἀγωνιῶ μή ποτε ἀρρωστεῖ**, P. Par. 49 (ii/B.C.). The use of **μή** as a conjunction in clauses of design and fear with the indicative is parallel to the use of the negative particle **μή**, but does not fall here for discussion.

(ii) **The Subjunctive**. After all that has been said it is obvious that **μή** was destined to be the negative of the subj., first of the volitive and deliberative uses and finally of the futuristic also. The few remnants of **οὐ** with the subj. have already been discussed. For the rest the normal and universal negative of the

[1] Moulton, Prol., p. 171.
[2] Thomson, Synt., p. 441.
[3] Moulton, Prol., p. 171.
[4] Ib., p. 192.

subj. is **μή.** Cf. **μὴ ἐνκακῶμεν** (Gal. 6:9). In Mk. 12:14, **δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν**; (cf. **οὔ** just before), we see how well **μή** suits this deliberative question. The use of **μή** with the aor. subj. in prohibitions need not be further stressed. Wherever the subj. in a dependent clause has a negative (save after the conjunction **μή** after verbs of fearing) the negative is **μή**. Cf. **ὅς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ** (Lu. 8:18); **ἵνα μὴ ἔλθητε** (Mk. 14:38), etc. It is needless to give more examples.

(iii) ***The Optative***. It is only the optative of wish that uses **μή**. It was rare to have the negative precative optative in the old Sanskrit.[1] But already in Homer **μή** is used with the optative for a future wish. In the N. T. there is no example of **μή** with the optative except in wish. It is seen chiefly in **μὴ γένοιτο**, as in Ro. 3:4, 6, 31; Gal. 6:14, etc. But note also the curse of Jesus on the fig-tree in Mk. 11:14, **μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι**.

(iv) ***The Imperative.*** It seems that the imperative was originally used only affirmatively and the injunctive originally only negatively with *ma*. The oldest Sanskrit does not use *ma* with the imperative.[2] In Homer we find once **μὴ ἔνθεο** (*Il*., IV, 410) and once **μὴ καταδύσεο** (*Il*., XVIII, 134) and once **μὴ ἀκουσάτω** (Od., XVI, 301). The second person aorist imper. in prohibitions did not take root and the third person only sparingly (cf. p. 856). See Mt. 6:3, **μὴ γνώτω**.[3] The original negative injunctive appears in the form **μὴ ποιήσῃς** (Latin *ne feceris*). The imperative in Greek follows the analogy of this construction and uses **μή** uniformly. Cf. Lu. 11:7, **μή μοι κόπους πάρεχε**. For the difference between **μή** with the present imperative and **μή** with the aorist subjunctive see Tenses and Modes. Cf. Mk. 13:21, **μὴ πιστεύετε**, wit Lu. 12:11, **μὴ μεριμνήσητε**, and **μὴ φοβεῖσθε** with **μὴ φοβηθῆτε** (Mt. 10:28, 31). It is obviously natural for **μή** to be used with the imperative. For a delicate turn from **οὐ** to **μή** see Jo. 10:37. But Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 171) cites **οὐδενὶ ἐξέστω** from an inscr. (Benndorf-Niemann, *Reisen in Lykien und Karien*, 129 N. 102).

(v) ***The Infinitive***. As we have already seen, the oldest Sanskrit inf. did not use the negative particles, and in Homer[4] **οὐ** appears to be the original negative. But there are a few instances of pit with the inf. in Homer. They occur when the inf. is used as an imperative (cf. in the N. T. 1 Cor. 5:9; 2 Th. 3:14), for an oath, a will or an indirect command. It is thus from the imperative and other finite modes that **μή** crept into constant use with the inf.

[1] Thompson, Synt., p. 499.
[2] Ib., p. 495 f.
[3] Ib.
[4] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 263.

It came to be the normal idiom with the inf. outside of indirect assertion and in antithetical or emphatic phrases (see under **οὐ**). Thompson[1] challenges the statement of Gildersleeve: "Not till the infinitive, came to represent the indicative (in indirect statement) could **οὐ** have been tolerated with the infinitive." Thompson adds: "But this toleration is established in Homer." Just as we saw **μή** make inroads on **οὐ** in other constructions (cf. participles), so it was with the inf. Even in indirect statement.[2] The came to be the rule (cf. the Atticist Lucian). Even in the Attic **οὐ** did not always occur with the inf. in indirect statement.[2] The facts as to the use of **μή** with the inf. in the N. T. have been already given. (see Infinitive and Indirect Discourse). Cf., for instance, **λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι** (Mk. 12:18); **ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι** (Lu. 20:7). In short, Blass[3] says that in the N. T. "**μή** is used throughout." That is not quite true, as we have seen, but the limitations have already been given under **οὐ**. Cf. Lu. 11:42, **ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ παρεῖναι**. Cf. 21:14. The use of **μὴ λαλεῖν** after **οὐ δυνάμεθα** (Ac. 4:20) has already been noticed. Here **μή** retains its full value. We need not pursue the matter. Cf. **τοῦ μή** (Ac. 21:12); **πρὸς τὸ μή** (2 Cor. 3:13); **εἰς τὸ μή** (4:4); **διὰ τὸ μή** (Mt. 13:5) **τῷ μή** (2 Cor. 2:13); **ὥστε μή** (Mt. 8:28), etc. The redundant or pleonastic use of **μή** with the inf. has likewise come up for consideration under the Infinitive. In Lu. 20:27 some MSS. read **ἀντι-λέγοντες** and thus **μή** is redundant after **ἀντί--**, but **א**BCDL do not have **ἀντι**—. Then in 22:34 **א**BLT reject with **μή** with **εἰδέναι** after **ἀπαρνήσῃ**. In Heb. 12:19 W. H. put **μή** in the margin after **παρῃτήσαντο**. But there is no doubt of the use of the redundant **μή** in the N. T. Cf. Lu. 17:1 **ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἐλθεῖν**, (24:16) **ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν**. See also Lu. 4:42; 1 Pet. 3:10; Gal. 5:7. But this pleonastic **μή** is by no means necessary (cf. Ac. 8:36; Ro. 15:22). It does not usually occur with **κωλύω** in the N. T., but note Ac. 10:47, **μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ δύναται κωλῦσαί τις τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι**; Here **μήτι** is the interrogative particle expecting the answer 'no,' while **μή** is redundant after **κωλύειν**. But in Ac. 24:23 **μηδένα** is not pleonastic. We do not have **μὴ οὐ**, with the inf. in the N. T. Here (after **οὐ**) **μή** stands alone and is not redundant (cf. Ac. 4:20) or is redundant (20:20, 27), as the case may be. The use of **μή** and **μὴ οὐ** was not compulsory in the ancient Greek.[4]

[1] Synt., p. 414. [2] Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 430.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 255.
[4] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 324 ff.; Thompson, Synt., pp. 425 ff.

(vi) ***The Participle***. We have seen already how the oldest Sanskrit did not use the negative particles with the participle. In Homer we have only one instance of with the participle (*Od*., IV, 684).[1] But **μή** gradually made its way with participles even in Attic Greek. In the modern. Greek **μή** has driven **οὐ** entirely from the participial use. In the N. T. **οὐ** still hangs on, as we have seen, but that is all. The drift of the **κοινή** is for **μή**, and a writer like Plutarch shows it.[2] **Μή** is the usual negative of the participle. The details were given in connection with Participles. In the N. T. we need pay no attention to the Attic refinements on this point, which were not always observed even there. We have **μή** with the participle in the N. T. as a matter of course. Cf. Mt. 12:30 **ὁ μὴ ὤν** and **ὁ μὴ συνάγων**, (1 Tim. 5:13) **τὰ μὴ δέοντα** (Lu. 4:35) **μηδὲν βλάψαν**, (Ac. 20:22) **μὴ εἰδώς**. In Mt. 22:11 f. and 1 Pet. 1:8, a distinction, as was shown, seems to be drawn between **οὐ** and **μή** with the participle. Cf. Mt. 18:25; Lu. 12: 33; Jo. 7:15; Ac. 9:9; 17:6; 1 Th. 4:5 (cf. Gal. 4:8), etc. The downright denial of a lingered on awhile in the **κοινή** (cf. papyri), but **μή** is putting **οὐ** to rout.[3]

(vii) ***Nouns***. The ancient Greek[4] used **μή** with substantives as **ὁ μὴ ἰατρός** (Plato, *Gorg*. 459 b), adjectives as **οἱ μὴ καθαροί** (Ant. v. 82), or adverbs as **τὸ μὴ ἐμποδών**, (Thuc. ii, 45. 1). In the N. T., so far as I have noticed, **μή** with substantives and adjectives occurs only in contexts where it is natural. Thus in Lu. 10:4, **μὴ πήραν, μὴ ὑποδήματα**, we have just before **μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον**. In Jo. 13:9, **μὴ τοὺς πόδας μου μόνον**, we have no verb, but **νίπτε** is to be supplied from the preceding sentence. Cf. also Eph. 5:15; Jo. 18:40. So in Ro. 12:11 **μὴ ὀκηροί** is in the midst of participles used in an imperatival sense. In 1 Tim. 3:3, **μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην**, the construction is **δεῖ εἶναι**. This infinitival construction is carried on in verse 6 (in spite of the parenthesis in verse 5) by **μὴ νεόφυτον**. So as to verse 8 and Tit. 1:7. There is no difficulty as to the use of **μή** in Col. 3:2 and 2 Th. 3:6.

(d) ***The Intensifying Compounds with*** **Μή**. The same story in the main that we found with **οὐ** is repeated with **μή**. There is no **μηχί**, but we have **μήτι** in this sense. The examples in the N. T. are all in questions (cf. Mt. 7:16; Jo. 18:35) except one, **εἰ μήτι** (Lu. 9:13). The position of **μή** may give it emphasis as in Jas. 3:1 (cf. **οὐ** in Mt. 15:11). The use of the compound

[1] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 263.
[2] Thompson, Synt., p. 255.
[3] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 231 f.
[4] Thompson, Synt., p. 410 f.

negative as a second (or third) negative is simply to strengthen the negative s is true of **οὐ**. Cf. Mk. 11:14 **μηκέτι μηδεὶς φάγοι**, (Ac. 25:24) **ἐπιβοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν μηέτι**, (Ro. 13:8) **μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε**, (2 Cor. 13:7) **μὴ--μηδέν**, etc. Besides **μηδείς** there is **μηθέν** (Ac. 27:33), **μηδέ** in the sense of 'not even' (Eph. 5: 3), **μήγε** (Mt. 6:1), **μηδέποτε** (2 Tim. 3:7), **μηδέπω** (Heb. 11:7), **μηκέτι** (Mk. 9:25), **μήποτε** (margin of W. H. in Heb. 9:17. Elsewhere in the N. T. a conjunction), **μηδαμῶς** (Ac. 10:14), **μήπου** (Ac. 27:29), **μήπω** (Ro. 9:11), **μήτιγε** (1 Cor. 6:3), **μήτις** (2 Th. 2:3). **Μήπως** is only a conjunction in the N. T. If **μή** is followed by **οὐ** as in 1 Jo. 3:10, **ὁ μὴ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ**, the last negative retains its force. So *vice versa* in Ac. 4:20. In Gal. 6:3 there is a sharp contrast between **τι** and **μηδέν** (both neater abstracts referring to a person.).

(e) **Καὶ μή.** We saw that after a positive statement the negative was carried on by **καὶ οὐ**. So also we have **καὶ μή** as in Eph. 4:26, **ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε**, and in Lu. 1:20; 2 Cor. 12:21 In Ac. 18:9 note **μὴ φοβοῦ ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς**, where a positive command comes in between the two examples of p,77. In Jas. 3:14, *per contra*, **μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας**, the negative **μή** seems to cover both verbs connected by **καί** rather than **μηδέ.** Cf. also Lu. 3:14. We have instances. also of **καί** connecting a clause with the conjunction **μή ποτε** (Mt. 13:15 = Mk. 4:12).[1] In Lu. 14:29, **ἵνα μέ ποτε θέντος αὐτοῦ θεμέκιον καὶ μὴ ἰσχύοντος--ἄρξωνται** we have **μή ποτε** with **ἄρξωνται** and **μή** with **ἰσχύοντος**.

(f) ***Disjunctive Use of* Μή**. The simplest form of this contrast is **μή--δέ** as in Lu. 10:20, **μὴ χαιρετε—χαίρετε δέ.** Then we have **μή--** ἀλλά as in **μὴ τοῦτον ἀλλὰ τὸν Βαραββᾶν**, Jo. 18:40; **μὴ φοβοῦ ἀλλὰ λάλει**, Ac. 18:9. We have **μή--πλήν**, in Lu. 23:28. In Lu. 10:20 we really have **μή ὅτι** –**δὲ ὅτι**. Moulton (*Prol*., 240) does not find **μὴ ὅτι** in the N. T., but considers **μήτιγε** in p. 1 Cor. 6:3 as tantamount to it. See Jo. 13:9 for **μὴ μόνον—ἀλλὰ καί**. So Ph. 2:12. We need not trench further upon the conjunctions.

3. COMBINATION OF THE TWO NEGATIVES.

(a) **Μὴ οὐ**. This is very simple. It is in the N. T. confined to questions where is the interrogative particle and **οὐ** is the negative of the verb. Each negative thus has its own force, though it is a bit difficult to translate the combination into good English. But it is good Greek. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 192) quotes

[1] Cf. W.-Th., p. 494.

Plato's *Protag*. 312 A, ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα μὴ οὐκ ὑπολαμβάνεις. Cf. also μὴ οὐχί, in Jer. 23:24. So Ro. 10:18, μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; We may render it 'Did they fail to hear?' expecting the answer 'No.' Paul repeats the same idiom in 10:19. See further 1 Cor. 9: 4 f.; 11:22. 1 Cor. 9:8 is not an instance, since μή comes in one part of the question and οὐ in the other. We do have μή πως οὐχ εὕρω after φοβοῦμαι, in 2 Cor. 12:20, but here μή is a conjunction and οὐχ is the negative of εὕρω, both retaining their full force. The construction in 1 Jo. 3:10 is not pertinent.

(b) **Οὐ μή**. The use of **οὐ—μή** in Ac. 4:20 is not under discussion, nor the redundant **μή** after **οὐ** (Ac. 20:20, 27), but only the idiomatic **οὐ μή** with the aorist subj. (rarely present) or occasionally the fut. ind. Cf. **οὐ μὴ φάγω, οὐ μὴ πείνω** in the boy's letter, P. Oxy. 119 (ii/iii A.D.). See Is. 11:9, **οὐ μὴ κατκοποιήσουσιν οὐδὲ μὴ δύνωνται**. Whatever the origin of this vexed problem, the negative is strengthened, not destroyed, by the two negatives. We need not here recount the various theories already mentioned.[1] See Tense and Mode. Let it go at Gildersleeve's suggestion that was originally **οὔ μή**. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 249) quotes Giles to the effect that this explanation was offered in the Middle Ages the ancients have all our best ideas) and notes "in one if not both of the best MSS. of Aristophanes it is regularly punctuated **οὔ μή.**" In Mt. 13:29 we have **οὔ μή ποτε—ἐκριζώσητε** where **μή** is a conjunction. Gildersleeve notes that **οὐ μή** is more common in the LXX and the N. T. than in the classic Greek.[2] But Moulton (*Prol*., pp. 187-192) will not let it go at that. "In the LXX **לֹא** is translated **οὐ** or **οὐ μή** indifferently within a single verse, as in Is. 5:27." It seems probable that the force of **οὐ μή** has worn down in the LXX and the N. T. In the non-literary papyri "**οὐ μή** is rare, and very emphatic," Moulton notes. He urges also that in spite of the 100 examples in the text of W. H. the idiom in the N. T. is as rare as in the papyri when the 13 LXX quotations and the 53 from the words of Christ are removed, "a feeling that inspired language was fitly rendered by words of a peculiarly decisive tone." But in these examples the force of **οὐ μή** is still strong. Of the other 34 some are probably weakened a bit as in Mt. 25:9; Mk. 13:2; Jo. 18:11. It is only in the Gospels and the Apocalypse (66 and 18 respectively) that **οὐ μή** occurs with frequency. It is interesting to observe that on this point Moulton gets the Gospels and Revelation in har-

[1] Cf. Goodwin, M. and T., pp. 389 ff.; Thompson, Synt., pp. 431-438.
[2] Justin Martyr, p. 169.

mony with the papyri by eliminating the 70 passages due to Semitic influence. Cf. Gildersleeve (A. J. P., iii, 202 ff.) and Ballentine (*ib*., xvni, 453 ff.). But Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 172) explains Mt.24:21, **οἵα—οὐδ᾽ οὐ μὴ γένηται**, not as a Hebraism, but as a "barbarism" like the Wesseley Papyrus xxvi, **οὐδ᾽ οὐ μὴ γένηταί μοι γυνή**. He quotes also Pap. Lugd. II, p. 107, 9, **ἐὰν θέλῃς γυναῖκας οὐ μὴ σχεθῆναι** (Rev. 2:11); **οὐ μὴ ἔσται** (Mt. 16:22). There is a climax in Rev. 7:16, **οὐ – οὐδέ σε ἐγκαταλίπω**. Even **οὐ μή** was not strong enough sometimes, so that we have **οὐδέ** and **οὐ μή** in Heb. 13:5, **οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ οὐδ᾽ οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω**. So also **οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσει** (Lu. 10:19). In Mk. 13:2 we have **οὐ μή** in both the principal and the subordinate (relative) clause.

IV. **Interrogative Particles** (ἐπερωτηκαὶ παραθῆκαι). It is not the mode thatIlwe have under discussion here, but simply the particles used in the various forms of questions.[1]

1. SINGLE QUESTIONS.

(a) Direct Questions.

(i) ***No Particle at all***. So **συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα**; (Mt. 13:51). So 13:28 and fiery often. Here the inquiry is colourless except as the tone of voice or context may indicate one's attitude. In fact, most interrogative sentences have no interrogative word at all. Cf. Lu. 13:2; Jo. 7:23; 13:6; Ac. 21:37, etc. Hence it is sometimes a matter of doubt whether a sentence is interrogative or declarative. Cf. Jo. 16:31; Ro. 8:33; 14:22; 1 Cor. 1:13; 2 Cor. 3:1; Heb. 10:2; Jas. 2:4, etc. It may be doubtful also at what point the question ends. Cf. Jo. 7:19; Ro. 4:1. Winer[2] rightly says on this point grammar cannot speak.

(ii) ***The Use of Negative Particles.*** They are used to indicate the kind of answ, expected. This subject has already had sufficient discussion. See under **οὐ** and **μή**. **Οὐ** expects the answer ‘yes’ (cf. Mt. 7:22) and **μή** the answer 'no' (cf. Jo. 7:31). In Jo. 18:37 we **οὐκοῦν**, according to W. H., which has lost its negative force, but **οὔκουν** would preserve it. Probably Pilate was hardly ready to go that far unless in jest. The use of **μή** varies greatly in tone. The precise emotion in each case (protest, indignation, scorn, excitement, sympathy, etc.) depends on the context. Cf. Jo. 4:29; 6:67; 7:47; Lu. 6:39; Ro. 10:18; 11:1. In Jo. 3:10 the first part of the question has no negative and the second part has **οὐ**.

[1] Cf. W.-Th., pp. 508 ff.; Robertson, Short Gr., pp. 177 ff.

[2] W.-Th., p. 508.

(iii) ***Other Particles.*** There are not many. There is ἄρα (akin to root of ἀρ-αρ-ίσκω, 'to join'), an illative particle which occurs with **οὐκ** as in Ac. 21:38, **μήτι** as in 2 Cor. 1:17, or with **τίς** as in Mt. 18:1. This classic use is not strictly interrogative, but illative in the interrogative sentence. But ἆρα, from the same root[1] with more vocal stress, is interrogative. Indeed, it is sometimes doubtful which accent is correct, as in Gal. 2:17, where ἆρα is probably correct. In Ro. 14:19, however, W. H. give ἄρα **οὖν** We have ἆρα in Lu. 18:8 and ἆρά **γε** in Ac. 8:30.᾽**Αρα** looks backward, ἆρα forward. But the accent is a question of editing. The use of **εἰ** in direct questions is either a Hebraism[2] or involves ellipsis. Cf. Mt. 12:10, **εἰ ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύειν**; So also 19:3. It is common in the LXX (cf. Gen. 17:17) but is foreign to the old Greek. The classic Greek, however, did use **εἰ** in indirect questions, and this fact may have made it easier for the direct use of **εἰ** to arise. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr.*, p. 136) takes this **εἰ**= ᾖ. The N. T. does not use ᾖ, but the papyri have it: **ᾖ μείνωι ἐν βακχιάδι; ᾖ μέλ(λ)ω ἐντυνχάνιν**; P. Fay. 137 (i/A.D.). So the question to the oracle.

(iv) ***Interrogative Pronouns.*** The most common in the N. T. is **τίς** cf. Mt. 3:7). Other words are frequently added, as ἄρα (24: 45); γάρ (9:5); **οὖν** (Lu. 3:10). The various uses of **τί** as adverb (Mk. 10:18, Lu. 16:2); with prepositions, as **διὰ τί** (Mt. 9:11) and **εἰς τί** (Mk. 14:4) or **χάριν τίνος** (1 Jo. 3:12); or elliptically, as **τί ὅτι** (Lu. 2:49) and **ἵνα τί** (Mt. 9:4), need not detain us. The double interrogative **τίς τί** appears in Mk. 15:24. Both **τίς** and **ποῖος** occur in 1 Pet. 1:11. For **ποταπός** see Mt. 8:27, and **πόσος** see 15:34. We need not tarry longer on these elementary details.

(v) ***Interrogative Conjunctions***. These are common besides **τί** (as in Mk. 10:18). The possible exclamatory use of **τί** in Lu. 12: 49= 'how' is sustained by the modern Greek **τί καλά**= 'how fine.' Cf. **ποσάκις** (Mt. 18:21); **πότε** (25:38); **ἕως πότε** (17:17); **ποῦ** (Lu. 8:25); **πῶς** (10:26); **πόθεν** (Mt. 13 : 27), etc.

(b) ***Indirect Questions***. Here there must be either a pronoun or a conjunction.

(i) ***Pronouns***. The use of **τίς** (**τί**) is common. Cf. Mt. 6:25; Lu. 9:46; Jo. 2:25; Ac. 19:32. We find **ὅτι** so used in Ac. 9:6 and ἅ apparently so in 1 Tim. 1:7. Certainly **ὁποῖος** occurs in this construction (1 Cor. 3:13). The same thing is true of

[1] Jann. (Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 411) notes the pre-Attic **ᾖ ῥα.**

[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 260.

ὅσος (Mk. 5:19) and ὁποῖος (Jas. 1:24). Cf. also ποῖος (Mk. 11: 29); πόσος (M 27:13); ποταπός (Lu. 7:39); πηλίκος (Heb. 7:4), and ἡλίκος in Gal. 6:11 (margin of W. H.) if this reading be accepted. Cf. τί in Ac. 12:18.

(ii) ***Conjunctions***. These are also common, as εἰ (Mk. 15:44); πόθεν and τοῦ (Jo. 3:8); πότε (Mk. 13:33); πῶς (1 Th. 1:9); ὅπώς (Lu. 24 :20); ὅπου (Mk. 14:14); μή ποτε (Lu. 3:15), etc.

2. DOUBLE QUESTIONS. These are rare.

(i) ***Direct***. There is no instance of πότερον—ἤ. We do have τίς—ἤ (Mt. 9:5; 23:17; 27:17), the later Greek caring little for the dual idea in πότερον. We more commonly have simply with the second part of the question and nothing in the first, as in Lu. 20:2, 4; Ro. 2:3 f. We may have ἢ οὔ (Mt. 22:17) and ἢ μή (Mk. 12:14). Sometimes we have simply at the beginning of the question with a reference to an implied alternative (1 Cor. 9:6; 2 Cor. 1:17). This ἤ may come in the middle of the sentence as in 1 Cor. 9:8. The may even precede τίς as in Mt. 7:9.

(ii) ***Indirect***. There is one instance of πότερον—ἤ in an indirect question Jo. 7:17).

V. **Conjunctions** (σύνδεσμοι). In the nature of the case much had to be sail about the conjunctions[1] in the treatment of the Sentence and also Subordinate Clauses. The syntactical principles controlling both paratactic and hypotactic sentences have received adequate discussion. But conjunctions play such an important part in the language that it is best to group them all together. They connect words, clauses, sentences and paragraphs, and thus form the joints of speech. They have a very good name, since they bind together (*con-jungo*) the various parts of speech not otherwise connected, if they need connection, for asyndeton is always possible to the speaker or writer. The point here is to interpret each conjunction as far as possible so that its precise functin may be clear.

1. PARATACTIC[2] CONJUNCTIONS (σύνδεσμοι παρατακτικοί).

(a) Copulative. Conjunctions which connect words and clauses are evidently later in development than the words and clauses. The use of conjunctions came to be very common in the Greek so that the absence was noticeable and was called asynde-

[1] The distinction between adv. and conj. is, of course, arbitrary. Conjs. are advs. just as the other particles are. Cf. Paul, Principles of the Hist. of Lang., p. 406.

[2] "Co-ordinating" is from co-ordino, to range together.

ton.[1] But it is a mistake to suppose that these connectives are necessary. One may fail to use them as a result of rapidity of thought as the words rush forth, or they may be consciously avoided for rhetorical effect. Cf. βλέπετε, βλέπετε, βλέπετε in Ph. 3:2, with Tennyson's "Break, break, break." All this is entirely within the province of the speaker. Cf. 1 Cor. 3:12, χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, λίθους τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην. Cf. also 1 Cor. 13: 4-7 where the verbs follow one another in solemn emphasis with no connective save one δέ. In the same way contrast may be expressed without conjunctions as in 1 Cor. 15:43 f.[2] In Luke and John there is a pleasing alternation of asyndeton and conjunctions. Cf. Gal. 5:22. The first conjunctions were the paratactic or co-ordinating, since language was originally in principal sentences.[3] The copulative (connecting) conjunctions are the simplest and earliest type of the paratactic structure. They simply present the words or clauses as on a par with each other.[4] The primitive conjunctions were monosyllabic like καί, τέ, δέ.[5]

(i) **Τέ**. This word appears to be related to the Sanskrit *ca*, the Latin *que* (with labio-velar q^u), and the Gothic –h.[6] These words are all enclitic and postpositive. The Sanskrit is almost devoid of conjunctions which were so highly developed by the Greek and Latin, but *ca* is one of the few possessed by this ancient tongue.[7] There is a striking connection between *quis, que, quis-que* and τίς, τέ τὶς. The Thessalian dialect has κὶς for τὶς and κίσ-κε. We have τίς τε in the old Greek. **Τέ** shows this double pronomial origin in its use for *and* and *ever* (just like *que, quis-que*).[8] The indefinite use is distinctly Homeric.[9] The use of ἐπεί τε, ὅς τε was old Ionic and continued in Attic tragedy, as οἷός τε did in Attic prose. Cf. Rademacher (*N. T. Gr.,* p. 5). Indeed, some scholars[10] hold that the correlative use (τέ--τέ) was the original one, but this is doubtful. It seems certain that τέ indicates a somewhat closer unity than does καί. This close correlative use is certainly very old. Cf. σύ τ' ἐγώ τε in Homer.[11] In the N. T. it is rare except in the Acts, where it occurs some 175 times. It is common in all parts of the book and is thus a subtle argument

[1] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 551.
[2] Cf. W.-Th., p. 538.
[3] Brug., ib., p. 552.
[4] Cf. C. Pitman, Conjunctions., p. 5 f.; Blass, Gr. of N, T. Gk., p. 261.
[5] W.-Th., p. 434.
[6] Brug., Griech. Gr., pp. 529, 541 f.
[7] Whitney, Sans. Gr., p. 417.
[8] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 530. Cf. K.-G., II, pp. 536 ff.
[9] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 242.
[10] K.-G., II, p. 246.
[11] Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 530.

for the unity of the work (we-sections and all). It is something additional, but in intimate relation with the preceding. We find **τε** alone as in Ac. 2:33, where **ὑψωθείς** and **λαβών** are united by **τε**. Cf. also 10:22, where again two participles are connected. In 23:24, **κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι**, the change from the direct to the indirect discourse is marked by **τέ**, whereas **καί** is used twice before to join minor phrases. **Τέ** puts **παραστῆσαι** on a par with **ἑτοιμάσατε.**[1] In the same way in 20:11 the first two participles are joined by **καί** and then both are related to the next by **τέ**. The same idiom occurs in Jo. 6:18, where **τε** gives an additional item somewhat apart from the **καί — καί** just before. In Jo. 4:41 **καί — τέ** are not co-ordinate. **Καί** introduces the whole sentence and **τέ** connects the two parts. Cf. thus **δέ--τέ** in Ac. 2:37. But **τέ--τέ** is strictly correlative. Cf. the Latin *que — que*, English *as — so*. See Ac. 2:46 where the two participles are co-ordinated. In Ro. 14:8 -- have **τε** four times in succession with **ἐάν**. There are here two pairs of conditions. The parts of each pair are balanced carefully. The disjunctive **εἴτε--εἴτε** (cf. 1 Cor. 12:26) is at bottom this same correlative use of **τέ**. So as to **οὔτε –οὔτε** (Mt. 12:32) and **μήτε—μήτε** (Ac. 27:20). The use of **τέ--καί** is also common where there is an inner bond, though no hint is given as to the relative value of the matters united. Cf. **ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς** (Lu. 22:66); **ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν** (Ac. 1:1); **ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες** (8:12); **ἐκινήθη τε—καὶ ἐγένετο** (21:30); **δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων** (24:15); **μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ** (26:22);**῾Ελλησίν τε καὶ βαρβάροις** (Ro. 1:14); **᾽Ιουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ ῾Ελληνος** (2:9), etc. For **τὲ καί--τέ** see Ac. 9:15, and for **τὲ καί--τέ--καί** 26 20. In Jo. 4:11, **οὔτε--καί**, we really have the **τέ--καί** ('both and') construction. Cf. Latin *non que— et*. We even have **οὔτε --οὔτε--καί** in Jo. 5:37 f. In Ac. 27:20 **μήτε—μήτε** stand together and both are parallel to **τε** following. *Per contra* we find **τέ -- δέ** in Ac. 19:2 and also 3. The manuscripts often vary between **τέ** and **δέ (**cf. Ac. 3:10; 4:14, etc.). We have **τὲ γάρ** (common from Aristotle on[2]) in Ro. 1:26 followed by **ὁμοίως τε καί**. In Heb. 2:11 note **τὲ γάρ—καί**. As a rule **τε** stands after the word or words that are paralleled, but this is not always so.

(ii) **Καί**. The etymology of this conjunction is disputed. Curthis[3] makes it he locative case of the pronominal stem **κα--, κο--,** so

[1] This classic iJiom is a mark of Luke's literary style. But in the **κοινή τε** is on the retreat before **καί.** Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 401.

[2] Cf. Hammer De **τε** Particulae Usu Herodoteo Thucydideo Xenophonteo, 1904, p. 92.

[3] Gk. Etymology.

that it would ultimately come from the same root as **τέ** (*que*). It would thus mean 'in this respect,' 'this besides.' Brugmann[1] finds its original sense in **κοινός**, Latin *co-, cum*, Gothic *ga*. The idea would then be 'together with,' 'in addition to.' The Arkadian, South Achaean and Cypriote dialects use **κάς** and **κά=καί.** Whatever the origin, it all comes to the same thing in the end. It is by far the most frequent of all the conjunctions or other particles in the N. T. It is so common in fact that Moulton and Geden do not list it in their concordance. This in itself is in accord with the later Greek idiom, as Thumb[2] notes in Aristotle and in the modern Greek and Moulton[3] in the papyri. Moulton cites Par. P. 18, **ἔτι δύο ἡμέρας ἔχομεν καὶ φθάσομεν εἰς Πηλούσι**, as parallel to Mk. 15:25; Jo. 4:35. But there can be little doubt that the extreme fondness for parataxis in John's Gospel, for instance, is partially due to the use of **καί** in the LXX for the Hebrew which "means a hook and resembles a hook in shape."[4] It was certainly used to "hook" together all sorts of sentences. There is not the same unity in the older Greek in the matters united as is true of **τέ**. **Κια,** "connects in a free and easy manner"[5] and the Hebrew ו still more loosely. There are three main uses of **καί** which appear in the N. T. as in all Greek.

The Adjunctive Use ('Also'). This is possibly the original use, though one cannot tell. It is thus like the Latin *et-iam*, English *too* (*to*) = addition to something already mentioned, and is common enough in all stages of the language.[6] A good example of this use of **καί** is seen in Mt. 8:9, **καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν**. The **καί** here points to Christ's relation to the boy. The centurion, like a true soldier, does not say that he is a man who gives orders, but rather one who obeys them. He has the true military spirit and knows therefore how Jesus can cure the boy without going to see him. The **καί** is here very significant. Cf. **οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς** in Mt. 7:12, where the Golden Rule is applied to Christ's hearers by **καί**. Cf. Jo. 7:3 **ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου,** (12:10) **ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λαζαρόν**. This use of **καί** is more frequent in Luke than elsewhere in the N. T.[7] Cf. **κἀγώ** (Lu. 20:3); **ἢ καί** (Lu. 12:41); **δὲ καί** (12:54, 57); **τί καί** (1 Cor. 15:29); **καὶ γάρ** (Mt. 8:9); **ἐὰν καί** (Gal. 6:1); **εἰ καί** (2 Cor. 11:15); **καὶ δέ** (Mt. 10:

[1] Griech. Gr., p. 542.
[2] Hellen., p. 129.
[3] Prol., p. 12.
[4] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 196.
[5] Jann., Gk. G-., p. 401.
[6] Cf. M. W. Humphreys, The Cl. Rev., 1897, vol. XI, pp. 140
[7] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 140.

18); **ὡς καί** (Ac. 11:17); **καθὼς καί** (Ro. 15:7); **οὕτω καί** (Ro. 6:11); **ὅς καί** (Ac. 2:6, 8); **ὁμοίως καί** (Jo. 6:11); **ὡσαύτως καί** (1 Cor. 11:25); **καθάπερ καί** (1 Th. 3:12); **διὸ καί** (Lu. 1:35); **διὰ τοῦτο καί** (Lu. 11:49); **ἀλλὰ καί** (24:22), etc. So then **καί** in the sense of 'also' occurs with nouns, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, conjunctions. It may refer to a word or a clause. Cf. **ἄλλως τε καί**, B. G. U. 530 (i/A.D.). For the use of **ὁ καί** see the Article, and for **σὺν καί** see Prepositions.[1] It is common for **καί** to sum up a sentence that precedes. For the relative and articular participle see the **καί** in the sentences in Mt. 5:39-43. Here **καί** balances the principal and the subordinate clauses. So in the apodosis of a conditional sentence we find **καί**, as in Jo. 14:7. Cf. Heb. 7:26, where **καί** almost means 'precisely,' and Mt. 6:10, where, it means 'just so.' Cf. Ro. 11:1. So with **ἅ** we find it in the apodosis (Jo. 5:19). Cf. also after **ὥσπερ** in 5:26. Sometimes the **καί** seems to be redundant as in Lu. 11:1, **καθὼς καί**, or **ὡς καί** in 1 Cor. 7:7. We may indeed have **καί** ('also') in both parts of the comparison, a studied balancing of the two members of the sentence as in Mt. 18:33, **καὶ σέ--ὡς κἀγώ.** So Ro. 1:13, **καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν**. See **οἶδα καί--οἶδα καί** (Ph. 4:12).

The Ascensive Use ('Even'). The notion of 'even' is an advance on that of mere addition which is due to the context, not to **καί**. The thing that is added is out of the ordinary and rises to a climax like the crescendo in music. Cf. Latin *adeo*. Cf. **οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καί** (Ac. 21:13; Ro. 13:5). This use of **καί** depends wholly on the context. Cf. Mk. 1:27, **καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖ ς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει**. (So Lu. 10:1). Cf. also **καὶ οἱ τελῶναι** and **καὶ οἱ ἐθνικοί**, Mt. 5: 46 f. See further Ac. 10:45; 11:1, 20; Gal. 2:13. The use of **καὶ εἰ** belongs here. (Cf. 1 Cor. 8:5.)

The Mere Connective ('And'). The difference between **καί** as 'and' and **καί** as 'also' is very slight, whichever was the original idea. The epexegetic or explicative use of **καί** occupies a middle ground between 'also' and 'and.' Blass[2] treats it under 'also.' Cf. Lu. 3:1:, **πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν**, where the "connective" force of **καί** is certainly very slight. So also Jo. 20:30, **πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα**. See further Jo. 1:16, **καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος**, where the clause is an explanatory addition. Cf. (Ac. 22:25) **καὶ ἀκατάκριτον**, (1 Cor. 2:2) **καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον**, (Ro. 13:11) **καὶ τοῦτο** (Latin *idque*) which is our 'and that too' where we combine 'and' and 'also' ('too') in the **καί**, (Heb. 11:12) **καὶ ταῦτα** (frequent in ancient

[1] Cf. Deiss., B. S.; Hatch, Jour. of Bib. Lit., 1908, p. 142.
[2] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 263.

Greek). See in particular Eph. 2:8, **καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν**, where **τοῦτο** refers to the whole conception, not to **χάριτι**. The simple copulative idea is, however, the most common use of **καί** where words are piled together by means of this conjunction. Sometimes the connection is as close as with **τέ**. Thus **ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ** (2 Cor. 1:3); **καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ** (Lu. 8:15). But the words may be very loosely joined in idea, as **οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι** (Mt. 16:1). **Καί** may be used to connect all sorts of words, clauses and sentences. Thus **λέγω Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται** (Mt. 8:9). The use of **καί** after the imperative is seen in Mt. 11:29. The chain with **καί** as the connective may go on indefinitely. Cf. the four examples in Ph. 4:9; five in Ro. 9:4; the six in Rev. 7:12 (so 5:12). So we have **καὶ ὅτι** three times in 1 Cor. 15:4 (**καί** to connect **ὅτι** clauses). In Rev. 12-16 every paragraph and most of the sentenes begin with **καί**. In fact it is true of much of the Apocalypse. If one turns to First Maccabees, it is true even to a much grater extent than in the Apocalypse. In First Maccabees **καί** translates the Hebrew ו. But Thumb[1] has found this repetition of **καί** in Aristotle so that the Hebrew influence simply intensified a Greek idiom. We have noted the use of **καί** with **τέ** (**τέ--καί**. Cf. Ro. 1:20). The use of **καί--καί** is far more common in the seise of 'both — and' as in Ac. 2:29, **καὶ ἐτελεύτησε καὶ ἐτάφη**. Cf Mk. 4:41; Ph. 2:13; Ac. 26:29. Sometimes the connection almost amounts to 'not only, but also.' In Col. 2:16 note **καί--ἤ**. Cf. **κἄν--κἄν** (Lu. 12 : 38). A. Brinkmann contends that in the papyri and late Greek **κἄν** is sometimes 'at any rate' and is never a mere link (*Scriptio continua und Anderes*, Rhein. Mis. LXVII, 4, 1912). In Lu. 5:36 we have **καί--καί--καὶ οὐ** (so Jo. 6:36), and in Jo. 17:25 **καὶ οὐ**—**δὲ--καὶ**. It is usual to have **καὶ οὐ** after an affirmative clause as in Jo. 10:35. Cf. **καὶ μή** in 2 Cor. 9:5. See Negative Particles. In Lu. 12:6 **καὶ οὐ** follows a question with **οὐχί**. **Καί** connects two negative sentences in Lu. 6:37. For **οὔτε--καί** see Jo. 4:11. Sometimes **καί** begins a sentence when the connection is with an unexpressed idea. Children use "and" thus often in telling stories and asking questions. Cf. **καὶ σὺ ἦσθα** in Mt. 26:69 (and 73) like *Et tu, Brute*. See also Mk. 10:26, **καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι**. So also Lu. 10:29; Jo. 9:36; 2 Cor. 2:2. Cf. also the use of **καί** in parenthesis as in Ro. 1:13, **καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο**. The context gives other turus to **καί** that are sometimes rather startling. It is common to find **καί** where it has to bear the content 'and yet.' So Jo.

[1] Hellen., § 129.

3:19; 4:20; 6:49; 7:30; 1 Jo. 2:9. The examples are common in John's Gospel (Abbott, *Joh.. Gr*., pp. 135 ff.). See Jer. 23:21. In Mk. 4:4 note **μέν—καί**. In 1.Cor. 10:21 we have **οὐ—καί** in contrast. Cf. Mt. 3:14, **καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρός με**; So also Ph. 1:22, **καὶ τί αἱρήσομαι**. This idiom occurs in Plato, and Abbott notes a number of them in the Gospel of John. Cf. 1:5; 2:20; 3:13; 5:39 7:27 f.; 8:57, etc. In Lu. 12:24 **καί** is almost equal to **ἀλλά**, that is, the context makes contrast. Cf. also Mt. 6:26 (**οὐ—καί**); Mk. 12:12; Lu. 20:19; Jo. 18:28. Tholuck[1] so takes **καί** in Ro. 1:13 (the parenthetical **καί)**. Sometimes **καί** seems imitative of the Hebrew ְו by almost having the sense of **ὅτι** or **ἵνα** ('that') as in Mt. 26:15; Mk. 14:40; Lu. 9:51; 12:15. In particular note **καὶ ἐγένετο καί** (as in Lu. 5:1, 12, 17, etc.). In Mt. 16:6 observe **ὁρᾶτε καί**. So Lu. 12:15 and Mt. 26:15. In modern Greek **καί** has so far usurped the field that it is used not only in all sorts of paratactic senses like 'and,' 'but,' 'for,' 'or,' 'and so,' but even in hypotactic senses for **νά** or **ποῦ**, declarative and even consecutive (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 184). In Mk. 3:7 **καί** comes near takng the place of **ὅ**, for in the next verse there are five instances of **καὶ** co-ordinate with each other, but subordinate to **καί** in verse 7. Sometimes after **καί** we may supply 'so' as in **καὶ λάμπει**, Mt. 5:15; **καὶ βλέπομεν**, Heb. 3:19. See also Ph. 4:7. This is a kind of consecutive[2] use of **καί**. Cf. Lu. 24:18. The fondness for co-ordination in the Gospels causes the use of **καί** where a temporal conjunction (**ὅτε)** would be more usual. Cf. Mk. 15:25, **ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν** (Lu. 23:44). But Blass[3] admits that this is a classic idiom. Cf. Mt. 26:45; Lu. 19:43, where **καί** drift further away from the ancient idiom. Cf. also **καὶ ἰδού** in the apodosis, 'and behold,' as in Lu. 7:12. In 2 Tim. 2:20 note **καί** allowed by **ἃ μέν—ἃ δέ**. In Ph. 4:16 note **καί** thrice (one= 'even,' two = 'both — and').

(iii) **Δέ.** This conjunction is generally ranked wholly as an adversative particle.[4] Monro[5] says: "The adversative **δέ** properly indicates that he new clause stands in some *contrast* to what has preceded. Ordinarily, however, it is used in the continuation of a narrative." As a matter of fact, in my opinion, Monro has the matter here turned round. The ordinary narrative use (continuative) conceive to be the original use, the adversative the developed and later construction. The etymology confirms

[1] Beitr. zur Spracherklarung d. N. T., p. 35.
[2] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 262.
[3] Ib.
[4] So Jann., Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 407.
[5] Hom. Gr., p. 245.

this explanation, though it is largely conjectural. Brugmann[1] associates it with the *aksl. ze* and possibly also[2] with δή and the enclitic ending –δέ **(οἵκα-δε, ὅ-δε, τοσός-δε)**, while Hartung[3] connects it with **δύο, δίς**, and Baumlein[4] with **δεύ-τερος**. The enclitic –δε thus means 'again,' 'back,' while the conjunction δέ would mean 'in the second place' or 'a second comment' or an important addition' (δή). But, however we take it, there is in the word no essential notion of antithesis or contrast. What is true is that the addition is something new[5] and not so closely associated in thought as is true of **τέ** and **καί**. I prefer therefore to begin with the narrative and transitional (copulative) use of **δέ.** Kuhner-Gerth[6] call this use of δέ for 'something new' (*etwas Neues*) copulative and give it separate discussion. Abbott[7] has the matter correctly: "In classical Greek, calling attention to the second of two things, may mean (1) *in the next place*, (2) *on the other hand*." The first of these uses is the original one and is copulative. The second is adversative. Abbott notes also that δέ in both senses occurs in Matthew and Luke nearly three times as often as in Mark and John. Its use is mainly in the historical books of the N. T. It is so common there that, as with **καί**, Moulton and Geden do not give any references. A good place to note the mere copulative force of δέ is in the genealogy in Mt. 1:2-16 where there is no notion of opposition at all. The line is simply counted from Abraham to Christ. In verses 6 and 12 there are breaks, but the contrast is made by repetition of the names, not by **δε,** which appears with every name alike. In Mt. 23:4 we have both uses of **δέ.** The first is properly translated 'yea' and the second 'but' (adversative). See further 1 Cor. 4:7 (δέ and **δὲ καὶ)** where there is a succession of steps in the same direction. So 15:35; 2 Cor. 6:15 f.; Heb. 12:6; and in particular the list of virtues in 2 Pet. 1:5-7. Sometimes a word is repeated with δέ for special emphasis, as **δικαιοσύνη** δέ in Ro. 3:22 (cf. 9:30). A new topic may be introduced by δέ in entire harmony with the preceding discussion, as the Birth of Jesus in Mt. 1:18 ('Now the birth of Jesus Christ,' etc.). The use of δέ in explanatory parenthesis is seen in Jo. 3:19 ('And this is,' etc.); 19:23 ('Now the coat,' etc.). For **ὡς** δέ ('and when,' 'so when') in John see 2:9, 23. In John

[1] Griech. Gr., p. 547.
[2] Ib. Cf. also Hist. Gk. Gr., p. 410. Cf. Klotz ad Dev., II, p. 355.
[3] I, p. 156 f.
[4] Part., p. S9.
[6] W.-Th., p. 443.
[6] II, p. 274.
[7] Joh. Gr., p. 104.

as elsewhere it is sometimes not clear whether δέ is copulative or adversative. Cf. 3:1, **ἦν δέ.** Is Nicodemus an illustration or an exception?[1] The resumptive use of **δέ,** after a parenthesis, to go on with the main story, is also copulative. Cf. Mt. 3:1; Lu. 4:1. There is continuation, not opposition, in the use of **καὶ δέ,** as in Lu. 1:76 **καὶ σύ** δέ where means 'and' and **καί** 'also.' Cf. further Mt. 10:18; 16:18; Jo. 15:27. In Jo. 6:51 we have **καὶ** δέ in the apodosis of the condition in this sense. **Δέ** is always postpositive and may even occupy the third place in the sentence (Mt. 10:11) or even the fourth (Jo. 6:51) or fifth (1 Jo. 2:2) or sixth (Test. xiii, Patr. Jud. 9:1) as shown in chapter on Sentence.

In accord with the copulative use of δέ we frequently have **οὐδέ** and **μήδέ** in the continuative sense, carrying on the negative with no idea of contrast. Cf. Mt. 6:26, **οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν**. So also 6:28; Mk. 4:22, etc. In Jo. 7:5, **οὐδὲ γάρ**, we have **οὐδέ** in the sense of 'not even' as often (Mt. 6:29, etc.). In Mt. 16:15 **οὐδέ** means 'not also' (cf. also 21:27, etc.). All three uses of **καί** are thus paralleled in **οὐδέ** (merely **οὐ δέ)**. For **μηδέ** in the continuative sense see Mt. 7:6. It means 'not even' in 1 Cor. 5:11. For the repetition of continuative **μηδέ** see 1 Cor. 10:7-10. In Mk. 14:68, **οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι** (some MSS. **οὐκ—οὐδέ**), we come pretty close to having **οὔτε--οὔτε** in the merely continuative sense as we have in **οὔτε--καί** (Jo. 4:11; 3 Jo. 10).

(iv) **Ἀλλά**. Here there is no doubt at all as to the etymology. **Ἀλλά** is a virtual proclitic (cf. **ἔπι** and **ἐπί**), and the neuter plural was ἀλλά (ἄλλα, 'other things'). Baumlein[2] does take ἀλλά as originally an adverb. But in reality it is 'this other matter'[3] (cf. **ταῦτα** and **τοῦτο**). In actual usage the adversative came to be the most frequent construction, but the original copulative held on to the N. T. period. It is a mistake to infer that **ἄλλος** means 'something different.' In itself it is merely 'another.' Like δέ the thing introduced by ἀλλά is something new, but not essentially in contrast.[4] So the classic Greek used **ἀλλὰ μήν** in the emphatic continuative sense.[5] Blass[6] observes that "the simple ἀλλά also has this force of introducing an accessory idea." Cf. 2 Cor. 7:11, **πόσην κατειργάσατο ὑμῖν σπουδήν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολογίαν, ἀλλὰ ἀγανάκτησιν, ἀλλὰ φόβον, ἀλλὰ ἐπιπόθησιν, ἀλλὰ ζῆλον, ἀλλὰ ἐκδίκησιν**. All these six examples are confirmatory and continuative. See further Lu. 24:21, **ἀλλά γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσιν τούτοις**, where it is cli-

[1] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 105.
[2] Unters. uber griech. Partikeln, p. 7.
[3] Paley, Gk. Particles, p. 1.
[4] K.-G., II, p. 286.
[5] Ib.
[6] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 269.

acteric, not contradictory. The story is carried on by ἀλλὰ καί in verse 22. Cf. also 2 Cor. 1:9; Lu. 12:7; 16:21. In Ph. 1:18, χαίρω, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι, the connection is very close. The most striking example of all is Ph. 3:8, ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι. In 2 Cor. 11:1, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθε, the tone of irony akes it doubtful whether to take ἀλλά as copulative or adversative. These and similar passages are not a dropping of the adversative idea, but merely the retention of the original copulative meaning. Abbott[1] sees that "it is hard to find a satisfactory explanation of Jo. 8:26" along the usual line. If one no longer feels impelled to translate by 'but,' the trouble vanishes. Just make it 'now' or 'yea' and it is clear. Abbott[2] likewise considers axm "inexplicable" in 4:23, because it has to mean 'but.' Cf. Jo. 16:2, ἀλλ᾽ ἔρχεται ὥρα, 'yea, the hour comes.' The same use of ἀλλά occurs also in negative sentences. In 1 Cor. 3:3, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ νῦν δύνασθε after οὔπω ἐδύνασθε. In 4:3, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ after an affirmative clause. In Ac. 19:2, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽, the thought answers the preceding question and is probably adversative, as is possible in 1 Cor. 3:3. The ἀλλά at any rate is negative like the **οὐδέ.** So as to ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ Ἡρῴδης (Lu. 23:15).

(b) *Adversative*. It should be stated again that not all of these conjunctions mean contrast (antithesis) or opposition, but the context makes the matter clear. The modern Greek keeps ἀλλά, ὅμως, πλήν, but not δέ and μέντοι (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 185).

(i) **Δέ.** In Jas. 1:13 f. note the two uses of δέ (continuative and adversative). Sometimes the positive and the negative are sharply contrasted and then δέ is clearly adversative as in Mt. 23:4, αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐ θέλουσιν. More obvious still is 6:14 f., ἐὰν ἀφῆτε --ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφῆτε. Cf. also 6:23. So μὴ θησαυρίζετε— θησαυρίζετε δέ (6:19 f.). Cf. 1 Cor. 1:10, etc. The contrast may lie in the nature of the case, particularly where persons stand in contrast as in ἐγὼ δέ (Mt. 5:22, 28, 32, etc.), σὺ δέ (Mt. 6:6; 1 Tim. 6: 11; ἡμεῖς δέ (1 Cor. 1:23); ὑμεῖς δέ (Mk. 8:29); the common ὁ δέ (Mk. 1:45), οἱ δέ (Mt. 2:5); αὐτὸς δέ (Lu. 8:37), αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς (Jo. 2:24), etc. The contrast is made more manifest by the use of μέν, (see Intensive Particles) as in Mt. 3:11. In 1 Cor. 2:6, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, an exception is filed to the preceding. This adversative use of δέ is very common indeed. Cf. further Mk. 2:18; Lu. 5:5; 9:9, 13; 24:21; Ac. 12:15; Ro. 8:9 ff.

(ii) Ἄλλά. Just as ἄλλος (cf. 2 Cor. 11:4) can be used in the sense of ἕτερος (when it means 'different,' not merely ‘second’), so

[1] Joh. Gr., p. 100. [2] Ib., p. 99.

ἀλλά can mean 'another' in contrast to the preceding. With a negative the antithesis is sharp as in Lu. 1:60, **οὐχί, ἀλλὰ κληθήσεται Ἰωάνης**. So Jo. 6:32, **οὐ Μωυσῆς— ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πατήρ** (cf. 6:38). Cf. Mk. 9:37; 1 Cor. 15:37. In verse 39 of 1 Cor. 15 note **ἀλλὰ ἄλλη μέν—ἄλλη δέ** where both ἀλλά, and **ἄλλη** have the notion of difference due to the context. In 1 Cor. 9:12 note ἀλλά, twice. In Mt. 15:11 **οὐ** begins one clause and ἀλλά the other. Cf. 2 Cor. 4:5, **οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κηρύσσομεν, ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κύριον**. So Mt. 5:17. In Lu. 12:51 note **οὐχί ἀλλ᾽ ἤ** and in 2 Cor. 1:13, **ἄλλα--ἀλλ᾽ ἤ** a sort of pleonastic use of ἀλλά. This is a classical idiom.[1] Cf. also **οὐ μόνον**—ἀλλά, (Ac. 19:26) or **ἀλλὰ καί** (Ro. 5:3). See Negative Particles. For **οὐχ ὅτι**—ἀλλά see Jo. 7:22, for **οὐχ ἵνα**—ἀλλά see 6:38. For ἀλλά **γε** in apodosis see 1 Cor. 9:2, for ἀλλά. Col. 2:5, for **ἀλλ᾽ οὐ**, 1 Cor. 4: 15. Sometimes **ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα** may be elliptical as in Mk. 14:49; Jo. 1:8. **Ἀλλά** alone may refer to an interruption in thought not expressed, as in Jo. 12:27. One of the most striking instances of ἀλλά occurs in Ac. 16:37, **οὐ γάρ,** ἀλλά, where **οὐ γάρ** means 'not much' with fine shorn (cf. **καὶ νῦν**; just before). Both Winer and W. F. Moulton (W.-M., p. 566) felt certain that ἀλλά never equalled **εἰ μή**, not even in Mt. 20:23 and Mk. 4:22. But J. H. Moulton (*Prol*., p. 241) quotes Tb. P. 104 (i/B.C.), **καὶ μὴ ἐξέστω Φιλίσκωι γυναῖκα ἄλλην ἐπαγαγέσθαι ἀλλὰ Ἀπολλωνίαν**, where ἀλλά means practically 'except.' See also Gen. 21:26. Moulton suggests that, since **εἰ μή** (brachylogy) in Lu. 4:26 f.; Rev. 21:27, means 'but only,' the same may be true of ἀλλά.

(iii) **Πλήν**. Curtius gets it from **πλέον** ('more'), but Brugmann[2] finds its original --meaning to be 'near by.' At any rate it was a preposition (Mk. 12:32). Cf. Ac. 15:28, **πλέον πλὴν τούτων** where the two werds exist together. Probably its original use as a conjunction is seen in the combination **πλὴν ὅτι** (Ph. 1:18). It is chiefly confined to Luke's writings in the N. T. As a conjunction it is always adversative (cf. Lu. 6:24; 12:31, etc.). In Mt. 26:39 note **πλὴν οὐχ ὡς** –**ἀλλ᾽ ὡς**. The classical language used it as a preposition and with **ὅτι**, but Aristotle[3] shows the existence of **πλήν** as a conjunction which developed in the vernacular. Blass[4] notes that Paul uses it at the end of an argument to single out the main point. Cf. 1 Cor. 11: 11; Eph. 5:33; Ph. 3: 16; 4:14.

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 269.
[2] Griech. Gr., p. 550.
[3] Blass, Gr of N. T. Gk., p. 268. [4] Ib.

(iv) **Μέντοι**. This word is a combination of two intensive particles (**μέν, τοί**), and is used to mean 'however.' Cf. Jo. 4:27; 12:42. It occurs in the N. T. only eight times.

(v) **Ὅμως**. This word is even more rare than **μέντοι**. It occurs with two participles (1 Cor. 14:7; Gal. 3:15) and once with **μέντοι** (Jo. 12:42).

(vi) **Εἰ μή**. This phrase marks an exception, as in Mt. 12:4; Jo. 17:12. We even have **ἐκτὸς εἰ μή** (1 Cor. 14:5; 15:2; 1 Tim. 5:19).

(c) *Disjunctives*. Dionysius Thrax calls this construction **σύνθεσις διαζευτική**. It was always possible to express alternative ideas without any conjunction (cf. the Latin *nolens volens*) or by copulative conjunctions (**δέ, καί**), a construction common in the vernacular[1] (cf. Hebrew וְ). Dissimilar things may be united by **καί** as in Col. 3:11, but we do not have to take **καί** as being **ἤ** or *vice versa*.[2]

(i) **Ἤ**. Its origin from **ἠέ** (enclitic) is held by Brugmann.[3] They are equivalent in Homer. We may have just **ἤ** as in Mt. 5:17. For **ἢ καί** see Mt. 7:10; Lu. 18:11. In the sense of 'or' **ἤ** may be repeated indefinitely (Ro. 8:35). In Ro. 1:21 we have **οὐχ—ἤ** as in 4:13. See **μήπω—μηδέ--ἤ** (Ro. 9:11). This use in negative clauses appears in Thuc. 1, 122, and later writers. In 1 Th. 2:19 note **ἢ οὐχὶ καί**. In Mt. 21:23 we have **καὶ τίς**, while in Lu. 20:2 (parallel passage) the reading is **ἢ τίς**. This does not prove **καί** and **ἤ** to be synonymous. The logion was translated differently. The modern Greek retains **οὔτε, μήτε** and **ἤ** (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 185). In 1 Cor. 11:27, **ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου**, some MSS. have Kai, but ij is the true text. This, however, does not mean that some partook of one element and some of the other, but that, whatever element was taken in this way, there was guilt. The correlative use of **ἤ — ἤ** ('either --or') is also frequent.[4] Cf. Mt. 6:24; 1 Cor. 14:6. In Ro. 6: 16 note **ἤτοι--ἤ**. As a disjunctive we have **πότερον—ἤ** in Jo. 7:17 and **ἤ — ἤ — ἤ— ἤ** in Mk. 13:35. For **πρὶν ἤ** see Mt. 1:18; for **ἤ** after **θέλω** see 1 Cor. 14:19; after **καλόν**, Mt. 18:8; after **χαρά**, Lu. 15:7; for **ἀλλ᾽ ἤ**, Lu. 12:51. Radermacher (*N. T. Gr*., p. 27) finds **ἤ τοι—ἤ**, B. G. U. 956; **ἤ τοι—ἤ τοι**,

[1] Jann., Hist. Gk. Cr., p. 406.

[2] W.-Th., p. 440.

[3] Griech. Gr., p. 541.

[4] Cf. Margolis, The Particle ἤ in O. T. Gk. (Am. Jour. of Sem. Lang. and Lit., July, 1909).

Vett. Val., p. 138, **ἤτε--ἤ**, I. G. XII, 2, 562, 5 (Roman time); **ἤτε--ἤτε**, *Quaest. Barth*., pp. 24, 30.

(ii) **Εἴτε--εἴτε (ἐάντε—ἐάντε)**. These conditional particles are like the Latin *sive — sive*. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:31, **εἴτε--εἴτε--εἴτε**. So 12:13; 14:7. We have **εἴτε** eight times in 3:22. In 14:7 it follows **ἤ —ἤ** in verse 6. For **ἐάντε—ἐάντε** see Ro. 14:8.

(iii) **Οὔτε--οὔτε (μήτε—μήτε)**. We have seen that there is nothing inherent in **οὔτε** to make it disjunctive. Cf. Jo. 4:11; 3 Jo. 10. It is simply **οὐ** and **τέ** (cf. **οὐ δέ**, a negative copulative conjunction. In Rev. 5:3 f. we have **οὐδέ--οὔτε** (cf. Gal. 1:12) and the next verse **οὐδείς—οὔτε**. In Ac. 24:12 f. we have **οὔτε --οὔτε--οὔτε--οὐδέ.** Cf. Lu. 20:35 f. In Jo. 5:37 f. note **οὔτε – οὔτε – καὶ οὐ**. In 1 Cor. 6:10 note **οὔτε--οὔτε--οὐ – οὐ**. In Jas. 3:12 cf. are after question. A good-example of the correlative **οὔτε--οὔτε** is 1 Cor. 3:7. In Ro. 8:38 f. **οὔτε** occurs ten times. In Ac. 23:8 we find **μή--μήτε—μήτε**. This is also just a copulative negative conjunction **(μή τε)**. In Mt. 5:34-36 we have **μή--μήτε—μήτε – μήτε—μήτε**. In 2 Th. 2:2 we have **μηδέ--μήτε—μήτε**. In Lu. 7:33 **μή--μήτε**, while in 9:3 **μηδέν** is followed by **μήτε** five times. There is often some confusion in the MSS between **μηδέ** and **μήτε, οὐδέ**, and **οὔτε**. Blass[1] rejects **οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι** in Mk. 14:68 (**א**BDL), but on whimsical grounds.

(d) *Inferential Conjunctions*. It is not easy to draw a distinction between "inferential" and "causal." There is no doubt about **ἄρα** and **οὖν**. These are inferential paratactic particles. What about **γάρ**? Monro[2] calls it causal. Kuhner-Gerth[3] treat all three as causal. Perhaps it is just as well to reserve the term "causal" for the hypotactic particles **ὅτι, ἐπεί**, etc. One has to be arbitrary sometimes. And even so these particles (**ἄρα**, **οὖν**, **γάρ**) were originally just transitional or explanatory in sense. Blass[4] calls them "consecutive" co-ordinate conjunctions.

(i) **Ἄρα**. The etymology seems to be clear, though not accepted by all scholars. The root **ἀρ--** (**ἀρ—αρ—ίσκω**, 'to fit') suits exactly.[5] It means then 'fittingly, accordingly.' Cf. our "articulate" (*ar-ticulus*). The word expresses some sort of correspondence between the sentences or clauses. It was postpositive in the ancient Greek, but in the N. T. it is not always so. Cf.

[1] Gr. of N.T. Gk., p. 265.
[2] Hom. Gk., p. 253.
[3] II, p. 317.
[4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 272.
[5] Cf. K.-G., II, p. 317 f., for the discussion of the theories. So Brug., Griech. Gr., p. 519.

Mt. 12:28; Ac. 17:27. It occurs some 50 times in the N. T., in Matthew, Mark, Luke, Acts, Paul's Epistles, and Hebrews. The original notion of mere correspondence is apparently preserved in Lu. 11:48, ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε, 'so ye are witnesses.' Cf. alsd Ac. 11:18. In Mk. 11:13; Ac. 17:27, εἰ ἄρα has the idea of 'if haply.' Klotz takes ἄρα to describe the unexpected and strange, something extrinsic, while Baumlein considers it a particle giving point to what is immediately and necessarily conclusive. Most of the N. T. instances seem to be clearly illative. Cf. Mt. 17:26 f.; Ro. 7:21. It has γε added three times (cf. Mt. 7:20; 17:26 f.; Ac. 17:27). Paul is specially fond of ἄρα οὖν (Ro. 5:18; 7:3, 25, etc.). Once he has ἄρα νῦν (Ro. 8:1). Ἄρα occurs also in the apodosis (Mt. 12:28; Gal. 2:21). We have μήτι ἄρα in a question in 2 Cor. 1:17.

(ii) Γάρ. There is no doubt as to the origin of this word. It is a compound of γέ and ἄρα and is always postpositive. It is called σύνδεσμος αἰτιολογικός, but it does not always give a reason. It may be merely explanatory. We have seen that ἄρα itself was originally just correspondence and then later inference. So then γέ can accent as an intensive particle either of these ideas. It is a mistake, therefore, to approach the study of γάρ with the theory that it is always or properly an illative, not to say causal, particle. It is best, in fact, to note the explanatory use first. Thayer wrongly calls the illative use the primary one. The word is common in all the larger books of the N. T. It is least common in the Gospel of John and in Revelation. In Matthew and Luke it is much more frequent in the discourses and is rare in the strict narrative. In Mark and John it is about half and half.[1] In general the N. T. use of γάρ is in accord with that of the classic period. The explanatory use is common in Homer.[2] The N. T. examples are numerous. Cf. Mt. 19:12; Mk. 5:42; 16:4; Lu. 11:30; 18:32. Here the explanation follows immediately. Sometimes the explanation comes in by way of appendix to the train of thought. So Mt. 4:18, ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς. Cf. also Mk. 2:15; Ro. 7:2. In questions we have good examples, particularly τί γάρ. So Mt. 27:23, τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν; Cf. Ro. 3:3. In Ac. 16: 37, οὐ γάρ ἀλλά, we have to resolve γάρ into its parts and make the phrase= 'not much, but.' In Jo. 9:30, ἐν τούτῳ γάρ, the man uses γάρ with fine scorn, 'why, just in this,' etc. In Jo. 19:6 it is hardly creditable to Pilate's common sense to take γάρ as illative. Cf. also Jo. 7:41; Ac. 19:35; Mt. 9:5. Γάρ sometimes

[1] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 102. [2] Monro, Hom. Gr., p. 253.

gives the major premise (Mt. 26:52), more often the minor premise (2 Pet. 1:15 f.), sometimes both (Jo. 3:19 f.). The purely illative use of **γάρ** is simple enough, though the force of the ground or reason naturally varies greatly. See Mt. 1:21, **αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει**; (6:24) **ἢ γάρ**; (Ro. 8:18) **λογίζομαι γάρ**. Paul begins every sentence with **γάρ** in Ro. 8:18-24. For **καὶ γάρ** see Ro. 11:1; 15:3. The precise relation between clauses or sentences is not set for by **γάρ**. That must be gathered from the context if possible. Cf. Jo. 4:44. Note **γάρ — ὅτι** in 1 Tim. 6:7.

(iii) **Οὖν**. The etymology of **οὖν** is unknown. Brugmann[1] thinks it probable that it is derived from ***ὁ ἐν** or **ὁ ὀν** (cf. **ὄντως, τῷ ὄντι**). The Ionic also has **ὦν** (so Lesbian, Doric, Boeotian). But, however that may be, it is important to note that the particle is not illative nor even consequential in Homer.[2] It is merely a transitional particle relating clauses or sentences loosely together by way of confirmation. It was common in this sense in Homer, though rare in fthe Attic writers save in **μὲν οὖν**. But it is very frequent in the Gospel of John as a mere transitional particle. In this Gospel it occurs about 200 times, nearly as frequent as all the rest of the N.T., though it is rare in the other Johannine writings. In John's Gospel, outside of 8 examples in the words of Jesus, the rest occur in the narrative portion.[3] Abbott[4] seems puzzled over the many non-illative instances of **οὖν** in John and suggests that "the writer perhaps had in view the objections of controversialists" But this is wholly gratuitous and needless in the light of a history of the particle. Probably a majority of the instances in John's Gospel are non-illative as in Homer, the original use of the word.[5] Luke preserves the literary Attic idiom by the common use of **μὲν οὖν** as in Ac. 15:3, 30, etc. But John boldly uses **οὖν** alone and needs no apology for doing so. It just carries along the narrative with no necessary thought of cause or result. It is, because of John's free use, one of the commonest particles in the N. T. and is oftener in the narrative books than in the epistles.[6] It is interesting in John to take a chapter and note when **οὖν** is merely continuative and when illative. Cf. ch. 11, for instance, verses 3, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 45, 47, 54, 56. So we start off again in 12:1 with **ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς**

[1] Griech. Gr., p.549.
[2] Monro, Hom, p. 255.
[3] Abbott, Joh. Gr., p. 165.
[4] Ib., p. 168.
[5] Cf. K.-G., II. p. 326. See also Weymouth, App. A, Rendering into Eng. of the Gk. Aorist and Perfect, 1894.
[6] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 272.

(continuative). It is the commonest connective between sentences in this Gospel. We moderns do not feel the same need for connecting-particles between independent sentences. The ancient Greeks loved to point out these delicate *nuances*. The interrogative **οὐκοῦν** occurs only in Jo. 18:37. A good instance of the purely illative use is in Mt. 3:8, **ποιήσατε οὖν καρπόν**. It is common in Paul's Epistles (Ro. 5:1; 6:12, etc.). Paul is fond also of **ἄρα οὖν** (Ro. 8:12) and of **τί οὖν** (6:1, 15; 7:7; 8:31, etc.). **Οὖν** is always postpositive.

2. HYPOTACTIC CONJUNCTIONS (**σύνδεσμοι ὑποτακτικοί**). The conjunctions used in the N. T. with subordinate clauses have been discussed and the constructions given in detail already. See Modes (Subordinate Clauses). The relative, temporal, comparative, local, causal, final and consecutive, apprehensive, conditional and declarative conjunctions make a goodly list. But it is not necessary to go over the same ground again. Most of these conjunctions, as previously shown, are of relative origin.[1] All are adverbs. It was necessary to treat at length the paratactic conjunctions which antedate the hypotactic in origin and were always exceedingly abundant in the vernacular. The hypotactic belong to the more highly developed speech, but one must not think that the hypotactic conjunctions regulate the construction of the sentence. They get their meaning from the sentence, not the sentence from the conjunction. The other view is a mechanical theory of language out of harmony with the historical growth of both mode and particle.[2] Hypotaxis grew out of parataxis. This paratactic origin survives in many ways. Cf., for instance, the relative at the beginning of sentences, as **ἐν οἷς** (Lu. 12:1). So also **ὅτι** in 1 Jo. 3:11 f. The Greek is particularly rich in its subordinating conjunctions as compared with the Sanskrit and the Hebrew. Each subordinate clause possesses a case-relation toward the principal sentence as substantive, adjective or adverb, so that the sentence expansion is on the lines of the word-relations. In general the disappearance of the ancient Greek conjunctions from the modern Greek is noticeable. **Ὁπότε (ὁπόταν), ἄχρις, μέχρις, εἰ, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ** "have entirely disappeared" (Thumb, *Handb*., p. 186). Thumb goes on with the story. We have **ὡς** in **σάν** and **ὥστε νά**= 'until.' **Ὅτι** is gone before **ποῦ** and **νά**, though **ὅπως** has revived.

[1] On the relative origin of conjs. like **ὅτι, ὅτε, ὅπως, ὡς, ἕως** see Baron, Le Pronom Relatif et la Conjonction, 1891, pp. 95 ff.

[2] Cf. Nilsson, Die Kausalsiitze im Griech. his Arist. See also Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1907, p. 354 f.

Νά has greatly extended its functions. Some survive greatly modified, like **ἀφοῦ, ἐάν, εἴτε--εἴτε, ἐνῷ, ἐπειδή, πρίν, ὡς ποῦ (ἕως), ποῦ (ὅπου), προτοῦ**, etc. The paratactic conjunctions are "pressed into service to form dependent clauses" as at the beginning. Parataxis turfs into hypotaxis.

VI. *Interjecitions.* Winer[1] considers interjections to be mere sounds, and so entirely outside of the sphere of syntax and indeed of graminar. But one[2] of the imperatival forms (**ἄγε**) is exclamatory in origin. Or is the interjection an imperative in origin? We this form still used as an interjection in Jas. 4:13. So also **ἴδε** in Jo. 1:29, **ἴδε ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ**. Cf. **δεῦρο** (Mk. 10:21), **δεῦτε** (Mt. 11:28). **Δεῦρο** is very vivid in Jo. 11:43, **Λάζαρε δεῦρο ἔξω**. **Ἰδού** is either used absolutely (Mt. 11:10) or with the nominative (Rev. 4:1) and is of frequent occurrence. **Καὶ ἰδού** is gold Greek, but its frequency reminds one of the Hebrew idiom. We have **ἔα** in Lu. 4:34. Once **οὐά** occurs (Mk. 15:29) with the vocative. So **οὐαί** is found with the vocative in Lu. 6:25. It is found absolutely in Rev. 18:10, 16, 19, **οὐαί, οὐαί**. Twice it is used with the accusative (Rev. 8:13; 12:12), as the object of thought. Usually the dative is found with **οὐαί** as in Mt. 11:21; Lu. 6:24 f.; 11:42. The word occurs mainly in Matthew and Like. Sometimes we **ὦ** have with the vocative as in Mt. 15:28, **ὦ γύναι**. So Ac. 13:10; Ro. 2:1; Gal. 3:1. There is usually some vehemence or urgency when **ὦ** is used. But not always. See Ac. 1:1; 18:14. In Ro. 10:15 **ὡς** is an exclamatory particle, as **τί** is in Lu. 12:49. It is not quite true, therefore, to say that interjections lie quite outside of grammar. Indeed, language may come from just these ejaculatory sounds, like "mama" with the babe. Tragedians[3] naturally use interjections more frequently. People differ greatly in the use of "Oh" and "Ah." The English audiences are fond of "Hear, hear," while the American crowds love to clap their hands or stamp their feet. Farrar[4] follows Scaliger and Destutt de Tracy in regarding them as words *par excellence* and as having high linguistic importance. Grammar can deal with emotion as well as with thought.

[1] W.-Th., p. 35 [2] Cf. Moulton, Prol., p. 171 f.
[3] Muller, De interjeetionum apud Sophoclern, Euripidem que Usu, 1885, p. 3.
[4] Gk. Synt., p. 201.

CHAPTER XXII

FIGURES OF SPEECH (**ΓΟΡΓΙΕΙΑ ΣΧΗΜΑΤΑ**)

I. **Rhetorical, not Grammatical.** Strictly speaking there is no need to go further in the discussion of the points of syntax. There are various matters that the grammars usually discuss because there is no N. T. rhetoric. These points belong to language in general, though in some of them the Greek has turns of its own. Each writer has, besides, his own style of thought and speech. See discussion in chapter IV. Under The Sentence we have a ready discussed the ellipsis (of subject, predicate or copula), matters of concord, apposition, the position of words (emphasis, euphony, rhythm, poetry, prolepsis, ὕστερον πρότερον, postpositive wards, hyperbaton, order of clauses), simple and compound sentences, connection between words (polysyndeton and asyndeton), connection between clauses and sentences (paratactic and hypotactic) and asyndeton again, running and periodic style, parenthesis, anacoluthon, *oratio variata,* connection between paragraphs. These matters call for no further comment. They could have been treated at this point, but they seemed rather to belong to the discussion of sentences in a more vital way than the remaining rhetorical figures. For attraction and incorporation see Cases and Relative Pronouns. The points now to be discussed have not so much to do with the orderly arrangement (σύνθεσις)[1] as with the expression and the thought.

II. **Style in the N. T.** The characteristics of the N. T. writers received treatment in chapter IV. The precise question here is whether the writers of the N. T. show any marks of rhetorical study. We have seen already (The Sentence, Rhythm) that the scholars are divided into two camps on this subject. Blass[2] **(**but not Debrunner) argues that Paul's writings and the Epistle to the Hebrews show the influence of the rules of rhythm of the literary prose of Asia (Asianism) and Rome (Pausanias, Cicero,

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 295.
[2] Die Rhythmen der asianischen and romischen Kunstprosa, 1905.

Curtius, Apuleius). Deissmann[1] will have none of it. It is a pretty quarrel and, as usual, there is truth in both views. One must get his bearings. We can all agree with Blass[2] at once that the N.T. writers are not to be compared on this point with the literary masters of Attic prose, but with writers like Polybius. We are surely of to look for the antithetic style of the Attic orators (Isocrates, Lysias, Demosthenes).[3] If there is aesthetic beauty in 1 Cor. 13 or Heb. 11, it may be the natural aesthetic of Homer's rhapsodies, not the artificialities of Isocrates. Blass[4] admits the poverty of the Oriental languages in the matter of periods and particles and does not claim that the N. T. writers rose above the 0. T. or rose to the level of Plato. And yet Norden in his *Antike Kunstprosa* claims that in his best diction Paul rises to the height of Plato in the Phaedrus. Wilamowitz-Mollendorff likewise calls Paul "a classic of Hellenism." Sir W. M. Ramsay is a stout advocate for the real Hellenic influence on Paul's life.[5] But Ramsay scouts the word "rhetoric" in connection with Paul: "I can hardly imagine that one who had ever experienced the spell of Paul could use the word rhetoric about the two examples which he mentions from First Corinthians, and Romans."[6] There was in Paul's time artificial rhetoric with which Paul evilently had no connection, nor did any of the writers of the N. T. One cannot believe that Paul, for instance, studied at one of the famous schools of rhetoric nor that he studied the writings of the current rhetoricians. This much may be freely admitted about all of the N. T. writers, who wrote in the language the people, not of the schools. Deissmann correctly say: "The history of Christianity, with all its wealth of incident, has been treated much too often as the history of the Christian literary upper class, the history of theologians and ecclesiastics, schools, councils and parties, whereas Christianity itself has often been most truly alive in quarters remote

[1] Theol. Lit., 1906, p. 434; The Expositor, 1908, p. 74. See also his St. Paul (1912).

[2] Hermeneutik und Kritik, 1S02, p. 198. The true grammarian is but too willing to see the ether point of view. Cf. Gildersl., Am. Jour. of Philol., 1908, p. 266.

[3] Hahne, Zur sprachl. Asthetik der Griech., 1896, p. 4.

[4] Hermeneutik und Kritik, p. 19S.

[5] Cf. the controversy between him and Principal Garvie in The Expositor for 1911 anent Garvie's book, Studies of Paul and His Gospel (1911).

[6] The Expositor, Aug., 1911, p. 157.

[7] Light from the Ancient East, p. 404.

fro councils." This is all pre-eminently true and we must never forget that Jesus was a carpenter, John a fisherman and Paul a tentmaker. And yet Deissmann[1] himself will say of John: "St. John has no liking for progress along an unending straight road; he loves the circling flight, like his symbol, the eagle. There is something hovering and brooding about his production; repetitions are in no wise abnormal with him, but the marks of a contemplation which he cherishes as a precious inheritance from St. Paul and further intensifies." There is a perfection of form in the Parables of Jesus that surpasses all the rules of the grammarians and rhetoricians. The eagle flight of John makes the cawing of the syntactical crows pitiful. The passion of Paul broke through all the traditional forms of speech. He lacked the punctilious refinements[2] of the Stoic rhetoricians, but he had the cyclonic power of Demosthenes and the elevation of Plato. Even Blass[3] sees that "the studied employment of the so-called Gorgian assonances is necessarily foreign to the style of the N. T., all the more because they were comparatively foreign to the whole period; accident, however, of course produces occasional instances of them, and the writer often did not decline to make use of any that suggested themselves." This would seem modest enough to satisfy Deissmann. In particular Blass[4] notes "the absence of rhetorical artifice in the Johannine speeches." He finds little of that nature in Mark and Luke. "But in Matthew there really is same artistic sense of style," but it is "mainly drawn from Hebrew and not from Greek." The many quotations in this Gospel show a close use of the LXX and the Hebrew 0. T. And yet, on the whole, the Greek runs smoothly enough. Konig has a valuable article on "Style of Scripture" in the Extra Volume of Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, but he deals mainly with the 0. T. There is in truth little that is distinctive in the style of the N.T. apart from the naturalness, simplicity, elevation and pass on of the writers. It is only in the Epistle to the Hebrews that Blass[5] finds "the care and dexterity of an artistic writer" as shown by his occasional avoidance of hiatus, but even here Blass has to strain a point to make it stick. Bultmann[6] draws a definite parallel between the style of Paul and the Cynic-Stoic

[1] Light from the Anc. East, p. 410.
[2] J. Weiss, Beitr. zur paulinischen Rhetorik, 1897, p. 168.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 298.
[4] Ib., p. 302. [5] Ib., p. 296.
[6] Der Stil der paulinische Predigt and die kynisch-stoische Diatribe, 1910.

Diatribe and Makes his point, but even so one wonders if after all Paul uses question and answer so skilfully by reason of definite study of the subject or because of his dialectical training as a rabbi and his native genius in such matters. It is *per se*, however, entirely possible that Paul knew the common Stoic dialectic also as he did the tenets of current Stoicism (cf. Paul's work in Athens). The examples of figures of speech in the N. T. are due to the nature of speech in general, to the occasional passion[1] of the writer, to the play of his fancy, to unconscious expression of genius, to mere accident. We must not make the mistake of rating men like Luke, Paul, James and the author of Hebrews as boorish and unintellectual. They lived in an age of great culture and they were saturated with the noblest ideas that ever filled the human brain. As men of genius they were bound to respond to such a situation. They do show a distinct literary flavour as Heinrici[2] has so well shown. In 1 Cor. 13 we have finish of form and thought. Even John, called ἀγράμματος καὶ ἰδιώτης (Ac. 4:13), rose to the highest planes of thought in his Gospel. Deissmann in his *St. Paul* goes to the extreme of making Paul a mere man of affairs devoid of theological culture, — an untenable position in view of Acts and Paul's Epistles when he says: "His place is with Amos, the herdsman of Tekoa, and Tersteegen, the ribbon-weaver of Mulheim" (p. 6). We may brush aside the artificial rules of Gorgias as too studied efforts for the N. T. Indeed, the men of the time had larger refused to follow the lead of Gorgias of Sicily, though his name clung to the figures of speech. His mannerisms were not free from affectation and pedantry.[3] The Attic orators of the fourth century B.C. had their own rules for easy and flexible practical speech. The writers and speakers of the later time modified these in their own way. We are not concerned here to follow Blass[4] in his effort to prove that Paul and the writer of Hebrews were students of the current rhetoricians. This we fail to see, but we do see that the language of the N. T. was a living organism and exhibits many of the peculiarities of human speech which the rhetoricians have discussed. For convenience, therefore, we adopt their terminology.

[1] Norden (Die ant. Kunstprosa, Bd. II, p. 508) speaks of Paul's use of rhetorical figures as die to his "Ton." Heinrici (Zum Hellen. d. Paulus, Komm. zu II Kor.) sees Paul's "Eigenart."

[2] Der literarische Charakter d. neut. Schriften, 1908.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 295.

[4] Die Rhythmen der asianischen and romischen Kunstprosa, 1905.

III. **Figures of Idea or Thought** (σχήματα διανοίας). Blass[1] observes that these figures of thought belong more to the later peiod of Attic oratory. Some of them are distinctly rhetorical in character, as the *rhetorical question* of which Paul makes abundant use, especially in the Epistle to the Romans. Blass[2] makes a good critique of such questions as showing dialectical liveliness and perspicuity, as in Ro. 3:1 **τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου**; (4:10) **πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ**; This is quite like the diatribe in Epictetus and other **κοινή** writers (Radermacher, *N. T. Gr.*, p. 182). Cf. 1 Cor. 7:18 ff. Other questions are quite emotional, as in 2 Cor. 11:22. In Ro. 8:31-35 we have a "brilliant oratorical passage," worthy of any orator in the world. There are others almost equal to it, Ro. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11; 1 Cor. 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15; 2 Cor. 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13. Here we have oratory of the highest kind with the soul all ablaze with great ideas. The words respond to this high environment and are all aglow with beauty and light. Certainly the Epistle to Hebrews is oratory of the highest order, as are the addresses in Acts. Blass[3] thinks that Luke is distinctly "unprofessional (*idiotisch*)" in his manner of presenting the great speeches in Acts, **ἰδιωτικὴ φράσις**, not **τεχνικὴ φράσις**. That is true, but one would have a martinet spirit to cavil at the word eloquence here. The discourses of Jesus in Matthew, Luke and John are above all praise in content and spirit. One cannot think that Jesus was a technical student of rhetoric, but he sang with the woodrobin's note, and that far surpasses the highest achievement of the best trained voice whose highest praise is that she approaches the woodrobin or the nightingale. There is perfection of form in the thoughts of Jesus whether we turn to the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, the Parables in Luke 15, or the Discourses in the Upper Room and On the Way to Gethsemane in John 14-17. The style of the reporters does not conceal the consummate skill of Christ as the "Master Preacher" of the ages.

There is undoubted use of *irony* (**εἰρωνεία**) in the N. T. We see it in the words of Jesus. See the high scorn in **καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν** (Mt. 23:32). This is the correct text, not **πληρώσετε**. So also **καλῶς ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ** (Mk. 7:9) and **ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἰερουσαλήμ** (Lu. 13:33).

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 304.

[2] Ib. The "Terminology of Grammar" is not fixed like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Cf. Rep. of the Joint Com. on Gr. Terminol., 1911.

[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 305.

There is more of it in Paul's writings. Cf. 1 Cor. 4: 8; 2 Cor. 11:19 f.; 12:13; Ro. 11:20. There was never a more nimble mind than that of Paul, and he knew how to adapt himself to every mood of his readers or hearers without any sacrifice of principle. It was no declaimer's tricks, but love for the souls of men that made him become all things to all men (1 Cor. 9:22). He could change his tone because he loved the Galatians even when they had been led astray (Gal. 4:20). The rhetoricians call it *prodiorthosis*, as in 2 Cor. 11:21, **ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ** λέγω (cf. also 11: 1f., 16 f., 23) and *epidiorthosis* as in Ro. 3:5, **κατὰ ἄνθρωπον** λέγω. Cf. also 1 Cor. **7**:6; 12:11; Ro. 8:34; Gal. 4:9. So Paul uses *paraleipsis*, as 2 Cor. 9:4, **μή πως καταισχυνθῶμεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα μὴ** λέγωμεν **ὑμεῖς**, instead of **μή ποτε καταισχυνθῆτε**. As Blass[1] suggests, Paul's innate celicacy of feeling makes him take the reproach on himself. Cf. also Phil. 19, **ἵνα μὴ** λέγω **ὅτι καὶ σεαυτόν μοι προσοφείλεις**. So in Ro. 7:4 Paul says **καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ** frather than bluntly assert **καὶ ὁ νόμος ἀπέθανεν** (or **ἐθανατώθη**). There is sometimes of parallelism (*heterogeneous structure*). Cf. 1 Jo. 2:2, **ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ** περὶ **τῶν ἡμετέρων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου**, instead of **τῶν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου**. also Ph. 2:22, **πατρί--σὺν ἐμοί**. Cf. **περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμούς** in Mk. 12:38 f., **τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται** in 2 Jo. 2.

V. **Figures of Expression** (**σχήματα λέξεως**). What Winer[2] calls "Broken and Heterogeneous Structure" (anacoluthon, *oratio varicaata*) has had sufficient discussion under The Sentence. So as to asyndeton. There remain a number of other points which may be grouped for convenience.

(a) PARALLELS AND CONTRASTS (*Parallelismus membrorum*). There are many illustrations of this idiom in the N. T., both in the Gospels and, Epistles. The 0. T. is full of such words and phrases, particularly in the Psalms. One who read these hymns much would naturally have his eye and ear trained to this form of rhythm. We do not need to see conscious effort at poetry, though in 1 Tin. 3:16 we probably have a fragment of an early Christian hymn. The Hebrew *parallelism* is manifest in Lu. 1: 42-45 (the song of Elizabeth), 46-56 (the song of Mary), and 68-79 (the son, of Zacharias), 2 : 29-32 (the song of Simeon). One does not have to go to the Greek rhetoricians. The spirit of rhapsody here shown is due to the Spirit of God moving the heart and stirring the highest impulses of the soul. There are other examples of primitive Christian song in the N. T., as in Eph. 5:

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 304. [2] W.-Th., p. 566.

14; Jude 24 f.; Rev. 5:12-14, and often in this book. There is the perfection of poetic form in the noble prose in 1 Cor. 13; 15: 54-7; Col. 1:10-12. One hesitates to think that this use of antithesis or parallelism is artificial even if it is conscious. This parallelism may be *synonymous* (Mt. 10:26; Jo. 1:17; Ro. 11:33) or *antithetic* (Jo. 3:6; Ro. 2:7).[1] There are also examples of *Chiasm* or *Reverted Parallelism* (from the letter X) as in Philemon 5, **τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις εἰς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους**. So Mt. 7:6; Ph. 1:15 f.; 1 Th. 5:6; Ph. 3:10.[2] I doubt very much if Paul was at all conscious of the stilted parallelism that Blass[3] sees in 1 Cor. 1:25 with *anaphora* (the first words alike) as in **οὐ πολλοί--οὐ πολοί**, or *antistrophe* (the last words alike) as in **τοῦ θεοῦ—τοῦ θεοῦ--τῶν ἀνθρώπων—τῶν ἀνθρώπων**, or *symploce* (both alike) as in **ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς ἵνα καταισχύνῃ, ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς ἵνα καταισχύνῃ**. Cf. Heb. 2:16. The manuscripts vary a deal in 1 Cor. 1:25 ff., and Blass has to juggle the text in order to make it come out in "rounded periods of three sections." What if this finesse was praised by dilettante rhetoricians when they found it in Demosthenes or Cicero? Surely Paul was not a "stylist" of the fashion of Cicero nor even of Demosthenes. Perhaps no orator "would have regarded the eloquence of this passage with other feelings than those of the highest admiration." Doubtless so, but for the passion and force, not for the mere word-play. Just so the three poetical quotations (Ac. 17:28; 1 Cor. 15:33; Tit. 1:12) do not justify straining after accidental lines in Ac. 23:5; Jas. 1:17; Heb. 12:12 f., or elsewhere. Blass[4] is so fond of finding poetic parallelism in the Gospels that he actually makes it tilt the scales against the best manuscripts in some passages as in Mt. 5:45; 7:13 f.; 25:35. This seems much like *eisegesis*.

(b) CONTRASTS IN WORDS. There is the solemn repetition of a word with powerful effect (the *epanadiplosis* of the rhetoricians), but Blass does not claim this as a rhetorical device in the N. T. It is natural to strong emotion. Cf. **ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα** (Lu. 8:24); **κύριε κύριε** (Mt. 25:11); **σταύρωσον σταύρωσον** (Jo. 19:6); Rev. 18:2, **ἔπεσεν ἔπεσεν**. See Ph. 3:2. Cf. also the two hours of shouting in Ac. 19:34. *Climax* is as old as Homer. This is again a perfectly natural method of emphasis. Cf. the links in the list of virtues in 2 Pet. 1:5-7. See also Ro. 5:3-5; 10:14. There is a cumulative force in the repetition. *Per contra, zeugma* puts together

[1] W.-Th., p. 639.
[2] Green, Handb. to N. T. Gk., p. 355.
[3] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 300 f.
[4] Ib., p. 302.

words that do not properly go together, as in 1 Cor. 3:2, **γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα.** So also Lu. 1:64, **ἀνεῴχθη τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ**. Cf. 1 Tim. 4:3. This construction is usually explained as elliptical, one verb (as above) being used where two are necessary for the full statement. Kuhner-Gerth[1] treat it as a species of *brachylogy*. The use of *synonyms* is not absent in the N. T., though not in the richness of the classic idiom. Cf. Lu. 8:15, **ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ**, and the use of **ἀγαπάω** and **φιλέω** side by side in Jo. 21:15-17 where Peter makes a point of using **φιλέω**. See chapter on Formation of Words.[2] The play on words takes many turns. The onomatopoetic words like **γογγύζω** (cf. our "murmur ") are very simple. Cf. Jo. 6:41. Examples of *initial alliteration* occur, like **πονηρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ** (Ro. 1: 29); **ὑβριστάς, ὑπερηφάνους** (1:30); **ἀπειθεῖς, ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀνελεήμονας** (1:30 f.). It is hard to tell whether this is conscious or unconscious. There are also instances of *paronomasia* and *annominatio. Paronomasia* is rather loosely applied in the books. Winer[3] uses it only for words of *similar sound,* while Blass[4] confines it to the recurrence of the same word or word-stem, like **κακοὺς κακῶς** (Mt. 21:41); **ἐν παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν** (2 Cor. 9:8); **ὁ νόμος νομίμως** (1 Tim. 1:8), and uses *parechesis* for different words of similar sound, like **λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί** (Lu. 21:11); **ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν** (Heb. 5:8); **φθόνου φόνου** Ro. 1:29); **ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους** (1:31). See also 2 Cor. 10:12; Ro. 11:17. The point is a fine one and need not be pressed. But *annominatio* deals with the *sense* as well as the sound. Thus **Πέτρος** and **πέτρα** in Mt. 16:18; **γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις** (Ac. 8:30); **ὑπερφρονεῖν—φρονεῖν --σωφρονεῖν** (Ro. 12:3); **μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους** (2 Th. 3:11). Cf. also Mt. 27:9; Lu. 9:60; Ac. 23 :3; 2 Cor. 3:2; 1 Cor. 11:29 ff.; Ph. 3:2 f.; 2 Cor. 4:8 f.; Ro. 1:20; 5: 19; 12:15; Eph. 4:1. Even so there is a certain amount of overlapping in the two figures. The ancients did not smile because a pun was made. It was merely a neat turn of speech and was very common. So Jesus says to Thomas, **μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός** (Jo. 20:27).

(c) CONTRACTION AND EXPANSION. It is difficult to draw lines between groups among these figures of speech. *Zeugma*, as we have seen, can very well come in here as a sort of *ellipsis*. The ellipsis of subject or predicate came up for discussion under

[1] I II, p. 570.
[2] Cf. Trench, N. T. Synonyms; Heine, Synonymik d. neut. Griech.
[3] W.-Th., p. 636. [4] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 298.

The Sentence. But a few more words are needed here. Cf. **πιστὸς ὁ θεός** (2 Cor. 1:18); **ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς** (Ph. 4:5) as samples of the absence of the copula. So Jo. 14 : 11; Ac. 19 :28, 34; 2 Cor. 11:6. It is not always clear what verb is to be supplied, though **εἰμί** and **γίνομαι** are the most common. Cf. **φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν,** Ac. 10:15; **οὐκ ἐν** λόγῳ **ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει**, 1 Cor. 4:20. Cf. Jo. 21:21; 1 Cor. 5:12. Usually the context makes clear what verb is wanting, as in Mt. 27:25; Ac. 18:6; Ro. 4:9; 5:18; 2 Cor. 9:7; Gal. 2:9; Rev. 1:4. In 2 Cor. 8:15 the participle **ἔχων** must be supplied with **ὁ** according to a common Greek idiom. Cf. also Ro. 13:7, **τῷ τὸν φόρον**, where Winer[1] supplies **ἀποδιδόναι κελεύοντι**. Cf. also 1 Cor. 4: 6. It is easy to supply **ὁ θεός** in passages like Heb. 1:7 λέγει, 4:3 **εἴρηκε**. The context supplies the noun in a case like Ac. 21:31, **ζητούτων τε αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι**. Cf. Jo. 20:2, **ἦραν τὸ κύριον** ('people took away'). In Ac. 21:16, **συνῆλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν**, supply **τινές** as in Lu. 11:49, **τινάς**. Many verbs are considered clear enough without the object. So **διάγω** (sc. **βίον**) in Tit. 3:3; **προσέχω** (sc. **νοῦν**) in Lu. 17:3, **ἐπέχω** in 14:7, **ἐνέχω** (sc. **χόλον**) in Mk. 6:19; **συμβάλλω** (sc. **λόγους**) as in Ac. 4:15 (cf. Lu. 24:17, **ἀντιβάλλετε** with object); **συλλαμβάνω** in Lu. 1:31. It is unnecessary (see Adjectives) to recount again the many instances of the adjective without a substantive where the gender and number and context make it clear. A few common examples suffice. For the absence of **ἡμέρα** note **τῇ τρίτῃ** (Lu. 13:32); **ἡ αὔριον** (Mt. 6:34); **τῆς σήμερον** (Mt. 27:8); **τῇ ἐχομένῃ** (Lu. 13:33); **τῇ ἐπιούσῃ** (Ac. 16:11); **ἡ ἑξῆς** (21:1); **τῇ ἑτέρᾳ** (Ac. 20:15). **Γῆ** is easily supplied in Mt. 23:15, **ἡ ξηρά**, and in Heb. 11:26, **ἐν Αἰγύπτου.** Supply **γλῶσσα** in Rev. 9:11, **ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ**. So with **ὁδός** in Lu. 5:19, **ποίας**; 19:4, **ἐκείνης**. We miss **ἱμάτιον** in Jo. 20:12, **ἐν λευκοῖς**, and **ὕδωρ** in Mt. 10:42, **ψυχρόν**. So with **χείρ** in Mt. 6: 3, **ἡ δεξιά, ἡ ἀριστερά** and **χώρα** in Lu. 17:24, **ἐκ τῆς –εἰς τήν**. Much more serious is the ellipsis in Mt. 26:5, and Gal. 5:13, where the context must supply both verb and subject. Cf. also **οὐχ ὅτι --- ἀλλ'** in Jo. 7:22. In a case like 2 Th. 2:3 f., **ὅτι ἐάν—ὅτι,** there is no apodosis expressed. These are but samples of the ellipses common to Greek (cf. **εἰ δὲ μή**) as to all languages more or less. It is not worth while to try to bring under this rhetorical figure all the lapses and turns of style in each writer. Cf. the absence of the verb with **ἵνα** in 1 Cor. 1:31, with **τὸ μή** in 4:6, with **ἕν δέ** in Ph. 3:13, with **τοῦτο δέ** in 2 Cor. 9:6, with **ἵνα**

[1] W.-Th., p. 590.

again in Gal. 2: 9. Cf. also Mk. 14:29; 1 Cor. 10:24; 2 Cor. 5:13.

Aposiopesis stands to itself since it is a conscious suppression of part of a sentence under the influence of a strong emotion like anger, fear, pity. Curiously enough Blass,[1] who sees so many rhetorical tropes in the N. T., denies that any instances of aposiopesis occur in the N. T. I do not consider his objections well founded. We may dismiss Mk.7:11 and Lu. 22:42 because of the true text (see W. H.), and need not quibble over **ὅρα μή** in. Rev. 22:9. We may agree with Winer[2] that we have simply anacolutha in 2 Th. 2:3 ff. But we have left others like Mk. 11:32, **ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;--ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον**. See also Lu. 13:9, **κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπόν εἰς τὸ μέλλον—εἰ δέ μήγε, ἐκκόψεις αυτήν.** So again 19:42, **εἰ ἔγνως καὶ σύ.** So Jo. 6:62, **ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον**; Then again Ac. 23:9, **εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος--**. It is possible to regard Ro. 7:24 as aposiopesis. What differentiates these passages from ellipses or abbreviations of other clauses (cf. Mt. 25: 14; Mk. 13:34; 2 Cor. 3:13) is the passion. One can almost see the gesture and the flash of the eye in aposiopesis.

We need not follow minutely the various sorts of *breviloquence* or *brachylogy* that are possible. Thought moves more rapidly than expression and the words often crowd together in a compressed way that may be not only terse, but at first obscure. A good illustration occurs in Mt. 9:6, **ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας—τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ Ἔγειρε ἆρόν σου τὴν κλίνην, κτλ**. Here the Evangelist has inserted **τότε λέγει τῷ παρ**. before the conclusion to make it clearer. The same thing is done in the parallel passages in Mk. 2:10; Lu. 5:24 (an incidental argument for a common document for this paragraph). Cf. also Mk. 14:49, **ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί**. So Jo. 13:18; 15:25. Cf. Ac. 1:1, where **ἤρξατο** implies **καὶ διετέλει** before **ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας, κτλ**. See a similar use of **ἀρξάμενος** in Mt. 20:8, Lu. 23:5. A case like Lu. 24:47, **ἀρξάμενοι**, amounts to anacoluthon or the use of the participle as a principal verb. Cf. also **καθαρίζων** in Mk. 7:19. Various examples of ellipsis-like zeugma are also instances of brachylogy. No clear line of distinction appears. So in comparisons we sometimes have to fill out the sense. Cf. Rev. 13:11, **εἶχε κέρατα δύο ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ**, i.e. **κέρασιν ἀρνίου**. Cf. 1 Jo. 3:11 f.; 2 Pet. 2:1. Other instances of brachylogy may be seen in Lu. 4:26 f.; Jo.

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 294. [2] W.-Th., p. 600.

5:36; 15:11; Ac. 27:22; Gal. 2:16. The so-called *constructio praegnans* belongs here also. Cf. 2 Tim. 4:18, **σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν**, though **εἰς** of itself does not mean 'into.' But note **διασώσωσι πρὸς Φήλικα** (Ac. 23:24) where the notion is that of taking to Felix and so saving Paul. Cf. also **ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν** (Mk. 10:46). See also Lu. 11:13 **ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ**, (Col. 4:16) **τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικίας**. Blass[1] distinguishes brachylogy from ellipsis in that brachylogy affects the thought rather than the grammatical form, but both ideas are usually present. Cf. Ro. 11:18. It would be wearisome to endeavour to put a name or tag upon every structure that seems defective from the standpoint of formal grammar or rhetoric. "It will be seen that many of them are due to that agility and acuteness of the Greek intellect which enables the Hellene or Hellenist readily to sacrifice the grammar of a sentence to its logic, or in other words its form to its meaning. Hence arose the many forms of the *sense-figure* (**σχῆμα πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον**, *constructio ad sensum*)."[2] We have seen illustrations of this construction **κατὰ σύνεσιν** under Concord (The Sentence) and only a few further are called for here. Indeed, this section is largely an illustration of this principle. In Jo. 15:6 **αὐτά** refers to **τὸ κλῆμα**; in Ac. 17:16 **αὐτοῦ** points to Christ, who has not been mentioned; in 7: 24, **τὸν Αἰγύπτιον**, though no Egyptian had been mentioned; in 1 Cor. 7:36, **γαμείτωσαν**, the subject being drawn from the context (the two young people). Winer[3] was glad to note a decline in emphasis on these overrefinements in his day. These supposed abnormalities were called *hypallage*. From the present standpoint Winer himself yielded entirely too much to the very thing that he condemned. What is the use in figuring out the various ways that Paul could have expressed himself in 2 Cor. 3:7, for instance? The papyri have taught us to be chary about charging John with being ungrammatical in **πλήρης χάριτος** (Jo. 1:14). These matters simply show that the N. T. writers used a live language and were not automata.[4] It is doubtless true that no other writer used repetition of word and phrase as did the author of the Fourth Gospel, but no one will deny that he did it with consummate skill and marvellous vividness and dramatic power.[5]

[1] Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 294.

[2] Farrar, Gk. Synt., p. 202.

[3] W.-Th., p. 634.

[4] Cf. Emil Heinrich, Die sogenannte polare Ausdrucksweise im Griech., 1899, p. 26.

[5] Cf. Abbott, Joh. Gr., pp. 401-465.

There are many instances of *pleonasm* in the N. T. as in all vernacular speech. It is of many sorts. The same word may be repeated for clearness as in **ὑμᾶς – ὑμᾶς** (Col. 2:13); **σπούδασον—ταχέως** (2 Tim. 4:9). This redundancy is usually due to the custom of the language with no thought of the repetition,[1] as in **ἧς --αὐτῆς** (Mk. 7:25); **περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον** (2 Cor. 7:13); **οὐ —μή** (Ac. 20:20, 27); **ἐκτὸς εἰ μή** (1 Cor. 15:2); **ἀπεκρίθη λέγων** (Mk. 15:9); **ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου** (Ac. 8:26); **τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας** like our "church-house" (Lu. 22:11); **ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο** (Jo. 11:7); **προδραμὼν ἔμπροσθεν** (Lu. 19:4); **ἐξάγειν ἔξω** Rec. (24:50); **ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν** (Ac. 2:30); **ἀρνούμενος ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν** (1 Jo. 2:22); **πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου** (Ac. 10:15), etc. Cf. also the cognate accusative. Redundances like these examples are not linguistic vices. They seem pleonastic to the technical student who is unwilling to allow for the growth of the language. Emphatic words have the constant tendency to become less so and to need re-enforcement. This love of emphasis in the N. T. is natural to conversation and to a certain extent has the Oriental richness and wealth of colour.[2] We see the same thing in. the 0. T. and in the papyri letters. It is a sign of life and in particular life in the East. These vivid details give life and beauty to the picture. Cf. **ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα** (Mt. 26:51); **ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει** (Jo. 21:13); **γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν** (Ac. 15:23); **ὡμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο** (Jo. 1:20). *Epexegetical* clauses arc common. Cf. **τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν** (Ro. 12:1), in apposition with the infinitive clause, **παραστῆσαι, κτλ**. So 1 Cor. 7:26, **ὅτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ**, as an expansion of **τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν**. In Jo. 7:35 **ὅτι** is probably causal.

We meet *hyperbole* in Jo. 21:25, **οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρήσειν τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία**. Cf. also Mt. 13:32. *Litotes* is common enough, as in Ac. 1:5, **οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας**; 14: 28, **χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον**. See also 15:2; 19:11, 23 f.; 21:39; 27: 14, 20; 28:2. *Meiosis* is, of course, only a species of *hyperbole* by understatement. Cf. Paul's use[3] of it in 1 Th. 2:15; 2 Th. 3:2, 7. We may put together two remarks of Milligan.[4] "St. Paul had evidently not the pen of a ready writer, and when he had once found an expression suited to his purpose found it very difficult to vary it." "St. Paul had evidently that highest gift of a great writer, the instinctive feeling for the right word, and even when writing, as he does here, in his most 'normal

[1] Blass, Gr. of N. T. Gk., p. 295.
[2] Cf. A. J. Wilson, Emphasis in the N. T., Jour. of Theol. Stu., VIII, pp. 75
[3] Milligan, Comm. on. Thess. Epistles, p. lvii. [4] Ib., p. lvi f.

style, and with an almost complete absence of the rhetorical figures, so largely practised in his day, he does not hesitate to avail himself of the more popular methods of adding point or emphasis to what he wants to say." There is no necessary inconsistency in these two statements. Add another from Milligan[1] which will help to reconcile them. "We readily recognise that the arresting charm of the Apostle's style is principally due to 'the man behind,' and that the highest form of all eloquence, 'the rhetoric of the heart,' is speaking to us." So it is with all the N. T. writers more or less. They are men of genius, of varying degrees of culture, and men of love for Christ and man. Language with these men is not an end in itself. They do not say "pretty" things and toy with them. As the words of Jesus are spirit and life, for they throb and pulse to-day (Jo. 6:63), so the Letters of Paul are βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί, as even his enemies admit (2 Cor. 10: 10). The Judaizers at Corinth did not discuss the rhetorical niceties of these Letters. They felt the power of the ideas in them even when they resisted Paul's authority. Paul used tropes,[2] but he smote hearts with them and did not merely tickle the fancy of the lovers of sophistry.[3] Paul denied that he spoke ἐν πιθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, though his words seem to the lover of Christ to be full of the highest appeal to the soul of man. One must discount this disclaimer not merely by Paul's natural modesty, but by contrast with the Corinthian's conception of πιθός. They loved the rhetorical flights of the artificial orators of the time.

(d) METAPHORS AND SIMILAR TROPES. We need not tarry over antiphrasis, ambiguity, hendiadys, hypokorisma, oxymoron, periphrasis, polyptoton, syllepsis, and the hundred and one distinctions in verbal anatomy. Most of it is the rattle of dry bones and the joy of dissection is gone. We may pause over *Metaphor* **(μεταφορά)**, since little progress could be made in speech without the picture of the literal and physical carried over to the moral and spiritual as in ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός (Jo. 10:11). Cf. the greatest metaphor in the N. T., Paul's use of σῶμα for the church (Eph. 1:22 f.). The *Simile* is just a bit more formal, as is seen in the use of ὅμοιος in Mt. 13:52, πᾶς γραμματεὺς ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ. *Parables* are but special forms of the metaphor or simile and form the most characteristic feature of the teaching of Jesus in so far as form is concerned. The parable **(παραβολή)**

[1] Comm. on Thess. Epistles, p. lvi f.
[2] Cf. Heinrici, Zum Hellen. des Paulus, Komm. zu 2 Igor.
[3] 1 Cor. 2 : 4.

draws a comparison between the natural and the moral or implies it. It may be a crisp proverb (Lu: 4:23) or a narrative illustration of much length, as in the Sower (Mt. 13). The Allegory (ἀλληγορία) is a parable of a special sort that calls for no explanation, a speaking parable (cf. the Good Shepherd in Jo. 10 and the Prodigal Son in Lu. 15). *Metonymy* (μετωνυμία) and *Synecdoche* (συνεκδοχή) are so much matters of exegesis that they must be passed by without further comment.

It is certain that no words known to man are comparable in value with those contained in the N. T. Despite all the variety of diction on the part of the reporters, probably partly because of this very fact, the words of Jesus still fascinate the mind and win men to God as of old. **Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους,** ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν 7:28 f.). It is the constant peril of scribes and grammarians[1] to strain out the gnat and to swallow the camel. I may have fallen a victim, like the rest, but at least I may be permitted to say at the end of the long road which I have travelled for so many years, that I joyfully recognise that grammar is nothing unless it reveals the thought and emotion hidden in language. It is just because Jesus is greater than Socrates and Plato and all the Greek thinkers and poets that we care so much what Luke and Paul and John have to tell about him. Plato and Xenophon hold us because of their own message as well as because they are the interpreters of Socrates. It matters not if Jesus spoke chiefly in the Aramaic. The spirit and heart of his message are enshrined in the Greek of the N. T. and interpreted for us in living speech by men of the people whose very diction is now speaking to us again from the rubbish-heaps of Egypt. The papyri and the ostraca tell the story of struggle on the part of the very class of people who first responded to the appeal of Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 1: 26 ff.). Christianity is not buried in a book. It existed before the N. T. was written. It made the N. T. It is just because Christianity is of the great democracy that it is able to make universal appeal to all ages and all lands and all classes. The chief treasure of the Greek tongue is the N. T. No toil is too great if by means of it men are enabled to understand more exactly the

[1] Gildersl. is scornful of those who fear "that anthropology is going to invade the sacrosanct realm of syntax, which belongs, strictly speaking, to the microtomists and statisticians — otherwise known as Dead Sea Apes." Am. Jour. of Philol., 1907, p. 235.

mind of Christ. If one is disposed to think less of the N. T. because it stands in the vernacular **κοινή**, let him remember that the speech of these Christians was rich beyond measure, since out of it came the words of Jesus. These were carried in the common tradition of the period and written down from time to time (Lu. 1:1-4). Paul was not a rhetorician, though a man of culture, but he cared much for the talk of the Christians that it should be worthy. **Ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι** (Col. 4:6). That was good advice for the Colossians and for all speakers and writers, grammarians included, and makes a fitting bon mot to leave with the rhetoricians who might care to quibble further over niceties of language.

Ταῦτα μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

1. **Καθαρίζω** or **καθερίζω** (p. 183). Mr. H. Scott furnishes me the following table for the variations between α and ε in the augmented tenses of **καθαρίζω**:

	ἐκθαερ	ἐκαθαρ
א	0/8	8/8
B	2/7 Mt., Mk	5/7
A	7/7	0/7
C	4/5	1/5
D	0/6	6/6
Syr.	0/6	6/6

For LXX see Helbing and Thackeray.

2. **Prothetic Vowels in the N. T**. (p. 206). The following is a table of (probable) prothetic vowels in N. T. (supplied by Mr. H. Scott).

BEFORE	α	ε	ο	ι
ρ		ἐ-ρυθρός ἐ-ρεύγομαι	ὀ-ρύσσω	
λ	ἀ-λείφω	ἐ-λαχύς, ἐ-λεύθερος		
ν	ἀ-νεψιός		ὀ-νειδίζω, ὄ-νομα	
μ	ἀ-μοιβή, ἀ-μύνω	ἐ-μέ, ἐ-μός	ὀ-μίχλη	
χθ		ἐ-χθές		ἰ-χθύς
στ	ἀ-στήρ [ἄ-στρον] ἀ-στράπτω			
φρ			ὀ-φρύς	
κ	ἀ-κούω	ἐ-κεῖ, ἐ-κεῖνος	(ἐπ-) ὀ-κέλλω	
θ		ἐ-θέλω		
δ			ὀ-δύνη ὀ-δυρμός [ὀ-δύρομαι]	
F	ἀ-είδω=ᾄδω ἀ-οιδ=ᾠδή			
τ			ὀ-τρύνω	

3. **Elision** (p. 208). Mr. H. Scott adds **οὐδ᾽ ἐάν** (Lu. 16:31, W. H. text), **οὐδ᾽ ἡ** (Tisch., **οὐδὲ ἡ** W. H.), **οὐδ᾽ αὐτόν** (Jo. 21:25). We have both **καθ᾽** and **κατὰ εἷς**, but **κατὰ ἑκατόν** (Mk. 6:40). There is much variation with prepositions before nouns.

4. **Παρρησία** (p. 212). Mr. H. Scott notes that out of 40 occurrences in the N. T. 24 read **παρρ--** without variant. In the remaining 16 **א** reads **παρρ**– 13/16, B 10/16, A 14/14, C 9/10, D 7/14, L 8/9, Syr. 16/16. In Gospels B always has **παρ**– except in Jo. 11:14, **א** only in Jo. 11:14.

5. **Assimilation of ἐν μέσῳ** (p. 216). Mr. H. Scott notes that the phrase **ἐν μέσῳ** occurs 27 times in the N. T., of which 2 (Jo. 8:3, 9) are in a spurious passage. Hort (*Notes on Orth.*, p. 150) observes that **א**BD never have **ἐμμέσῳ**. But A of Gospels and E of Acts always have **ἐμμέσῳ**, while C has it 9/12 times.

6. **Rules for Assimilation of Consonants** (p. 216). The familiar rules are given in all the school grammars (cf. Hadley and Allen, Goodwin, etc.), and need not be given here in detail. Note only these:

Before a **τ** mute a **π** or **κ** mute is co-ordinated.

Before **μ** **α** **π** mute changes to **μ,**

" " a **κ** mute changes to **γ,**

" " a **τ** mute changes to **σ** (analogy).

Before **σ** a **π** mute makes **ψ**

" " a **κ** mute makes **ξ,**

" " a **τ** mute drops out.

Before a labial **ν** changes to **μ**.

" a palatal **ν** changes to **γ** (nasal)

" **λ** or **ρ, ν** is assimilated.

" **σ, ν** is dropped, and the preceding vowel is lengthened..

Between two consonants **σ** is dropped.

The insertion of **σ** in some tenses is treated in the chapter on Conjugation of the Verb.

7. **Metathesis** (p. 221). We find **φαινόλιον** in P. 0xy. III, 531, 14 (ii/A.D.), but also **φαι**[**λο**] **νίων**, B. U. iii, 816, 24 (iii/A.D.). So the modern Greek **φελόνι**. **Φάτνη** (Lu. 2:7, etc.) is the Homeric and Attic form. Moeris (212, 9) says that **πάθνη** is the Hellenistic form. Modern Greek has **πάθνη**. Some LXX MSS. have it so. Cf. Thackeray, p. 106; Blass-Debrunner, p. 20.

8. Enclitics and Proclitics (p. 233 f.). Rules for accent by Mr. H. Scott:

ENCLITICS

Indefinite, **τὶς** in all its forms.
Pers, pron., **μοῦ, μοί, μέ,**
σοῦ, σοί, σέ,
Pres. indic., **εἰμί** (except 2d sing. **εἶ**);
φημί, φησίν, φασίν
Particles, **γέ, τέ** and the inseparable —**δε**.
Indef. adverbs, **ποτέ, πού, πέρ, πώ, πώς.**
Enclitics incline their accent when the preceding word is
(a) proparoxytone,
(b) properisimmenon,
(c) a proclitic.
Enclitics lose their accent when the preceding word is
(a) oxytone,
(b) perispomenon,
(c) paroxytone.
Enclitics retain their accent:
(a) if they begin or end a sentence;
(b) if dissyllables, after a paroxytone;
(c) if dissyllables, after perispomena.
(d) after an elided vowel;
(e) if dissyllables, after a proclitic.

If two or more enclitics occur together, each one receives the accent of the preceding, the last being unaccented. Editors differ in practice as to this rule.

PROCLITICS

Art., **ὁ, ἡ, οἱ, αἱ**.
Prep., **εἰς, ἐκ, ἐξ, ἐν**
Conj., **εἰ, ὡς**
Negative, **οὐ (οὐκ, οὐχ)**

Proclitics receive the acute accent:
(a) when they are at the end of a sentence;
(b) when followed by an enclitic.

9. **Βουστροφηδόν** (p. 243). The Greeks first wrote from right to left and then alternately. This alternate method (right to left, left to right) was called βουστροφηδόν, 'as oxen turn at the plow.' Cf. Geddes, *A Compendious Greek Grammar*, 1888, p. xiv. The Greeks had a fine system of abbreviations in frequent use. For full particulars see Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*, pp. 86-96.

10. **Perfect of ὁράω** (p. 364). Mr. H. Scott counts the perf. active (indic., inf., part.) 34 times in the N. T. (Luke, Gospel 3, Acts 2; John, Gospel 20, Epistles 6; Paul 3). Luke has —**ω**— established 5 times, John's Gospel 20. **א**ACD so always, B 20/24. In 1 Ep. John B has 6/6 —o—, Paul 3 —**ω**— (**א** 3/3, B 2/3, C 2/2, D 1/3; —o— A 3/3).

11. **Augment in the Past Perfect** (p. 366). Mr. H. Scott notes that of the 15 out of 22 verbs with past perfects in the N. T. the active verbs arc equally divided as to augment. Of the 7

passive verbs only **θεμελιόω** is unaugmented. **Βάλλω** is augmented in the passive, but not in the active. **Γίνομαι** and **ἵστημι** have both the augmented and the unaugmented forms in the active.

12. **List of Important Verbs.** (Purely normal verbs are not listed here. Only the tenses are given that occur in the N. T.) Mr. H. Scott has rendered valuable aid in preparing it.

Ἀγαλλιάω. Pres. act. in 1 Pet. 1:8 and Rev. 19:7; aor. act. **ἠγαλλίασα** (Lu. 1:47), but the active does not occur in LXX. The middle is in LXX (Ps. 15:9) and the N. T. (Jo. 8:56, etc.). The aor. passive appears in Jo. 5:35 (**ἀγαλλιαθῆναι**, BL **–σθῆναι**).

Ἀγγέλλω (comp. **ἀν--, ἀπ--. δι--, ἐξ--, ἐπ--, προ-επ-κατ--, προ-κατ--).** Simplex only in Jo. 20:18 **ἀγγέλλουσα,** and Jo. 4:51 in **א**D. **–αγγελῶ, --ήγγειλα, --ήγγελμαι, --ηγγέλην**. The classic nor. pass. **ἠγγέλθην** does not occur in LXX or N. T.

Ἄγνυμι (only **κατ-άγνυμυι** as in Attic and LXX). Three forms in N. T.: a fut. act. **κατ-εάξει**. (Mt. 12:20; LXX has **κατάξω**), an aor. act. **κατ-έαξαν** (Jo. 19:32 f.), an aor. pass. **κατεαγῶσιν** (Jo. 19:31. Cf. **κατεαγῆναι** in Plato, etc.). The copyists kept the augment where it did not belong, so that even a pres. act. **κατεάσσω** is found. Cf. Jann., *Hist. Gk. Gr*., p. 253.

Ἄγω (comp. **ἀν--, ἐπ-αν--, ἀπ--, συν-ἀπ--, δι--, εἰσ--, παρ-εἰσ--, ἐξ--, ἐπ--, κατ--, μετ--, παρ--, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ἐπι-συν-, ὑπ-).** The principal parts are regular save the aorist active (usually the reduplicated second aorist form **ἤγαγον**, but sometimes the rare sigmatic aorist **ἦξα** as in Hesiod).

Αἱρέω (comp. **ἀν-, ἀφ-, δι-, ἐξ-, καθ-, περι-, προ-**). Simplex only middle. **–ελῶ**, (as LXX), **αἱρήσομαι, -αιρεθήσομαι; -εῖλον** and **–εῖλα** (middle also); **--ηρούμην, --ήρημαι, -ηρέθην.**

Αἴρω (ἀπ-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, μετ-, συν-, ὑπερ-). Principal parts regular. Only note imperative aor. act. **ἆρον** and infl nor. act. **ἆραι**, while ind. nor. act. is **ἦρα** and fut. act. **ἀρῶ**.

Αἰσθάνομαι. Only once in N. T. (Lu. 9:45), aor. mid. **αἴσθωνται**.

Ἀκούω (**δι-, εἰσ-, ἐπ-, παρ-, προ-, ὑπ-**) **Ἀκούσω, ἤκουσα, ἀκήκοα**("Attic perf."), **ἀκούσομαι, ἀκουσθήσομαι, ἠκούσθην**

Ἀλλάσσω (ἀπ-, δι-, κατ-, ἀπο-κατ-, μετ-, συν-). **Ἀλλάξω, ἤλλαξα, ἠλλαξάμην** (Ro. 1:23, LXX); pass. **–ήλλαγμαι, -ηλλάγην, ἀλλαγήσομαι** (1 Cor. 15:51).

Ἅλλομαι.(**ἐξ-, ἐφ-).** Aor. **–άμην** and **–όμην.** Confined to Acts save Jo. 4:14.

Ἁμαρτάνω (**προ-**). **Ἁμαρτήσω, ἥμαρτον** and **ἡμάρτησα, ἡμάρτηκα**.

Ἀμφιάζω. So W. H. in Lu. 12:28 instead of **ἀμφιέζω**.

Ἀμφιέννυμι, ἠμφίεσμαι

Ἀναθάλλω (only comp.). **Ἀνεθάλετε** (Ph. 4:10).

Ἀναλίσκω (only comp., also **κατ-αν-**). Other tense-stems from **ἀναλόω; ἀναλώσω**; aor. act. inf. **ἀναλῶσαι;** aor. pass. **ἀναλωθῆτε** (N. T. forms do not show augment). In 2 Th. 2:8 W. H. in margin give **ἀναλοῖ**, as present (so Attic and LXX).

Ἀνοίγω (**δι-, ἐξ-,** Ac. 12:16 D). The simplex **οἴγω, οἴγνυμι** does not occur in LXX or N. T. Imperf. **διήνοιγε** (Lu. 24:32); fut. **ἀνοίξω**; nor. act. **ἤνοιξε, ἀνέῳξε, ἠνέῳξε**. The aor. ind. (22 times) is confined (H. Scott) to John (6), Acts (5), Rev. (10), except **διήνοιξεν** (Lu. 24:45). The predominant. form is

ἠνοιξ- (16 times without v. r.) and read by W. H., except ἀνέῳξεν (Jo. 9:14), and ἠνέῳξεν (Jo. 9:17, 32). Pass. fut. ἀνοιχθήσεται (Lu. 11:9 f. A); ἀνοιγήσεται (W. H., Mt. 7:7, 8=Lu. 11:9, 10). Aor. indic. occurs 9 times: ἠνοίχθη- (Rev. 20:12 (*bis*), δι–, Lu. 24:31); ἀνεῴθη— (Lu. 1:64); ἠνεῴχθη– (Mt. 3:16; 9:30; 27:52; Jo. 9:10; Ac. 16:26). 2d aor. indic. ἠνοίγη– (4 times, Mk. 7:35; Ac. 12:10; Rev. 11:19; 15:5); subj. Mt. 20:33. Perf. part. (only) 11 times: δι-ηνοιγμένος (Ac. 7:56); ἀνεῳγμένος (Ac. 9:8; 10: 11; 16:27; Ro. 3:13; 2 Cor. 2:12); ἠνεῳγμένος (Rev. 3:8; 4:1; 10:2, 8; 19:11).

᾽Αντάω (**ἀπ-, κατ-, συν-, ὑπ-**). The simplex does not occur. The parts. are regular. Fut. infin. **κατ-αντήσειν** (Ac. 26:7, W. H. marg.); fut. part. **συν-ἀντήσοντα** (Ac. 20:22).

᾽Απο-κτείνω. The simplex does not occur. Pres. varies between **–κτείνω, -κτέννω** (2 Cor. 3:6 W. H. alt., Mt. 10:28 W. H. alt., Lu. 12:4 W. H. alt.) and **–κτέννυμι** (Mk. 12:5); fut. **ἀπο-κτενῶ**; aor. **ἀπ-έκτεινα**; pass. inf. **ἀπο-κτέννεσθαι** (Rev. 6 :11); 1st aor. **ἀπ-εκτάνθην**.

῾Απτω (**ἀν-, καθ-, περι-**). **῾Ηψα, ἡψάμην, ἧφθην**.

᾽Αρνέομαι (ἀπ-), ἀρνήσομαι, -αρνηθήσομαι, -ηρνησάμην, ἤρνημαι.

῾Αρπάζω (**δι-, συν**—) **῾Αρπάσω, ἥρπασα**; pass. 2d aor. **ἡρπάγην**; 1st aor. **ἡρπάσθην**; 2d fut. **ἁρπαγήσομαι**.

Βαίνω (only in comp., **ἀνα-, προσ-ανα-, συν-ανα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-, συμ-, συγ-κατα-, ὑπερ-**). **–βήσομαι, -έβην, -βέβηκα.** Short forms of the imperative **ἀνάβα, ἀνάβατε**.

Βάλλω (ἀμφι-, ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, παρ-εμ-, περι-, προ-, συν-, ὑπερ-, ὑπο-). Imperf. **ἔβαλλον** (**ἐξ- ἐπ- συν-**) fut. **βαλῶ (ἐκ-, ἐπι-, παρ-εμ-, περι-)**. 1st aorist ("Alexandrian") **ἔβαλαν** (Ac. 16: 37); **ἐξ-** (Mt. 7:22 W. H. alt.; 21:39 W. H. alt.); **ἐπ-** (Ac. 21:27; Mk. 14:46); 2d aorist, **ἔβαλον (ἐξ-, ἐπ-, παρ-, περι-, συν-, ὑπ-**); perf. **βεβληκώς**; pluperf. **ἐκ-βεβλήκει**. Mid. fut. **περι-βαλεῖται** (Rev. 3:5); 2d aor. **ἀν-, περι-, συν-εβαλόμην**; pass. fut. **βληθήσομαι, ἐκ-;** 1st aor. **δι-, ἐξ-, ἐβλήθην**; perf. **βέβλημαι, περι-**; pluperf. **ἐβέβλητο**.

Βαρέω (ἐπι-, κατα-). ᾽Εβάρησα, βεβάρημαι, ἐβαρήθην (2 Cor. 1:8, Lu. 21:34). Only passive save in compounds.

Βαρύνω. The older verb is ousted in N. T. by **βαρέω** except in Mk. 14:40, **κατα-βαρυνόμενοι**. It is read in Lu. 21:34 Rec. **βαρυνθῶσι**.

Βλαστάνω. This is the old form of the pres. The pres. in N. T. is **βλαστάω** (Mk. 4:27). The aor. **ἐβλάστησα** may be from **βλαστάω** or **βλαστέω**, a form of the pres. occurring in LXX.

Βλέπω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐμ-, ἐπι-, περι-, προ-). **῾Εβλεπον, βλέψω, ἔβλεψα; περι-ἐβλέπετο; περι-προ-βλεψάμενος**.

Γαμέω. ᾽Εγάμουν, Attic **ἔγνημα**, late **ἐγάμησα, γεγάμηκα, ἐγαμήθην. Γαμιζω** is a late form and only pres. active and pass. and imperf. pass. **ἐγαμιζοντο** appear in N. T. **Γαμίσκω** likewise in pres. pass. stem appears in Lu. 20:34 (W. H.) and **ἐκ-γαμίσκω** in some MSS. in Lu. 20:34 Rec.

Γίνομαι. (**ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-, παρα-, συμ-παρα-, προ-**). Never **γίνομαι** like Attic. **᾽Εγινόμην; γενήσομαι**; part. **γενησόμενος** (1 Cor. 15:37), **ἐγενόμην** and **ἐγενήθην**. Opt. **γένοιτο**; part. **γεινόμενος**. The frequent use of the part. in comp., **ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-, παρα-, συν-παρα-**, is noteworthy. **Γενάμενος** is a frequent variant. J. H. Moulton counts 69 instances of the part. (simple and comp.) in Luke's writings, and 48 in remainder of N. T. It does not

occur at all in the Johannine writings. "Strong perfect," **γέγονα, γεγένημαι.** A in 1 Macc. 14:30 has **ἐγένην**, probably an error (cf. **γέγονα**). Pluperf. **γεγόνει** (Ac. 4:22), and **ἐγεγόνει**, (Jo. 6 :17). **Γειν–** is a rather frequent spelling, e.g. Ac. 21:11 **א**B*AD; 23:10 B*; Lu. 22:26 **א**BD; 42 **א**BAA; 1 Cor. 10:20 B*D*, etc.

Γινώσκω (**ἀνα-, δια-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-**). **Γνώσομαι, ἔγνων, ἔγνωκα, ἐγνώκειν, ἔγνωσμαι, ἐγνώσθην, γνωσθήσομαι**. Subj. aor. both **γνῷ** (Jo. 7:51) and **γνοῖ** (Mk. 5:43; 9:30; Lu. 19:15); imper. **γνῶθι**; inf. **γνῶναι**; part. **γνούς**.

Γράφω (ἀπο-, ἐγ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, προ-). Ἔγραφον, γράψω, ἔγραψα, γέγραφα; pass. **γέγραμμαι, -εγεγράμμην, ἐπι-, ἐγράφην, προ-**. Mid. 1st aor. **ἀπο-γράψασθαι** (Lu. 2:5).

Δείκνυμι and **δεικνύω** (**ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐν, ἐπι-, ὑπο-). Δείξω, ἔδειξα**; pass. **ἐδείχθην** (Heb. 8:5); perf. **ἀπο-δεδειγμένος**; mid. 1st aor. **ἐν-εδειξάμην**. The pres. has forms from **-νυμι** and **—νύω**.

Δέρω. Ἔδειρα, δαρήσομαι.

Δέχομαι (**ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, εἰσ-, ἐκ-, ἀπ-εκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, παρα-, προσ-, ὑπο-**). **Ἐδεξάμην**; pass. **δέδεγμαι, --εδέχθην**.

Δέω (προσ-). Ἐδεόμην, ἐδεήθην In Lu. 8:38 W. H. read **ἐδεῖτο** rather than **ἐδέετο;** (W. H. alt.) or **ἐδεεῖτο**. Impersonal **δεῖ** and **ἔδει**.

Δίδωμι (ἀνα-, ἀντ-απο-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα-, προ-). Pres. **παραδίδως** (2d sing.), 3d pl. **διδόασιν** (Rev. 17:13); subj. **παρα-διδῷ** (1 Cor. 15:24, **-διδοῖ**. BEG); imperf. **ἐδίδοσαν** (Jo. 19:3), **παρ-** (Ac. 16:4); fut. **δώσω**; part. **ἀπο-** (Heb. 13:17), **παρα-** (Jo. 6:64) **δώσων**; **-κα** aor. **ἔδωκα**, 3d pl. **ἔδωκαν**; 2d aor. 3d pl. **παρ-έδοσαν** (Lu. 1:2); imper. **δός**; subj. **δῶ, δῷς** (Mk. 6:25), **δῷ** (Jo. 15:16); subj. 3d sing. cont. **δοῖ** (Mk. 8:37), **παρα-** (Mk. 4:29), **δῴη** or **δώῃ** (2 Tim. 2:25, Eph. 1:17); opt. 3d sing. **δῴη** (Ro. 15:5; 2 Th. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:16, 18); inf. **δοῦναι**; part. **δούς**; perf. **δεδώκα**; plup. **δεδώκειν**; mid. fut. **δώσομαι, ἐκ-** (Mt. 21:41); 2d aor. **ἐξέδετο** (**א** Mt. 21:33 =Mk. =Lu.) with variant 1. **–ετο** in each passage; plur. without variant, **ἀπ-έδοσθε, -έδοντο**. Pass. pres. and imperf. **–ἐδίδετο, δι--** (Ac. 4:35), **παρ-** (1 Cor. 11:23), with variant **-ετο** in each case; fut. **δοθήσομαι, ἀνταπο-, παρα-**. 1st aor. **ἐδόθην, ἀπο-, ἐπ-, παρ-;** perf. **δέδομαι**. Dr. Hort considers the change of the vowels in imperf. and 2d nor. from **–ετο** to **–ετο** as probably euphonic. **Διδέω (ἀπο-, δια-, παρα-)**. Pres. **διδῷ** (Rev. 3:9); imper. **δίδου** (Lu. 6:30; 11:3); part. **ἀπο-διδοῦν** (Rev. 22:2); imperf. **ἐδίδου** (Mk. 3:6; Ac. 1:20), **ἐπ-, παρ-**; fut. **δια-διδώσουσιν** (Rev. 17:13 Rec.) *ex fictione Erasmi.*

Δύναμαι. Pres. 2d sing. **δύνασαι** (Mt. 5:36; 8:2; Mk. 1:40; Lu. 6:42). Opt. **δυναίμην** (Ac. 8:31; 27:12, 39). **Ἐδυνάμην**, and **ἠδυνάμην, δυνήσομαι, ἠδυνήθην** and **ἠδυνάσθην**. **Δύνομαι**, 2d sing. **δύνῃ** (Mk. 9:22 f.; Lu. 16:2; Rev. 2:2). There are traces of this late Greek form in B in present tense in Mt. 19:12; 26:53; Mk. 10:39; Ac. 4:20; 27:15.

Δύω (**ἐκ-, ἀπ-εκ** [mid.], **ἐν-, ἐπ-εν-, παρ-εισ-, ἐπι-**). Simplex only, Mk. 1:32. Pres. **ἐπι-δυέτω** 2d nor. **ἔδυν, ἔδυσα** (Mk. 1:32); mid. **–εδυσάμην**; pass. **παεισεδύην**. 2d nor. (Ju. 4) **ἐν-δεδυμένος**.

Δύνω (ἐκ-). In pres. only.

Ἐάω (**προσ-**). **Εἴων, ἐάσω, εἴασα**. Augt. **εσα***F*=**εα***F*=**ει-.** See Jannaris, § 719.

Ἐγγίζω (προσ-). Ἤγγιζον, ἐγγίσω and **ἐγγιεῖ** (Jas. 4:8 W. H. alt.), **ἤγγισα, ἤγγικα**.

᾽Εγείρω (δι-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-, συν-). ᾽Εγερῶ, ἤγειρα, δι-εγείρετο (Jo. 6:18 **δι-ηγ.** alt.), **ἐγήγερμαι, ἠγέρθην, ἐγερθήσομαι.** In Mk. 2:9 **ἐγείρου**, but usually intransitive **ἔγειρε** (cf. **ἄγε, ἔπειγε**) as Mk. 5:41. **῾Εγειραι** not in N. T., nor **ἐγρήγορα**.

᾽Εδαφίζω. ᾽Εδαφιαῶ ("Attic" fut.).

῾Εθω. Obsolete in pres. **Εἴωθα, εἰώθειν**.

Εἰδέω and **εἴδω (ἀπ-, ἐπ-, προ-, συν-, ὑπερ-)**. Not used in pres. Fut. **εἰδήσω** (Heb. 8:11, LXX). 1st aor. **εἶδα, εἴδαμεν, εἴδατε, εἶδαν** (W. H. text 18 times and 2 alt.). 2d aor. **εἶδον** and **ἴδον** (ind. both complete); imper. **ἴδε**; subj. **ἴδω**; inf. **ἰδεῖν**; part. **ἰδών**. 2d perf. **οἶδα** complete, and **ἴστε** (?), **ἴσασιν** (Ac. 26:4); imper. **ἴστε** (?): subj. **εἰδῶ**; inf. **εἰδέναι**; part. **εἰδώς**; pluperf. **ᾔδειν** complete. As **εἶδον** and **οἶδα** have the *same root* they are put together. It does not seem reasonable to divide the same root between **εἶδον** and **ὁράω**. See **ἴδω**.

Εἰμί (ἄπ-, ἔν-, ἔξ-, πάρ-, σύν-, συμ-πάρ-). ᾽Ην and mid. **ἤμην, ἦσθα, ἤμεθα;** imper. pres. **ἴσθι, ἔστω ἤτω, ἔστωσαν** (**ἔστε** 2d pl. does not occur); opt. **εἴην ἔσομαι, ἔσεσθαι, ἐσόμενος** (Lu. 22:49).

Εἶμι. Only in comp. (**ἄπ-, εἴσ-, ἔξ-, ἔπ-, σύν-**). Only pres. (fut. sense) 3d p1. **–ίασι, εἰσ-** (Heb. 9:6); imper. **εἴσ-ιθι** (Ac. 9:6 B) and imperf. **(-ᾔειν).**

᾽Ελαύνω (i.e. **ἐλα-νύω**) **(ἀπ-).** Pres. inf. **ἐλαύνειν**. 1st aor. **ἀπ-ήλασα;** perf. **ἐληλακώς**; imperf. pass. **ἠλαύνετο**.

῾Ελκω. Pres. act. and pass. **ἑξ-;** inperf. **εἷλκον**; other tenses from **ἑλκύω. ῾Ελκύσω, εἵκλυσα**.

῾Επω (ἀντ-, ἀπ-, προ-). Pres. not used. Fut. **ἐρῶ**. 1st aor. **εἶπα**, etc.; imper. **εἰπόν** (?), **εἰπάτω, --ατε, -άτωσαν;** part. **εἴπας.** 2d aor. **εἶπον**; imper. **εἰπέ;** subj. **εἴπω**; inf. **εἰπεῖν**; part. **εἰπών**. Perf. **εἴρηκα**, 3d pl. **—καν** and **—κασιν** (Ac. 17:28); inf. **εἰρηκέναι**; part. **εἰρηκώς**. Pluperf. **εἰρήκει**. Mid. 1st aor. **ἀπ-ειπάμεθα**. Pass. 1st aor. **ἐρρήθη** and **ἐρρέθη**; part. **ῥηθείς**; perf. **εἴρηται**; part. **εἰρημένος**.

᾽Εργάζομαι (κατ-, περι-, προσ-). Εἰργαζόμην (Ac. 18:3 HIP) and **ἠργαζόμην** (W. H.), **ἠργασάμην** (Gosp.) and **κατ-ειργάσατο** (2 Cor. 7:11), **εἴργασμαι** (passive). 1st aor. **κατ-ειργάσθην** and **κατ-ηρ-** (BDC, W. H. alt.).

῾Ερχομαι (ἀν-, ἐπ-αν, ἀπ-, δι-, εἰσ-, ἐπ-εισ-, παρ-εισ-, συν-εισ-, ἐξ-, δι-εξ-, ἐπ-κατ-, παρ-, ἀντι-παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-). ᾽Ηρχόμην, ἐλεύσομαι, ἦλθον and **ἦλθα, ἐλήλυθα**. Pluperf. **ἐληλύθειν**.

᾽Ερωτάω (δι-, ἐπ-). ᾽Ηρώτων and **ἠρώτουν, ἐρωτήσω, ἠρώτησα; ἐπ-ερωτηθείς**, 1st aor. pass.

᾽Εσθίω and **ἔσθω (κατ-, συν-)**. Pres. only. **῾Ησθιον, φάγομαι**, 2d sing. **φάγεσαι** (Lu. 17:8); **ἔφαγον** complete; opt. **φάγοι** (Mk. 11:14).

Εὐαγγελίζω (προ–). Active only, 1st aor. (Rev. 10:7; 14:6). **Προ-, εὐηγγελιζόμην, εὐηγγελισάμην, εὐηγγέλισμαι, εὐηγγελίσθην**.

Εὐδοκέω (συν-), **(εὐ, ηὐ)δοκοῦμεν** (1 Th. 2:8), **(εὐ, ηὐ)δόκησα** (**εὐ**– in Gospels. In the Epistles the reading varies).

Εὑρίσκω (ἀν-). Εὕρισκον and **ηὕρ., εὑρήσω, εὗρον (εὕραμεν,** etc.) and **εὕρησα** (some mss.) **εὕρηκα, ηὑ-, εὑρισκόμην, εὑρεθην, εὑρεθήσομαι,** mid. **εὑράμενος.**

῾Εχω (ἀν-, ἀντ-, ἀπ-, ἐν-, ἐπ-, κατ-, μετ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπερ-, ὑπο-). Εἶχον (εἴχαμεν, εἶχοσαν, as well as **εἶχαν** and **εἶχον**), **ἕξω, ἔσχον, ἔσχηκα, εἰχόμην, ἔξομαι**; 2d aor. mid. **ἀν-εσχόμην**.

Ζάω (ἀνα-, συν-). Pres. **ζῶ, ζῷς, ζῇ**; inf. **ζῆν. ῾Εζων, ζήσω, ζήσομαι, ἔζησα.**

Ζώννυμι and **ζωννύω** (i.e. **ζωσ-νυ--**) (**ἀνα-, δια-, περι-, ὑπο-**). **᾽Εζώνυον, ζώσω,** —**έζωσα**, mid. fut. **περι-ζώσομαι**. 1st aor. **ἐζωσάμην, -έζωσμαι**

῾Ηκω (ἀν-, καθ-). ᾽Ηκον, ἥξω ἧξα (in subj.), **ἧκα** in Mk. 8:3. Some MSS. have **ἥκουσιν** instead of **ἥκασιν.** BLA (W. H.) rend **εἰσίν**.

Ἡσσόομαι. once (2 Cor. 12:13). Elsewhere **ἡττάομαι, ἥττημαι, ἡττήθην**

Θάπτω (**συν**–). **Ἔθαψα, ἐτάφην**.

θαυμάζω (**ἐκ--**). **Ἐθαύμαζον, ἐθαύμασα, ἐθαυμάσθην, θαυμασθήσομαι** and mid. **θαυμάσομαι** (Rev. 17:8 ℵB).

Θνήσκω (**ἀπο--, συναπο-**). Simplex perf. only, **ἀπ-έθνησκον**; –**θανοῦμαι, --έθανον, τέθνηκα**. Both **τεθνάναι** and **τεθνηκέναι** (Ac. 14:19), but **τεθνηκώς**.

Ἰάομαι. Pres. **ἰᾶται, ἰώμην** mid. **ἰάσομαι, ἰασάμην**; pass. **ἴαμαι** (**ἴαται** Mk. 4:29), **ἰάθην, ἰαθήσομαι**.

Ἴδω obsolete. For **εἶδον** and **εἶδα** see **εἴδω** (**εἰδέω**).

Ἱκ-νέομαι (**ἀφ-, δι-, ἐφ-**). Simplex not found in N. T. Pres. –**ικνούμενος**; 2d aor. **ἀφίκετο;** inf. **ἐφ-ικέσθαι;** part. **ἀφ-ικόμενος**.

Ἵημι (i.e. ***σι-ση-μι**) (**ἀν-, ἀφ-, καθ-, παρ-, συν-**). Simplex does not occur in LXX or N. T. forms in –**μι**. Pres. complete, **ἀν-, ἀφ-, συν-**. Fut. **ἀφ-, συν-ήσω.** 1st aor. **ἀφ-, καθ-, συν-ῆκα** (complete). 2d aor. imper. **ἄφ-ες**; 2d pl. **ἄφ-, σύν-ετε**; subj. **ἀν-, ἀφ-, συν-ῶ**,, etc.; inf. **ἀφ-, παρ-, συν-εῖναι;** part. **ἀν-, ἀφ-είς**. Medio-pass. pres. **ἀφ-ίεμαι**; part. **καθ-ιέμενος**. Fut. **ἀφ-εθήσομαι**; 1st aor. **ἀν-, ἀφ-έθην**; subj. **ἀφ-εθῇ**; perf. **ἀφ-έωνται** (Lu. 5:20); part. **παρ-ειμένος. –ίω (ἀφ-, συν-).** Pres. (Lu. 11:4), **ἀφ-, συν-ίουσιν**; subj. **συν-ίωσι**; part. **συν-ίων** (Ro. 3:11); imperf. **ἧφ-ιεν** (Mk. 1:34; 11:16). Pass. pres. **ἀφ-ίονται** (Jo. 20:23 W. H. marg.). –**έω** (**ἀφ-**). Pres. **ἀφ-εῖς** (Rev. 2:20, 2d sing.).

Ἵστημι, ἱστάνω, ἱστάω (ἀν-, ἐπαν-, ἀνθ-, ἐξαν-, ἀφ-, δι-, ἐν-, ἐξ-, ἐπ-[**ίσταμαι**]**, ἐφ-, κατεφ-, συνεφ-, καθ-, ἀντικαθ-, ἀποκαθ-, ἀποκαθ-, μεθ-, παρ-, περι-, προ-, συν-).** Simplex has not the pres. and imperf. active or passive. **Στήσω**, 2d aor. **ἔστην** (complete), **ἔστησα** (complete), **ἕστηκα, εἰ**[**ί**]**στήκειν**; mid. fut. **στήσομαι; ἀνα-, ἐπανα-, ἀπο-**, etc. Passive **ἀνθ-, ἀφ-, ἐξ-ιστάμην, ἐστάθην, σταθήσομαι**. Both **ἑστώς** and **ἑστηκώς, ἐξ-εστακέναι** and **ἑστάναι**. Both **ἕστακα** and **ἕστηκα**.

Καθαίρω. (δια-, ἐκ-). –**εκάθαρα, κεκάθαρμαι.** Inf. **καθᾶραι**.

Καθαρίζω (δια-). Καθαριῶ, ἐκαθάρισα, κεκαθάρισμαι, ἐκαθαρίσθην and **ἐκαθερίσθη** (Mt. 8:3 =Mk.).

Καθέζομαι (**δια**–). The simplex **ἕζομαι** does not occur in LXX or N. T. Pres. part. **καθεζόμενος**; imperf. **ἐκαθεζόμην**. 1st aor. part. **παρα-καθεσθείς**.

Κάθημαι (συν-). Pres. 2d sing. **κάθῃ** (Ac. 23:3); imper. **κάθου** (Jas. 2:3); subj. **καθῆσθε** (Lu. 22:30); inf. **καθῆσθαι**; part. **καθήμενος**; imperf. **ἐκαθήμην**; fut. **καθήσομαι**.

Καθίζω (ἀνα-, ἐπι-, παρα- [Rec.], **συν-).** The simplex **ἵζω** does not occur in LXX or N. T. Fut. **καθίσω**; 1st aor. **ἐκάθισα**; perf. **κεκάθικα**; mid. fut. **καθίσεσθε** (Mt. 19:28).

Καίω (**ἐκ-, κατα-**). **Κατ-έκαιον, κατα-καύσω, κατ-έκαυσα, κέκαυμαι, κατ-εκάην, ἐξ-ἐκαυθην, κατα-καήσομαι, κατα-καυθήσομαι**. In 1 Cor. 13:3 some MSS. have **καυθήσωμαι** (fut. subj., Byz.).

Καλέω (ἀντι-, ἐν-, εἰσ- [**-μαι**], **ἐπι-, μετα-, παρα-, συνπαρα-, προ-, προσ-, συγ-). Ἐκάλουν, καλέσω, ἐκάλεσα, κέκληκα, κέκλημαι, ἐπ-εκέκλητο, ἐκλήθην, κληθήσομαι.** Mid. fut. **ἐπι-, μετα-καλέσομαι, ἐπι-, μετα-, προσ-εκαλέσάμην**.

Κάμνω. Ἔκαμον, κέκμηκα

Κερά-ννυ-μι, κερα-ννύω (**συγ**–). The present does not occur in N. T. **Ἐκέρασεα, κεκέρασμαι, συν-**.

Κερδαίνω. Pres. and imperf. do not occur. Fut. **κερδανῶ** (1 Cor. 9:21 W. H.); aor. subj. **κερδάνω**: a matter of editing.

Κερδάω. Fut. **κερδήσω** (Jas. 4:13); aor. **ἐκέρδησα**; subj. **κερδήσω** (1 Cor. 9:19-21). Pass. fut. **κερδηθήσομαι** (1 Pet. 3:1).

Κλαίω. Ἔκλαιον, κλαύσω, ἔκλαυσα, κλαύσομαι (Rev. 18:9 W. II. marg.).

Κλάω (ἐκ-, κατα-). Ἔκλασα, ἐκλάσθην, ἐξ-.

Κλείω (ἀπο-, ἐκ-, κατα-, συγ-). Κλείσω, ἔκλεισα, κέκλεισμαι, ἐκλείσθην.

Κλίνω (ἀνα-, ἐκ-, κατα-, προσ-). Ἀνα-κλινῶ, ἔκλινα, κέκλικα–. Pass. fut. **ἀνα-κλιθήσομαι, -εκλίθην, ἀνα-, κατα-, προσ-.**

Κομίζω (ἐκ-, συγ-, ἐκόμισα, συν-). Pass. **ἐξ-εκομίζετο** mid. **κομίσομαι** and **κομιοῦμαι** (1 Pet. 5:4; some MSS. in Col. 3:25), **ἐκομισάμην**.

Κόπτω (ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, κατα-, προ-, προσ-). Ἔκοπτον, ἐκ-, προ-κόψω, ἔκοψα; pass. 2d aor. **ἐξ-εκόπην**; 2d fut. **ἐκ-κοπήσομαι, ἐκοψάμην, κόψομαι, ἀπο-.**

Κορέννυμι, κεκορεσμένος, κορεσθείς.

Κράζω (ἀνα-). Ἔκραζον, κράξω, ἔκραξα and **ἐκέκραξα**; 2d aor. **ἀν-έκραγον**; 2d perf. **κέκραγα**. Some MSS. have **κεκράξομαι** in Lu. 19:40.

Κρέμαμαι, κρεμαννύω, κρεμάζω and **κρεμάω (ἐκ-**.) The active pres. does not occur. **Ἐκρέμασα, ἐκρεμάσθην**. In Lu. 19:48, **ἐξ-εκρέμετο** and **–ματο**.

Κρίνω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἀνταπο- [-μαι], δια-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, συν-, ὑπο-, συνυπο-). Διέκρινα, κρινῶ pass. **ἐκρινόμην; κατα-κρινῶν** (both a question of accent), **ἔκρινα, κέκρικα, κεκρίκειν, κέκριμαι, ἐκρίθην, κριθήσομαι**. Mid. 1st aor. **ἀπ-εκρινάμην**.

Κρύπτω (**ἀπο-, ἐν-, περι-). Ἔκρυψα**; 2d aor. **περι-έκρυβεν** (Lu. 1:24). [This may be the imperf. of **κρύβω**.] **Κέκρυμμαι, ἐκρύβην**.

Κυλίω (**ἀνα-, ἀπο-, προσ-). Ἀπο-κυλίσω, ἀπο-, προσ-εκύλισα**; pass. **ἐκυλίετο, κεκύλισμαι, ἀνα-, ἀπο-.**

Λακέω or **λάσκω**. Both presents could give **ἐλάκησε** (Ac. 1:18).

Λαμβάνω (**ἀν-, ἀντι-, συναντι-** [–μαι], **ἀπο-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, συν-παρα-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, συν-περι-, ὑπο-). Ἐλάμβανον, λήμψομαι, ἔλαβον;** opt. **λάβοι.** Λάβε, not **λαβέ; ἐλάβατε** (1 Jo. 2:27); **παρ-ελάβοσαν** (2 Th. 3:6), **ἔλαβαν** (Jo. 1:12). **Εἴληφα; εἴληφες** (Rev. 11:17); **-είλημμαι, ἐλήμφθην**. Pass. fut. **παρα-λημφθήσομαι**; mid. 2d aor. **ἐλαβόμην**; imper. **ἐπι-, προσ-λαβοῦ**.

Λανθάνω (ἐκ-, ἐπ- [–μαι]). Simplex active only, **ἔλθον. Ἐπ-ελαθόμην, -λέλησ-μαι (ἐκ-, ἐπι-)**.

Λέγω, 'say' (**ἀντι-, δια-, ἐπι-, προ-**). The simplex has pres. and imperf. act. and pres. mid. only. Imp. **ἔλεγον, ἀντ-, προ-; ἔλεγαν** (Jo. 11:56 **א**D). Pass. imperf. **δι-ελεγόμην**; 1st aor. **δι-ελέχθην**; mid. 1st aor. **δι-ελεξάμην.**

Λέγω, 'choose' (**ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, συλ-**). Simplex has not this meaning. **Συλ-** is the only compound with active forms. Fut. **συλ-λέξω**; 1st aor. **συνέ-λεξα**; mid. pres. **κατα-, παρα-, συλ-;** imperf. **ἐξ-, παρ-ελεγόμην**; 1st aor. **δι-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-ελεξάμην**; pass. perf. **ἐκ-λελεγμένος**.

Λείπω (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, ἐν-κατα-, περι-). Simplex only pres. (act. and pass.) except Tit. 3:13 W. H. marg. **Ἔλειπον, -λείψω, -έλειψα, ἔλιπον;** pass. **–λέλειμμαι, -ελείφθην**. (Some MSS. have a compound of **λι-μ-πάνω** in pres. and imperf., Ac. 8:24.)

Λογίζομαι (**ἀνα-, δια-, παρα-, συλ-). Ἐλογιζόμην, ἐλογισάμην, ἐλογίσθην, λογι-σθήσομαι**.

Λούω (**ἀπο-**). **Ἔλουσα**; pass. **λέλουμαι** and **λέλουσμαι** (Heb. 10: 22); mid. 1st aor. **ἐλουσάμην**.

Μανθάνω (κατα-). Ἔμαθον, μεμάθηκα.

Μέλω. Only **μέλει, ἔμελεν**, impersonal. Pass. **μέλομαι, ἐπι-, μετα-**; mid. fut. **ἐπι-μελήσομαι**. Pass. **μετ-ἐμελόμην, ἐπι-, μετ-εμελήθην; μετα-μεηθήσομαι.**

Μέλλω. Ἔμελλον and **ἤμελλον, μελλήσω**.

Μένω (ἀνα-, δια-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, συν-παρα- [Rec.], περι-, προσ-, ὑπο-), **Ἔμνον, μενῶ, ἔμεινα, -μεμένηκα, μεμενήκειν**.
Μιαίνω. **Μεμίαμμαι, ἐμιάνθην**.
Μίγνυμι and **μίσγω** (συν-ανα-). **Ἔμιξα, μέμιγμαι.**
Μιμνήσκω (ἀνα-, ἐπ-ανα-, ὑπο-). –**μνήσω, μέμνημαι, ἐμνήσθην, μνησθήσομαι**
Μνηστεύω. Ἐμνήστευμαι, ἐμνηστεύθην.
Νύσσω (κατα-).Ἔνυξα; 2d aor. pass. **κατ-ενύγην**.
Ξηραίνω. Pres. does not occur. **Ἐξήρανα, ἐξήραμμαι, ἐξηράνθην**.
Ξυράω. The form **Ξυρασθαι** occurs (1 Cor. 11:6), which may be accented **ξυρᾶσθαι** (pres. inf.) or **ξύρασθαι** (1st aor. mid. inf.). **Ἐξύρημαι, ξυρήσομαι.**
Οἰκοδομέω (ἀν-, ἐπ-, συν-). **Ὠικοδόμουν, οἰκοδομήσω, ᾠκοδόμησα**, (also **οἰκοδ**--), **ᾠκοδόμημαι, ᾠκοδομήμην, ᾠκοδομήθην** (also **οἰκοδ-), οἰκοδομηθήσομαι**.
Ὄλλυμι, and **ὀλλύω**. Simplex does not occur in N. T. It is confined in LXX to Job, Prov. and part of Jer. (Thackeray, p. 279). Comp. **ἀπ-, συν-ἀπ-.** Pres. act. **ἀπ-ολλύω**; pres. pass. **ἀπ-όλλυμαι**; imperf. **ἀπ-ώλλυντο** (1 Cor. 10:9); fut. **ἀπ-ολέσω** and **ἀπ-ολῶ** (1 Cor. 1:19 Q) ; 1st aor. **ἀπ-ώλεσα**; 2d perf. **ἀπ-ολωλώς**; mid. imperf. **ἀ=ωλλύμην**; fut. **ἀπ-ολοῦμαι**; 2d aor. **ἀπ-ωλόμην, συν-απ--**; inf. **ἀπ-ολέσθαι**; part. **ἀπ-ολόμενος**.
Ὁμοιόω (ἀφ-). **Ὡμοιώσω, ὡμοιώθην** (also **ὁμοιώθην), ὁμοιωθήσομαι, ἀφ-ωμοιωμένος.**
Ὁράω (ἀφ-, καθ-, προ-). Pres. complete. Imper. **ὅρα, ὁρᾶτε**; imperf. **ἑώρων**, (3d pl., Jo. 6:2); perf. **ἑώρακα** (Gospels and Acts. In Paul and 1 John variation between **ἑω**-- and **ἑο-)**; plup. **ἑωράκει**; pass. pres. **καθ-ορᾶται;** imperf. **προ-ορώμην** (LXX). Stem **ὀπ**-: fut. **ὄψομαι**; fut. pass. **ὀφθήσομαι**; 1st aor. pass. **ὤφθην**; 1st aor. mid. subj. **ὄψησθε** (Lu. 13:28). Stem **ἰδ-;** see **εἰδέω**.
Ὀρύσσω (δι-, ἐξ-). **Ὤρυξα, ἐξ-, δι-ορυχθῆναι** or **δι-ορυγῆναι** (W. H. alt.).
Πάσχω (προ-, συμ--). **Ἔπαθον, πέπονθα**.
Παύω (ἀνα-, ἐπ-ανα-, συν-ανα [–μαι], κατα-). Simple aor. act. once only. **Παύσω, ἔπαυσα**; mid. **παύομαι, ἐποαυόμην, παύσομαι, ἐπαυσάμην, πέπαυμαι, -παήσομαι**.
Πείθω (ἀνα-). **Ἔπειθον, ἔπεισα, πέποιθα, ἐπεποίθειν**; pass. **ἐπειθόμην, πέπεισμαι, ἐπείσθην, πεισθήσομαι**.
Πιάζω and **πιέζω ἐπίασα, πεπίεσμαι, ἐπιάσθην.**
Πίμπλημι. Pres. part. **ἐμπιπλῶν ἔπλησα, ἐμ-πεπλησμένος, ἐπλήσθην, πλησθήσομαι.**
Πίνω (κατα-, συμ-). **Πιόμαι (πιεσαί**, Lu. 17:8), **ἔπιον** (both **πεῖν** and **πιεῖν**, but only **πίε), πέπωκα, κατ-επόθην**.
Πιπράσκω, πεπρακα, πέπραμαι, ἐπράθην.
Πίπτω (ἀνα-, ἀντι-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προσ-, συμ-).
Ἔπιπτον, πεσοῦμαι, ἔπεσον, ἔπεσα (3d pl. **ἔπεσαν**, Gospel 5, Acts 2), **πέπτωκα.** In Rev. 2:5 **πέπτωκες**, Rev. 18:3 **πέπτωκαν**.
Πλέω (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, κατα-, παρα-, ὑπο-, **-έπλεον** (3d sing. **ἐξ-έπλει** contracted), **-έπλευσα**.
Πλέκω (ἐμ-- only comp.), **πλέκομαι**; aor. act. part. **πλέξας**; 2d aor. pass. **ἐμπλακείς**.
Πλήσσω (ἐκ-, ἐπι--). Act. 1st aor. subj. **ἐπι-πλήξῃς** (1 Tim. 5:1); pass. pres. **ἐκ-πλήσσεσθαι**; imperf. **ἐξ-ελησσόμην**, 2d aor. **ἐπλήγη** (simplex) and **ἐξ-επλαγην** (see Veitch).
Πνίγω (ἀπο-, ἐπι-, συμ-). **Ἔπνιγον, ἔπνιξα, ἐπνιγόμην, ἀπ-επνίγην.**
Πράσσω. Πράξω, ἔπραξα, πέπραχα, πέπραγμαι.
Πυνθάνομαι. Ἐπυθανόμην, ἐπυθόμην.
Ῥαντίζω. Ἐράντισα (some MSS. **ἐρράντ.), ῥεράντισμα** (so W. H., but some MSS. **ἐρρ.**. Mid. 1st aor. subj. **ῥαντίσωται** (Mk. 7:4).

῾Ρέω (παρα-). ῾Ρεύσω; 2d abr. pass. **–ερρύην**.

῾Ρήσσω (δια-, περι-, προσ- and **ῥήγνυμι**). The active forms belong to **ῥήσσω** and the passive to **ῥήγνυμι.** Act.. pres. **ῥήσσει, δια-**; fut. **ῥήξω**; 1st aor. **ἔρ(ρ)ηξα, δι-, περι-, προσ-;** pass. pres. **ῥήγνυνται**; **δι-ερ(ρ)ήγνυτο** (Lu. 5:6). The reading of Lu. 5:6 varies between **δι-ερ(ρ)ήγνυντο** and **δι-ερ(ρ)ήσσετο**.

Σβέννυμι and **σβεννύω, σβέννυμαι**, stem **σβε(σ)-.** Pres. **σβέννυτε, σβέσω, ἔσβεσα;** pass. **σβέννυμαι.**

Σείω (ἀνα-, δια-, κατα-). ᾿Αν-δι-κατ-έσεισα, σείσω; pass. pres. **σειόμενος**; 1st aor. **ἐσείσθην**.

Σκάπτω (κατα-). ᾿Εσκαψα, -έσκαμμαι (Ac. 15:16 Rec.).

Σκέπτομαι is not found in N. T. save in **ἐπισκέπτεσθαι** (Jas. 1:27; Heb. 2:6 Q), **ἐπι-σκέψομαι**; 1st aor. mid.

Σπάω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-, περι-). Pres. inf. **ἀπο-σπᾶν, ἀνα-σπάσω, ἀπο-έσπασα;** pass. **περι-εσπώμην, -εσπάσθην, ἀν-, ἀπο-, δια-;** perf. inf. **δι-εσπάσθαι**. 1st nor. mid. **σπασάμενος** (simplex).

Σπείρω (δια-, ἐπι-). ᾿Εσπειρα, ἔσπαρμαι, ἐσπάρην, δι-.

Στέλλω. Simplex only in pass. pres. **(᾿Απο-, ἐξ-απο-, συν-απο-, δια-, ἐπι-, κατα-, συ(ν)-, ὑπο-). ῾Υπ-έστελλον, δι-εστελλόμην, -στελῶ, -έστειλα, ἀπ-έσταλκα (ἀπέσταλκαν** in Ac. 16:36), **--ἔσταλμαι, ἀπο-εστάλην, δι-, ὑπ-εστειλάμην**.

Στήκω. Cf. modern Greek **στέκω** from **ἕστηκα**. Imperf. **ἕστηκον** in Jo. 8:44 and Rev. 12:4 according to W. H.

Στηρίζω (ἐπι–). **Στηρίξω (-ίσω** in MSS., 2 Th. 3:3, W. H. alt.; cf. **–ιῶ** in LXX), **ἐστήριξα** and **ἐστήρισα, στηρίξαι** (opt. and inf.), **ἐστήριγμαι, ἐστηρίχθην**.

Στρέφω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μετα-, συ(ν), ὑπο-). ῾Υπ-έστρεφον, -στρέψω, ἔστρεψα, -έστραμμαι, ἐστράφην, μετα-στραφήσομαι

Στρώννυμι or **στρωννύω (κατα-, ὑπο-).** Present does not occur. **᾿Εστρώννυον, ἔστρωσα, ἔστρωμαι, κατ-εστρώθην**.

Σφάζω (κατα-). Present does not occur. **Σφάξω, ἔσφαξα, ἔσφαγμαι, ἐσφάγην.**

Σώζω (δια-, ἐκ-). Σώσω, ἔσωσα, σέσωκα, ἐσωζόμην, σέσωσμαι, ἐσώθην, σωθήσομαι.

Τάσσω. (ἀνα- [**-μαι**], **ἀντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐπι-δια-** [**-μαι**] , **ἐπι-**, [**–προ-**] **προσ-, συν-, ὑπο-).᾿Εταξα, δια-τεταχέναι, τέταγ-** [**μαι**]; 2d aor. **δι-, ὑπ-ετάγην, δια-τάξομαι;** 2d fut. **ὑπο-ταγήσομαι**; 1st aor. **δια-ταχθείς** 1st nor. mid. **ἐταξάμην**.

Τελεώ (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, συν-). –**τελέσω, ἐτέλεσα, τετέλεκα, τετέλεσμαι, ἐτελέσθην, τελεσθήσομαι**.

Τέλλω (ἀνα-, ἐξανα-, ἐν-). Simplex does not occur in N. T. 1st aor. **ἀν-, ἐξαν-έτειλα**; perf. **ἀνα-τέταλκα**. pres. **ἐν-τέλλομαι**; fut. **ἐν-τελοῦμαι**; perf. **ἐν-τέταλμαι**; mid. 1st aor. **ἐν-ετειλάμην**.

Τέμνω (περι-, συν-). Simplex does not occur. 2d aor. **περι-έτεομον**; inf. **περι-τεμεῖν**; pass. pros., 1st aor. **περι-ετμήθην**; perf. **περι-τεμημένος.**

Τίθημι (**ἀνα-, προσ-ανα-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἀντι-δια-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, συν-ἐπι-, κατα-, συν-κατα-, μετα-, παρα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπο-).** Act. pres. complete. Imperf. **ἐτίθει** and **ἐτίθεσαν, ἐτίθουν** (from **τιθέω**); fut. **θήσω**; aor. **ἔθηκα, -κας, -καν** (3d pl.); imper. **θές (ἐπι-, προσ-**); subj. **θῶ** (complete); inf. **θεῖναι**; part. **θείς**; perf. **τέθεικα**; mid. and pass. **τίθεμαι, τέθειμαι, συν-ετέθειντο, ἐτιθέμην (ἐξ-, προσ-)**; mid. fut. **δαι-, ἐπι-θήσομαι**; 2d aor. **ἐθέμην** (complete); imper. **θοῦ (παρα-); θέσθε (ἀπο-);** inf. **θέσθαι (ἀπο-, κατα-);** part. **θέμενος (ἀπο-, δια-).** Pass. fut. **τεθήσομαι;** aor. **ἐτέθην**; inf. **τεθῆναι**; part. **τεθείς**.

Τίκτω. Τέξομαι, ἔτεκον, ἐτέχθην.

Τρέπω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐν-, ἐπι-, μετα-, περι-, προ-) Simplex not in N. T. 1st nor. **ἀν–, ἐπ-έτρεψα**; mid. pres. imperf. **ἐν-ετρεπόμην;** 1st aor. part. **προ-**

τρεψάμενος; pass. "strong" fut. ἐκ-, ἐν-τραπήσονται; 2d aor. ἐκ-, ἐπ-ετράπην; perf. ἐπι-τέτραπται (1 Cor. 14:34 Rec.).

Τρέφω (ἀνα--, ἐκ--, ἐν-). ᾽Εθρεψα, -εθρεψάμην, τέθραμμαι, -ετράφην.

Τρέχω (εἰσ-, κατα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ἐπι-συν-, ὑπο-). Pres. complete. ᾽Ετρεχον, ἔδραμον.

Τρίβω (δια-, συν-). Simplex does not occur. Pres. δια–, συν–; imperf. σι-έτριβον; fut. συν-τρίψω; 1st aor. δι-, συν-έτριψα; pass. pres. συν-τρίβομαι; 2d fut. συν τριβήσομαι; perf. inf. συν-τετρίφθαι; part. συν-τετριμμένος

Τυγχάνω (ἐν-, ὑπερ-εν-, ἐπι-, παρα-, συν-). ᾽Ετυχον opt. τύχοι, τέτυχα (Heb. 8:6 ℵ*AD*KL), τέτευχα (Rec., BE, or even τετύχηκα in MSS.).

Φαίνω (ἀνα-, ἐπι-). Pres. –έφανα (φανη, Rev. 8:12, 18:23 is variously accented), ἐφάνην, φανήσομαι and φανοῦμαι (LXX).

Φείδομαι. Φείσομαι, ἐφεισάμην.

Φέρω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, δια-, εἰσ-, παρ-εισ-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, παρα-, περι-, προ-, προσ-, συν-, ὑπο-). ᾽Εφερον, ἐφερόμην, οἴσω, -ήνεγκα, indic. ἤνεγκον; other parts ἠνέχθην; 2d perf. act. προσ-ενήνοχα

Φεύγω (ἀπο-, δια-, ἐκ-, κατα-). Mid. fut. φεύξομαι; 2d perf. ἐκ-πεφευγέναι, ἔφυγον.

Φθάνω (προ-). ᾽Εφθασα, ἔφθακα (1 Th. 2:16 W. II. marg.).

Φθείρω (δια-, κατα-). Imperf. (?) ἔ-φθειρεν (Rev. 19:2). Φθερῶ, ἔφθειρα, --έφθαρμαι, ἐφθάρην, φθαρήσομαι.

Φράσσω. ᾽Εφραξα, ἐφράγην, φραγήσομαι

Φύω (ἐκ-, συν-). Pres. part. φύων; pass. 2d aor. part. φυέν, συν-φυεῖσαι. A further form ἐκ-φυη (Mt. 24:32 = Mk..) may be accented –φύη (W. H.) and will then be active pres. subj. or 1st aor. subj.; or –φυῇ and will then be pass. 2d aor. subj. In this case τὰ φύλλα is considered the subject.

Χέω (ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, συν-). Simplex does not occur in N. T. and χύννυω (simplex not in LXX or N. T.). Comp. ἐκ-, ὑπερεκ-, συν-. Active part. (Lu. 10:34); imperf. συν-έχυννεν (Ac. 9:22); fut. ἐκ-χεῶ (LXX); 1st aor. ἐκ-, κατ-έχεα; inf. ἐκ-χέαι (Ro. 3:15, LXX); 2d aor. (?) imper. ἐκ-χέετε (Rev. 16:1), συν-έχεον (Ac. 21:27). Hort. (II, p. 165) would refer the above forms "to an otherwise virtually unknown 2d aor." Pass. pres. ἐκ-χεῖται (Mt. 9:17) and ἐκ-συν-, -ὑπερ-εκχύννομαι; imperf. ἐξ-εχύννετο (Ac. 22:20); fut. ἐκ-χυθήσομαι; 1st aor. ἐξ-, συν-εχυθην; perf. ἐκ-, συν-κέχυμαι

Χρίω (ἐγ-, ἐπι-). Aor. ἔχρισα, ἐγ-χρῖσαι, (Rev. 3:18) may be inf. of 1st aor. active (W. H.) or imper. of 1st aor. mid. (ἔγχρισαι).

Χαίρω (συν-). ᾽Εχαιρον, ἐχάρην, χαρήσομαι, some MSS. χαρῶ, (Rev. 11:10).

Χαρίζομαι. Mid. χαρίσομαι, ἐχαρισαμην; pass. κεχάρισμαι, ἐχαρίσθην, χαρισθήσομαι.

Χράομαι (κατα-). ᾽Εχρώμην, ἐχρησάμμην, κέχρημαι. Impers. χρή only once (Jas. 3:10).

Ψύχω (ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, κατα-; ἀν-, ἐκ-, κατ-έψυξα). Ψυγήσομαι.

᾽Ωνέομαι. ᾽Ωνησάμην, not ἐπριάμην.

13. **Ablaut**. It is important for the student to note the part played in Greek words, both root-syllables and other syllables, by ablaut or vowel-gradation. We find qualitative ablaut, as φέρω, φορος and λείπω, λέλοιπα. Then there is quantitative or qualitative-quantitative ablaut, as in ἴμεν, εἶμι and λιπεῖν, λείπω.

The subject is still more or less obscure as to the precise order of these vowel-changes and the precise factor in each change (accentuation, vowel-contraction, compensative lengthening). For a brief account see Wright, *Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language*, 1912, pp. 49-61; Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Gr*., pp. 138-50; Hirt, *Handbuch der griech. Laut- and Formenlehre*, pp. 84-105. For a fuller discussion see Hirt, *Der indogermanische Ablaut*; Brugmann, *Grundriss*, vol. I, pp. 482-505.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

References to pages. A complete List of Topics is not attempted

A

א: see Sinaiticus.

a-text: see Syrian text.

A: see Alexandrinus.

Abbreviations: of personal names, 171-3.

Ablative case: form, 248; Doric genitive-ablative, 254; Attic gen.-abl., 255 f.; name, 514; meaning, 514; rare with substantives, 514 f., with adjectives, 515 f.; with prepositions, 516 f. and ch. XIII; with verbs, 517-20 (of departure and removal 518, of ceasing and abstaining 518, of missing, lacking, despairing 518, of differing, excelling 519, of asking and hearing 519, with the partitive idea 519, attraction of relative 519 f.); after comparative, 667.

Ablaut: 1220 f.

Absolute: use of cases, 416; nominative, 459 f.; accusative, 400 f.; genitive, 512-4; positive adjective in absolute sense, 661; inf., 1092 f.; participle, 1130-2.

Abstract nouns: 152, 794.

Accent: discussion of, 226-36 (age of Greek accent 226-8, significance of, in the **κοινή** 228 f., signs of 229, later developments in 229 f., shortening stem-vowels 230 f., separate words 231 f., difference in sense 232 f., enclitics and proclitics 233-5, proper names 235, foreign words 235 f.); rules for accent of enclitics and proclitics, 1211.

Accidence: in the vernacular **κοινή** 72 f.; in the N. T., 82; part II, 141-376.

Accumulation of prepositions: see prepositions.

Accusative case: form, 248; double accusative, 257; singular in third decl., 264 f.; plural, 265 f.; like nom. in **-ες**, 266; singular of adjectives, 274; name, 466 f.; meaning of, 467 f.; with verbs of motion, 468 f.; extent of space, 469; for time, 469-71; with transitive verbs, 471-7; cognate, 477-9; double, 479-84; with passive verbs, 484-6; adverbial, 486-8; by antiptosis, 488; by inverse attraction, 488; with the infinitive, 489 f.; acc. absolute, 490 f., 1130; with prepositions, 491 and ch. XIII; compared with genitive, 506-10.

Achaean: origin, 16; Achan-Doric, 17, 54, 266; Achaean-Dorian **κοινή** 53, 63.

Active voice: endings, 337-9; displacing future middle, 356; meaning of, 799; transitive or intransitive, 799 f., effect of prepositions, 800; variation in tenses, 800 1.; causative, 801 f.; with reflexives, 802; impersonal, 802; infinitives, 802; as passive of another verb, 802 f. Acts: 120-3. See Index of Quotations, and passim in the volume.

Adjectives: with formative suffixes, 157-60 (primitive, 157 f.; secondary, 158-60: from verbs 158, from substantives 158, from adjectives 159 f., from adverbs 160); compound, 161-9 (with inseparable

prefixes 161 f., agglutinative or juxtapositive 168 f.); declension of adjectives, 270-6 (origin of the adjective 270 f., inflection of adjectives with one termination 271f., with two terminations 272 f., with three 273 f., the accus. singular 274, contraction in 274 f., indeclinable 275 f.); comparison of, 276-81 (positive 276, comparative 276-8, superlative 278-81); in predicate, 401; and substantive, 407; gender in, 412 f.; with vocative, 464; with genitive, 503-5; with ablative, 515 f.; with locative or instrumental, 523; with dative, 537; distinguished from adverbs, 549 f., 657; syntax of, ch. XIV, 650-75; origin of, 650; adjectival or appositional use of substantive, 651 f.; as substantive, 652-4 (any gender 652, masculine 652, feminine 652 f., neuter 654 f.); agreement with substantives, 654 f. (number 654 f., gender 655, case 655, two or more adjectives 655); attributive, 655 f.; predicate, 656 f.; personal construction, 657 f.; with cases, 658; with the inf. and clauses, 658 f.; as adverb, 659; positive, 659-61 (relative contrast 659 f., as comparative or superlative 660 f., with prepositions 661, comparison implied by ἤ 661, in absolute sense 661) ; comparative, 662-9 (contrast or duality 662 f., degree 663, without suffixes 663, double 663 f., without object of 664-6, followed by 666, by the ablative 666 f., by prepositions 667, displacing the superlative 667-9); superlative, 669-71 (vanishing 669, few true in N. T. 669 f., dative 670, no "Hebraistic" 671); numerals, 671-5; with inf., 1076 f.; part. originally, 1100 f.; adjectival aspects of part., 1104-10; negatives with, 1163 f.

Adverbs: with formative suffixes, 160; agglutinative compounds, 169-71; neglect of adverbs, 293; formation of, 294-7 (fixed cases 294, accus. 294 f., ablative 295, genitive 295, locative 295, instrumental 295 f., dative 296, suffixes 296, compound adverbs 297, analogy 297, comparison of adverbs 297); adverbial stems, 297-9 (substantives 298, adjectives 298, numerals 298, pronouns 298, verbs 298 f.); use of adverbs, 299-300 (manner 299, place 299 f., time 300); scope of, 300-2 (relative between adverbs and prepositions 301, adverbs and conjunctions 301 f., adverbs and intensive particles 302, adverbs and interjections 302); adverbial accusative, 486-8; genitive with, 505; dative with, 537 f.; syntax of, ch. XII, 544-52; special difficulties, 544; nature of, 544; narrower sense of, 544 f.; adverbs with verbs, 545 f. (commonest 545, N. T. usage 545, predicate uses 545 f., with ἔχω 546, with participles 546, loose relation 546); with other adverbs, 546; with adjectives, 546 f.; with substantives, 547; as substantives, 547 f.; frequent use of, 548; as marks of style, 548 f.; distinguished from adjective, 549 f. (different meaning 549, difference in Greek and English idiom 549 f.); adverbial phrases 550-2 (incipient adverbs 550, prepositional phrases 550 f., participles 551,1109 f.); the verb, 554 f.; prepositions, 554 f.; adjective as, 659; article with, 765 f.

Adversative particles: 1187 f.

AEolic: lyric odes, 17; persistence of, 52; relation to Doric, 17, 53; influence on κοινή, 63; on the N. T., 82; and here and there, *ad libitum*.

AEschylus : see Index of Quotations.

Affixes: 146.

Agent: words expressing, 153 f.; dative of, 542; with passive, 820.

Agglutinative : type of languages, 37; compounds, 163-71.

Agreement: see concord.

Aktionsart: 344 f., 823 f., 828 f., 831-5, 850 f., 858 f.
Alexander the Great: 44, 49-51, 53 ff., 60-3, 66-8, 71, 239, etc.
Alexandrian: grammarians, 31; do not treat adjectives, 650; no Alexandrian dialect, 68, 91, 100, 213, 215, 227, 242.
Alexandrian type of text: 180 and passim.
Alexandrinus: 179 and *passim*.
Allegory: 1207.
Alliteration: 1201.
Alphabet: original Greek, 178; law enforcing Ionic alphabet, 181, 209, 222.
Alternative: pronouns, 745-50 (see distributive); questions, 736 f.
Amplification: of subject, 398-400; of predicate, 400 f.
Anabasis: *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Anacoluthon: discussion of, 435-40 (suspended subject 436 f., digression 437-9, participle in 439 f., asyndeton 440); distinction from *oratio variata*, 440 f.; kinds of, 1203 f.
Analogy: *passim*.
Anaphora: 1200.
Anaphoric: see article, demonstrative, relative.
Anarthrous : attributive, 782-4; predicate, 790-6; participle, 1105 f.
Annominatio: 1201.
Antecedent: see demonstrative, relative, preposition.
Antiptosis: 488.
Antistrophe : 1200.
Antithesis: 1199 f.
Aorist: second aorist of **-μι** verbs, 307-11; forms of, strong and weak, second and first, 345-50; passive, 816 ff.; name, 831; *Aktionsart* in, 831-5 (constative 831-4, ingressive 834, effective 834 f.); indicative, 835-48 (narrative or historical tense 835 f., gnomic 836 f., relation to imperfect 837-40, relation to past perfect 840 f., relation to present 841-3, relation to present perfect 843-5, epistolary 845 f., relation to the future 846 f., in wishes 847, variation in use of tenses 847, translation of aorist into English 847 f.); subjunctive and optative, 848-55 (no time-element 848, frequency of subj. 848-50, *Aktionsart* 850 f., aorist subj. in prohibitions 851-4, aorist subj. with **θύ μή**, 854, aorist opt. 854 f.); imperative, 855 f.; infinitive, 856-8; participle, 858-64 and 1112-4 (*Aktionsart* 858 f., .5 and aorist 859 f., antecedent action 860, simultaneous action 860 f., subsequent action 861-3, aorist participle in indirect discourse 863 f.).
Aoristic: see punctiliar, present, perfect, future.
Aphaeresis : 205 f.
Apocalypse: 101, 135 f.; solecisms in, 413-6 and *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Apocrypha: *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Apodosis: see 921-3 and conditional sentences, 1007-27.
Aposiopesis: 1203.
Apostrophe: use of, 244.
Appian: see Index of Quotations.
Apposition: with substantive, 368-400; partitive, 399; predicative amplifications, 401; peculiarities in, 413 ff.; to vocative, 464; genitive of, 498 f.; appositional use of substantive, 651 f.; with **οὗτος**, 698-700; **ἐκεῖνος** 708; appositional inf., 1078 f.
Aquila: see Index of Quotations.
Aramaic: 24; spoken by Jesus, 26-9; distinct from the Hebrew, 102; portions of the 0. T. in, 103; the vernacular of Palestine, 103 f.; Josephus' use of, in his War, 104; signs of, in the N. T., 104 f.; possible use by Mark and Matthew, 105; proper names, 214 f., 236; on prepositions, 556 f.; and *passim*.
Arcadian; 63, 67, 82, 84, 184, *passim*.

Aristophanes: and the vernacular, 66. See Index of Quotations.
Aristotle: shows influence of Ionic and marks transition to Koun'7, 55, 58, 128, 146, 148-53, 168 f., 171, *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Arrangement: see sentence.
Arrian: see Index of Quotations.
Article: use by Peter, 127; with voca-Live, 465 f.; as possessive, 684; with possessive, 685; with reflexive, 690; with **οὗτος**, 700-2; with **ἐκεῖνος**, 708; origin and development of, 754 f. (a Greek contribution 754, derived from demonstrative 755); significance of, 755; method employed by, 756-8 (individuals from individuals 756, classes from classes 757, qualities from qualities 75S); varied usages of, 75S-76 (with substantives, context, gender, proper names, anaphoric 758-62, with adjectives, resumptive, adj. alone,with numerals 762-4, with participles 764 f., infinitive 765, with adverbs 765 f., with prepositional phrases 766, with single words or whole sentences 766, with genitive alone 767, nouns in predicate 767-9, distributive 769, nominative with = vocative 769, = possessive 769 f., with possessive 770, with **αὐτός** 770, with demonstratives 770 f., with **ὅλος, πᾶς** [**ἅπας**] 771-4, with **πλύς** 774 f., **ἄκρος, ἥμισυς, ἔσχατος, μέσος** 775, with **ἄλλος** and **ἕτερος** 775 f., with **μόνος** 776); position with attributives, 776-89 (with adjectives, normal, repetition, one with several, anarthrous substantives, partieiples 776-9, with genitive, between article and gen., after gen. without repetition, repetition with gen., absent with both, correlation of article 779-82, with adjuncts or adverbs, between article and noun, repeated, only with adjunct, only with noun, when several adjuncts occur, phrases of verbal origin, exegetical questions, anarthrous attributive 782-4, several attribii-tives with **καί**, same person or thing, when distinguished, treated as one, point of view, difference in number or gender, with disjunctive particle 785-9); position with predicates, 789 f.; absence of, 790-6 (with proper names 791, with genitives 791, prepositional phrases 791 f., with both preposition and genitive 792 f., titles 793, words in pairs 793, ordinal numerals 793 f., in predicate 794, abstract words 794, qualitative force 794, only objest of kind 794-6); with inf., 1062-8; articular part., 1106-8.
Article, indefinite: **εἷς** as, 674; **τις** and **εἷς**, 796.
Articular infinitive: 1062-S.
Articular participle: 1106-S.
Artistic prose: see literary **κοινή**.
Asianism: 60, 73, 57 f., *passim*.
Aspirate : 191, 209; doubling of, 215; aspiration of consonants, 219; origin of the aspirate, 221 f.; variations in MSS., 223-5; transliterated Semitic words, 225; use with **ρ** and **ρρ**, 225 f.; question of **αὐτοῦ**, 226.
Assertion, **sentence of :** see indirect discourse.
Asseverative particles: 1150.
Assimilation: of consonants, 215-7; rules for, 1210.
Associative case: see instrumental.
Asyndeton: 427-44; imperative in, 949.
Athens: losing its primacy in culture, 67, *passim*.
Attendant circumstance, participle of: see participle.
Attic: 16, 17, 20, 22, 35 f., 41-4; triumph of, 51; vernacular, the base of the **κοινή**, 60-2; influence on N. T., 82; Attic inscriptions show indifference to hiatus, 207; genitive-abl., 255 f . ; "Attic" declension, 260; *ad libitum* in the book.
Attica: 181 f.
Atticism: not part of the **κοινή**, 50; the

Atticistic reaction and its influence, 58-60, 73; conservative influence of, 177 f.; pronunciation, 239, *passim*.
Attraction of relative: inverse, 488; to genitive, 512; to ablative, 519 f.; with ὅς, 714-9; ὅσος, 732 f.
Attributive: adjective, 655 f.; positive article, 776-89. See participle.
Augment: discussion of, 365-8 (origin of 365, where found 365, purpose of 365, syllabic 365 f., temporal 366 f., compound verbs 367, double 367 f.); in past perfect, 1211 f.
Authorized version: influence of, on English language, 92.

B

B: see Vaticanus.
β-text: see Neutral text.
Bezae, Codex: 179 f., passim.
"Biblical" Greek: 5; view of E. Hatch refuted by Deissmann, 24 f.; the new point of view, 30; N. T. not "biblical Greek," 77-9, 88, 92, 112 f., *passim*.
Bilingualism: in Palestine, 27-30; in Brittany, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, 30, 69, 102 f.
Blending: see cases.
Boeotian: 16, 52; influence of, 61, 63; monophthongizing, 204 f.; pronunciation, 240; *passim*.
βουστροφηδόν: 1211.
Brachylogy: 1201, 1203.
Breathings : 221-6; use with ρ and ρρ, 225 f.; in Ionic, 240.
Breviloquence : see Brachylogy.
Brittany, bilingual: 29.
Broken continuity: see perfect and past perfect.
Byzantine Greek: literature on, 22-4, 43, 155, 179, 183, 191, 210, *passim*.

C

C = Codex Ephraemi: *passim*.
Cardinals: see numerals.
Cases: number of, 247-50 (history of the forms 247 ff., blending of case-endings, syncretism of the forms 249 f., origin of case-suffixes 250); concord in, 413-6 (adjectives 413, participles 413, the Book of Rovelation 413-6, apposition 416, absolute 416); syntax of, ch. XI, 446-543; history of interpretation of, 446-9 (confusion 446, Bopp's contribution 446 f., modern usage 447, Green's classification 447 f., syncretisrn of the cases 448, freedom in use of 448 f.); purpose of the cases, 449 (Aristotle's usage, word-relations); encroachment of prepositions on, 450-3 (reason 450, no "governing " of cases 450, not used indifferently 450 f., original use with "local" cases 451, 567, increasing use of 451 f., distinction preserved in N. T. 453); distinctive idea in each case, 453-6 (fundamental idea 453 f., cases not yet interchangeable 454, vitality of case-idea 454, historical development of the cases 454 f., method of this grammar 456); nominative, 456-66; vocative, 461-6; accusative, 466-91; genitive, 491-514; ablative, 514-20; locative, 520-5; instrumental, 525-35; dative, 535-43; functions of prepositions with, 567-71; see discussion of each preposition in ch. XIII; adjective and substantive, 655; with adjectives, 658; 6s, attraction and incorporation, 714-9; ὅστις, 728 f.; of inf., 1058-62; with inf., 1082; participle, 1119.
Causal participle: see participle and causal clauses.
Causal particles: see conjunctions and causal sentences (hypotactic).
Causal sentences: use of ὅς, 724 f.; paratactic, 962 f.; with hypotactic conjunctions, 963 f .; relatives, 965 f .; διὰ τό, and the infinitive, 966; par ticiple, 966, 1128; inf., 1091.
Causative verbs: 150; active, 801 f., middle, 808 f.

Cautious assertion: see final and consecutive sentences.
Chaldee (Aramaic): 211. See Aramaic.
Chiasm: 1200.
Chinese : 250.
Christian :element in N. T. Greek: chiefly lexical, 112-6; new connotations of familiar words, 115 f.
Chysostom: *passim*..
Circumlocutions: 330, 64S f.
Circumstantial participle: see participle.
"Classical Greek": 5, 89, *passim*.
Clause: paratactic, 428 f.; hypotactic, 429-31; inf. and part., 431 f.; clauses with the adjectives, 658 f.
Climax: 1200.
Collectives : see gender and number.
Colloquial: see vernacular.
Colon: 243.
Comma: origin of, 243.
Common speech: see κοινή.
Comparative: see adjectives.
Comparative clauses: with relative ὅσος,966 f.; relative with κατά, 967; καθότι, 967; ὡς and its compounds, 967 ff.
Comparative grammar or philology: 8-12; the linguistic revolution, 8; sketch of Greek grammatical history, 8-10; the discovery of Sanskrit, 10; from Bopp to Brugmann, 10 ff.; importance of, 36; the original Indo-Germanic speech, 38; Greek as a "dialect" of, 39 f.; applied to N. T. word-formation, 144; system of affixes, infixes, prefixes, suffixes, 146-247,250, *passim*.
Comparison: of adjectives, 276-81; of adverbs, 297; syntax of, 661-9.
Complementary infinitive: see infinitive (with verbs).
Complementary participle: see participle.
Composition: compound words cornmon in the N. T., 82; compound verbs in -εω, 147 f.; discussion of *composita* in the N. T., 160-71 (kinds of, proper, copulative, derivative 161, inseparable prefixes 161-3, agglutinative or by juxtaposition 163-71).
Compound sentences: order of clauses in, 425; two kinds of sentences, 425 f.; two kinds of compound or complex, 426; parataxis, 426; hypotaxis, 426 f.
Conative action: 880, 885.
Concessive: imperative as, 949; clause, 1026; participle, 1128.
Concord: and government, 397 f.; in person, 402 f.; in number, 403-9; in gender, 410-3; in case, 413-6.
Conditional sentences: apodosis of second class, 921-3; two types, 1004-7; four classes, 1007-22 (detcrmined as fulfilled 1007-12, determined as unfulfilled 1012-6, undetermined, but with possibility of determination 1016-20, remote possibility of determination 1021 f.); mixed conditions, 1022; implied conditions, 1022 f.; elliptical, 1023-6; concessive clauses, 1026 f.; other particles with εἰ and ἐάν, 1027; participle, 1129.
Conjugation of verb: : ch.VIII, 303-76.
Conjunctions: adverbs, 301; in subordinate clauses, 951 f.; and all through the discussion of hypotactic clauses, 950-1049; paratactic, 1177-92 (copulative: τέ 1178 f., καί 1179-83, δέ 1183-5, ἀλλά 1185 f.; adversative: δέ 1186 f., πλήν 1187, μέντοι 1188, ὅμως 1188, εἰ μή 1188; disjunctive: ἤ 1188 f., εἴτε and ἐάντε 1189, οὔτε and μήτε 1189; inferential: ἄρα 1189 f., γάρ 1190 f., οὖν 1191 f.); hypotactic, 1192 f.
Consecutive : use of ὅς; clauses, see final and consecutive.
Consonants: changes, 209-21 (origin and character of the consonants 209 f., the insertion of 210, the omission of 210 f., single or double 211-5, assimilation of 215-7, interchange and changing value of 217-9, aspiration of 219, variable final 219-21, metathesis 221).

Constative action: see aorist.
Constructio ad sensum: illustrated in, 400-424, 683 1., 1201.
Constructio praegnans: 1204. See also prepositions.
Contraction: discussion of, 203 f.; in second declension, 260 f.; in third declension, 268; in adjectives, 275 f.; in verbs, 341-3.
Contrasts: in Greek words, 175 f.; in comparison, 662 f.
Co-ordination: 443 f.; between participles, 1135 f.
Coptic: 215, 250 f., *passim*.
Copula: not necessary, 395 f.
Copulative conjunctions: 1177-86.
Coronis: 244.
Correlation of article: see article.
Correlative pronouns: 289 f., 298, 709 f., 732.
Crasis : 208.
Cretan dialect: *passim*.
Crete : early Greek culture in, 43.
Culture : variations in N. T. writers, 381.
Cynic-Stoic diatribe: 420 f., 1196 f.
Cyprus: as purveyor of Greek culture, 43; language and N. T. Gk., 82, *passim*.

D

D: see (Codex) Bezae.
δ-text: see Western text.
Dative: form, 248 ff.; syncretism, 535; decay of dative, 535 f.; idea of, 536; with substantives, 536 f.; with adjectives, 537; with adverbs and prepositions, 537 f. and ch. XIII; with verbs, 538-43 (indirect object 538, *dativus commodi vel incommodi*, 538 f., direct object 539-41, with intransitive verbs 541, possession 541, infinitive in dative 541 f., of the agent 542, because of preposition in composition 542 f.); ambiguous examples, 543; eth., 539.
Declarative clauses: 915 f., and see indirect discourse.
De-aspiration: increasing, 222 f.
Declensions : ch. VII, 246-302; history of the, 246 f.; first or a declension, 254-9 (Doric genitive-ablative singular 254 f., Attic genitive-ablative 255, vocative in -α 256, words in -ρα and participles in –υῖα 256; retention of --α gen.-abl. 256, double declensions 257, heteroclisis and metaplasm 257-9, indeclinable substantives 259); second or **ο**, 259-63 (the "Attic" 260, contraction 260 f., vocative 261, heteroclisis and metaplasm 261-3, mixed declension 263, proper names 263); third decl., 263-9 (nominative as vocative 264, accus. singular 264 f., accus. plural 265 f., peculiarities in the nominative 267 f., gen.-abl. 268, contraction 268, proper names 268 f., heteroclisis and metaplasm 269); indeclinable words, 269 f.; declension of adjectives, 270-81; numerals, 281-4; pronouns, 284-93; adverbs, 293-302.
Defective verbs: in voice, 799. See verbs.
Deictic: see demonstrative.
Deliberative: future, 875 f.; subjunctive, 934 f.; opt., 940; questions, 1046.
Delphian: 266.
Delta: 91.
Demonstrative pronouns: inflection of, 289 f.; nature of, 693; shades of meaning, 693; **ὁ, ἡ, τό**, 693-5; **ὅς**, 695 f.; **ὅδε**, 696 f.; **οὗτος**, 697-706 (the deictic use 697, the contemptuous use 697, the anaphoric use 697 f., in apposition 698-700, use of article 700 f., without article 701 f., contrast with **ἐκεῖνος** 702 f., antecedent of relative 703 f., gender and number 704, adverbial uses 704 f., phrase **τοῦτ' ἔστιν** 705, with other pronouns 705, ellipsis 705, shift in reference 706); **ἐκεῖνος** 706-9 (the purely deictic 707, the contemptuous use 707, the anaphoric 707, the remote object 707 f., emphasis 708, with apposition 705,

with article 708, antecedent to relative 708, gender and number 70S f., independent use 709); αὐτός, 709; correlative demonstratives 709 f.); article derived from, 755; article with, 770 f.
Demosthenes: in the New Attic, 52; pronouncing Greek, 238. See Index of Quotations.
Denial and prohibition, with οἱ) see aorist subj. and fut. ind.
Denominative verbs: 147.
Deponents: 332 f., 811-3, 817 f.
Derivation: derivative verbs, 147-50.
Design, **sentences of**: see final.
Diacritical marks: 226.
Dieresis: 204 f.; marks of, 244.
Dialects: fuller knowledge of the dialects, 16 f., 39 f., 41-4, 46, 52 f., 71, 79, 110 f.; dialect-coloured vernacular, 61-9, S2, 178 f.; accent in, 229-31, 238 ff.; declension in, 247; *passim*.
Diatribe, Cynic-Stoic: 420 f., 1196 f.
Diffuseness: see pleonasm.
Digamma: 209, 223 f.
Digraphs: 209.
Digression: 437 f.
Diminutives: frequent in the N. T., 82; less common than in modern Gk., 155.
Diodorus Siculus: see Index of Quotations.
Diphthongs: 204 f.
Direct discourse: exchange with indirect, 442 f.; with recitative ὅτι, 1027 f.
Discord: see concord.
Disjunctive particles: negative, 1165 f., 1173; conjunctions, 1188 f.
Dissimilation: see assimilation.
Distributive numerals: see numerals.
Distributive pronouns: inflection of, 292 f.; syntax of, 743, 744-50; ἀμφότεροι, 744 f.; ἕκαστος, 745 f.; ἄλλος, 746-8 (absolutely, for two, adjective, with article, ἄλλος ἄλλο, ellipsis, ἄλλος and ἕτερος, different, ἀλλότριος); ἕτερος, 748-50 (absolutely, with article, pair, different, three or more, contrast, antithetic); artide as, 769.
Division of words: not in old MSS., 243 f.
Doric: purest Hellenic, 17; tenacity of, 52; Doric-AEolic, 53; influence on the κοινή, 63; on the N. T., 82; genitive-ablative, 254, *passim*.
Doric: 16 f., 52-4, 62 f., 82, 118, 184 f., 193 f., 211, 224, 229, 240, 249, 254 f., 267, *passim*.
Double comparative and superlative: 663, 670.
Double compounds: 160, 165, 565.
Double consonants: 211-5.
Double declension: 257.
Double interrogative: 737.
Dual: origin and disappearance of, 251 f.
Duality: in the comparative adjective, 662 f.; with ἕτερος, 749.
Durative (linear) action: 823 f., 879-92.
Dynamic: see middle voice.

E

Ecbatic ἵνα: see consecutive clauses.
Ecbatic infinitive: see consecutive clauses and infinitive.
Editor's prerogative: 244 f.
Effective action: see aorist.
Egypt: 21, 56; peculiarities of κοινή in, 68, 91, 100 f., 111 f., 17S, 186, 189, 191, 195 f., 200, 202, 257, *passim*.
Elative: 278 f., 670.
Elean: 266.
Elision: 72, 206-8, 223, 226, 1210.
Ellipsis: of subject or predicate, 391; of οὗτος, 705 f.; in general, 1201 f.
Emphasis: position of, 417.1; in pronouns, 677 ff., 684 f., 686, 708.
Enallage: 454.
Enclitics: accent of, 233 ff.; pronouns, 681 f.; rules for accent of, 1211.
English: best English spoken in Edinburgh and Louisville, 69.
Epanadiplosis: 1200.
Epexegetic infinitive: 1086 f. —
Epexegetical apposition: 399.

Epic: 185, 204, *passim*.
Epicene : gender, 252.
Epidiorthosis : 1199.
Epimenides : see Index of Quotations.
Epistles: distinction from letters, 70 f., 85 ff., 197, 200, 239.
Epistolary aorist: see aorist.
Erasmus: on pronunciation of Greek, 237, 240.
Etacism: 191.
Etymology: work of the philosophers, 31; use of term, 143 f.
Euphony: 419-23.
Euripides: see Index of Quotations.
Euthalius: 241.
Exclamation: 461, 739, 741.

F

Fayum Papyri: see Index of Quotations.
Feminine: see gender.
Figures of speech: ch. XXII, 1194-1208;- rhetorical, not grammatical, 1194; style in the N. T., 1194-7; figures of thought, 1198 f. (rhetorical question, oratory, irony, prodiorthosis, epidiorthosis, paraleipsis, heterogeneous structure); figures of expression, 1199-1208 (parallels and contrasts: parallelism, synonymous or antithetic, chiasm or reverted parallelism, anaphora, antistrophe, poetry 1199 f.; contrasts in words: epanadiplosis, climax, zeugma, brachylogy, synonyms, onomatopoetic, alliteration, paronomasia, annominatio, parechesis, pun 1200 f.; contraction and expansion: ellipsis, aposiopesis, breviloquence or brachylogy, *constructio praegnans, constructio ad sensum,* hypallage, pleonasm, hyperbole, litotes, meiosis 1201-6; metaphors and similar tropes: metaphor, simile, parable, allegory, metonymy 1206 f.).
Final and consecutive clauses: kinship, 980; origin in parataxis, 980 f ; pure final, 981-91 (iva 981-5, ὅπως 985-7, ὡς 987, **μή, μή ποτε, μή πως**, 987-9, relative 989, infinitive 989-91, participle 991, 1128 f.); subfinal, 991-7 (ἵνα 991-4, ὅπως 994 f., **μή, μή ποτε, μή πως** 995 f., relative 996, infinitive 996 f., 1087-9, εἰ and ὅτι. 997); consecutive, 997-1003 ἵνα 997-9, ὥστε 999 f., ὡς 1000 f., ὅτι. 1001, relative 1001, infinitive 1001 ff., 1089-91).
Final consonants (letters): 194, 219-21, 248.
Finnish: 250.
First or a declension: 254-9, 267.
Foreign words: 108-11, 235 f. See Latinisms.
Formation of words: in the vernacu- κοινή, 72; ch. 11, pp. 143-76; formative suffixes, 146-60; by composition, 160-71.
Forms, rare: see declensions and conjugation of verbs.
Formulas of citation: 1027 f.
Fourth Book of Maccabees: see Index of Quotations.
Fourth Gospel and Apocalypse: see Index of Quotations.
French: accent, 230; cases and prepositions of, 252; gender, 252; passim.
Future: conjugation of, 353-7 (origin of 353 f., Ionic-Attic 355, syncopated 353 f., of liquid verbs 356, active and middle 356, second passive 356 f., first passive 357, per-- phrastic 357); syntax of middle, 813 f.; passive, 818-20; relation of aorist to, 846 f.; punctiliar (aoristic), 870-6 ("mixed" tense, punctiliar or durative 870-2, modal aspest of, merely futuristic, volitive, deliberative 872-6, in the modes 876-9: indicative 876, subjunctive and optative 876, infinitive 876, participle 877 f., periphrastic substitutes for 878 f.); durative (linear), 888-9 (three kinds of action 889, periphrastic 889); fut. ind. and nor. subj., 924 f.; fut. ind. as imperative, 942 f., 1118 f.

Future perfect: 361, 906 f.
Futuristic: modal aspect of future, merely futuristic, 872-4; present, 869 f., 881; pres. part., 992; present perfect, 898; subj., 928-30; optative, 937-9.

G

γ-text: see Alexandrian text.
Gender: of adjectives, 156 f.; in substantives, 252-4 (grammatical gender 252, kinds of 252, variations in 252 f., LXX illustrations 254); no feminine inflection in second declension, 259, 261 f.; concord in, 410-3 (fluctuations in 410 f., neuter singular 409, 411, explanatory ὅ ἐστιν and τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν 411 f., the participle 412, adjective 412 f.); of adjectives without substantives, 652-4; agreement with substantives, 654; οὗτος, 704; ἐκεῖνος, 708; ὅς, 712 ff.; ὅστις, 729.
Genealogy in Matthew: 270.
Genitive : form, 248, 263, 491 f.; Doric genitive-abl., 254 f.; Attic genitive-abl., 255 f.; name, 492; specifying case, 493 f.; local use, 494; temporal use, 495; with substantives, 495-503 (possessive 495 f., attributive 496 f., predicate 497 f., appositive or definitive 498 f., subjective 499, objective 499-501, of relationship 501 f., partitive 502, position of 502 f., concatenation of 503); with adjectives, 503-5; with adverbs and prepositions, 505 and ch. XIII; with verbs, 505-12 (very common 506, fading distinction from acc. 506, verbs of sensation 507 f., of emotion 508 f., of sharing, partaking, filling 509 f., of ruling 510, of buying, selling, being worthy of 510 f., of accusing and condemning 511, due to prepositions in composition 511 f., attraction of relative 512); of infinitive, 512; absolute, 512-4, 1131 f.
German: *passim*.
Gerundive: 157. See verbal adjectives.
Gnomic: aorist, 836 f.; present, 866; present perfect, 897.
Gorgian figures: 1197 IT.
Gothic : *passim*.
Grammar: the ideal grammar, 3; the pre-Winer period, 3; the service of Winer, 4; the modern period, the service of Deissmann, Thumb, Moulton, etc., 5-7; the new grammatical equipment, 8-31; sketch of Greek grammatical history, 8-10; advance in general Greek grammar, 12; critical editions of Greek authors, 13 ; grammatical monographs, 13; grammatical commentaries, 29; new point of view, 30; comparative, 31-48; in Alexander's time, 58-61; Greek grammarians and Latin, 822; Alexandrian grammarians and adjectives, 650; *passim*.
Greek authors: 13 f., 55, 57-9, 86 f., 94, 109, 121, 128 f., 147, 191, 199, 203, 218, 227, 238, 251, 265 f., chapter on Formation of Words, and *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Greek language: sketch of Greek grammatical history, 8-13; relation to earlier tongues, 39; regarded as a whole, 40-45; unity of, 41 f.; periods of, 43; the Greek point of view, 46-48; *passim*.
Greek culture : 14 ff., 35; subject to non-Greek influences, 49, 58, 67, 75, 84 f., 111 f., *passim*.
Greek, later: see Byzantine or modem Greek.
Greek point of view: 46-8.

H

Headings, anarthrous: see article.
Hebraisms: 3; the old view, 24 ff.; the revolt of Deissmann, 25 f.; number of, in N. T., 76 ff., 89; the traditional standpoint, 88 f.; translation, 89 f.; papyri and inscriptions disprove many, 90 f.; real, in

N. T., 94-6; greater indirect influence of the LXX, 96-102; transliterated words, 225; variety in N. T. writers, 106-8; on prepositions, 556 f.; φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό, 577; use of εἷς, 5 f.; superlative, 671; tense, 822; *passim*.
Hebraists : 76 ff., 88 f., 90 f.
Hebrew: proper names, 214; transliterated Hebrew words, 225; accent of proper names, 236, 259, 263, 268 ff., *passim*.
Hebrews: literary quality of, 106; peculiarities of, 132 f.; alone of the N. T. books avoids hiatus, 206, 218; rhythm in, 1196 f.
Hellenism: influence on Paul, 86.
Hellenistic : see κοινή.
Hendiadys: 1206.
Herculaneum: 196, 223, *passim*.
Hennas: see Index of Quotations.
Herodotus: 13, 57, 59, 266, *passim*.
Heteroclisis: 257-9 (the first and second decls., the first and third); between second and third, 261 f.; between masculine and neuter of second, 262 f.; third decl., 269.
Heterogeneous structure: 441 f., 1199.
Hiatus: 206-8, 219.
Historic present: see present.
Historical method of study: ch. II, 31-48; historical element essential, 31; descriptive historical grammar, 41, 71, 78, 173-5; syntax, 386.
History of words: 173 f.
Homer and Homeric Greek : 249, 252, passim. See Index of Quotations.
Hypallage: 1204.
Hyperbaton: 423 f.
Hyperbole : 1205.
Hypocoristic : 171-3.
Hypotaxis: 426 f., 429 f.; hypotactic sentences, 950-1049 (relative 953-62, causal 962-6, comparative 966-9, local 969 f., temporal 970-9, final and consecutive 980-1003, wishes 1003 f., conditional 1004-27, indirect discourse 1027-48, series of subordinate clauses 1048 f.).
Hypothetical sentences: see conditional sentences.
Hysteron proteron: 423.

I

Identical pronouns: see intensive pronouns.
Illative particles: see (inferential) conjunctions.
Illiteracy: in the papyri, 70 f.; diversity of culture, 85; *passim*.
Imperative: origin of, 320, 327-30 (non-thematic stem 327, thematic stem 327 f., suffix -θι 328, suffix -τω 328, old injunctive 328 f., forms in -am, 329, form in -σον 329, first person 329 f., prohibitions 330, perfect 330, periphrastic 330, circumlocutions 330); perfect, 360 f.; use of aorist, 855 f.; present, 890; perfect, 908; imper. and subj., 925; origin of, 941; meaning of, 941; disappearance of imperative forms, 941 f.; alternatives for, 942-6 (fut. ind. 942 f., subj. 943, opt. 943, infinitive 943 f., participle 944-6); uses of, 946-50 (command or exhortation 946 f., prohibition 947, entreaty 947 f., permission 948, concession or condition 948 f., in asyndeton 949, in subordinate clauses 949 f., tenses 950, in indirect discourse 950); negative with, 1161 f., 1170.
Imperfect: relation of, to aorist, 837-40; doubtful, 882 f.; descriptive tense in narrative, 883 f.; iterative or customary, 884; progressive, 884; inchoative or conative, 885; " negative," 885; potential, 885-7; in indirect discourse, 887; periphrastic, 887 f.; past perfect as, 885.
Impersonal verbs: active, 802; construction, 820.
"Improper" prepositions: see prepositions, 554, 636
Inceptive action: 150.
Incorporation of antecedent: 718 f., 731, 733.

Indeclinable words: accent, 236; substantives, 259; various foreign words, 269 f.; adjectives, 275 f.; **τί**, 736; **τι**, 744.
Indefinite article : 674 f., 796.
Indefinite pronouns: inflection of, 292; Tis, 741-4 (accent 741, relation to rig 741 f., as substantive 742, with numerals 742, with substantives 742 f., with adjectives 743, as predicate 743, position of 743, as antecedent 743, alternative 743, negative forms 743 f., indeclinable **τι** 744); **εἷς**, 744; **πᾶς**, 744; **ὁ δεῖνα**, 744.
Independent sentences: see para.-taxis.
Indicative: real mode, 320 f.; no mode sign, 322 f.; use of aor. ind., 835-48; future, 876; meaning of, 914 f.; kinds of sentences using, 915-8 (declarative or interrogative 915-7, positive or negative 917 f.); special uses of, 918-24 (past tenses, for courtesy 918 f., present necessity, obligation, etc. 919-21, apodosis of second class conditions 921-3, impossible wishes 923, present 923 f., future 924); in indirect discourse, 1032-6; negative with, 1157-60,1168 f.
Indirect discourse: exchange with direct, 442 f.; aorist participle in, 863 f.; imperfect ind., 887; present part., 992; perfect in; 897; inf. perf., 908; recitative **ὅτι** in *oratio recta,* 1027 f.; change of person in indirect discourse, 1028 f.; change of tense in, 1029 f.; change of mode in, 1030 f.; limits of indirect disc., 1031 f.; declarative clauses (indirect assertions), 1032-43 (**ὅτι** and indicative 1032-6, infinitive 1036-40, 1082-5, participle, 1040-2, 1122-4, **καί ἐγένεετο** 1042 f.); indirect questions, 1043-6 (tense 1043, mode 1043 f., interrog. pronouns and conjunctions used 1044 f.); indirect command, 1046 f., 1082-5 (deliberative questions 1046, conjunctions **ἵνα** and **ὅπως** 1046, infinitive, 1046 ff.); mixture, 1047 f.; the subordinate clause, 1048.
Individuality of N. T. writers: 116-37.
Indo-European: see Indo-Germanic.
Indo-Germanic : 10,37 ff., 145 ff., 209, 217, *passim*. See comparative philology (grammar).,
Inferential conjunctions : 1189-92.
Infinitive : ending, 246; forms of, 368-71 (original terminology 368, fixed case-forms 368 f., with voice and tense 369 f., no personal endings 370, article with 371, disappearance of inf. 371, N. T. forms 371); in apposition, 399 f.; in clauses, 431 f.; accusative with, 489 f.; in genitive, 512; in dative, 541 f.; with adjectives, 658 f.; article with, 765; and voice, 802; use of aorist, 856-8; future, 876 f.; perfect, 908 f.; as imperative, 943 f.; causal use of **διά τό**, 966; temporal use of, 978 f.; purpose, 989-91; sub-final, 996 f.; consecutive, 1001-3; in indirect discourse, 1036-40; in indirect command, 1046-8; origin of inf., 1051 f.; development, 1052-6 (prehistoric period 1052, earliest historic period 1052-4, classic period 1054-6, later period 1056-8); substantival aspects of inf., 1058-79 (case, subject or object 1058-62, articular 1062-8, prepositions with 1068-75, with substantives 1075 f., with adjectives 1076 f., with verbs 1077 f., appositional and epexegetical 1078 f.); verbal aspects of, 1079-95 (voice 1079 f., tense 1080-2, cases with 1082, in ind. disc. 1082-5, personal construction with 1085 f., epexegetical inf. 1086 f., purpose 1087-9, result 1089-91, cause 1091, time 1091 f., absolute 1092 f., negatives with 1093-5, 1162, 1171, **ἄν** with 1095); relation between part. and inf., 1101-3.
Infixes: 146.
Inflectional languages: 37.
Ingressive action: see aorist.

Injunctive mood: 321, 328 f., 913.
Inscriptions : the Greek inscriptions, 14-6, 52, 56 f., 66 ff., 76-80; more literary than the papyri, 84, 90 f., 96 f., 100 f., 106, 116, 130 f., 138 f., 148, 180, 181-93, 200, 202, *ad libiturn* through the book. See Index of Quotations.
Inseparable prefixes: 161-3.
Instrumental case: endings, 249 f.; term, 525 f.; syncretistic, 526; place, 526 f.; time, 527 f.; associative idea, 528-30; with words of likeness and identity, 530; manner, 530-2; with adjectives, 523, 530; measure, 532; cause, 532; means, 532-4; with prepositions, 534 f. and ch. XIII.
Instrumental use of ἐν: 589-91. See also locative.
Intensive particles: adverbs, 302; prepositions, 563 f.; limitations, 1144-7; γέ, 1147-9; δή, **1**149; εἶ μήν, νή and ναί, 1150; μέν, 1150-3; πέρ, 1153 f.; τοί, 1154 f.
Intensive perfect: see perfect tense.
Intensive pronouns: declension of, 287; nominative use of αὐτός, 685 f.; varying degrees of emphasis, 686; αὐτός with οὗτος, 686; αὐτός almost demonstrative, 686, in oblique cases, 686 f.; side by side with reflexive, 687; 6 667-65, 687.
Interjections: 302, 1193.
Interrogative particles: single questions, 1175-7 (direct, no particle, negative, others, interrogative pronouns, conjunctions, indirect, pronouns, conjunctions); double questions, 1177 (direct, indirect).
Interrogative pronouns: inflection of, 291 f.; τίς, 735-40 (substantival or adjectival 735, absence of gender 735, =ποῖος 735 f., indeclinable τί 736, alternative questions 736 f., double 737, as relative 737 f., predicate τί 738, adverbial 738 f., with prepositions 739, with particles 739, as exclamation 739, indirect questions 739, τίς or τὶς 739 f.); ποῖος, 740 (qualitative, non-qualitative, indirect questions); τόσος, 741 f. (rarity, meaning, indirect, exclamatory); πότερος, 741 (rare, indirect questions); ποταπός, 741; in indirect questions, 1044 f.
Intransitive: 330 f., 797 f., 806, 815 f.
Inverse attraction: 488, 717 f.
Ionic: earliest in literature, 16, 17; influence on the κοινή, 62 f.; on the N. T., 82, 181-93, 200, 203-6, 210f., 217 f., *ad libitum*.
Iota adscript: 194 f., 209.
Iota subscript: 194 f.
Ireland, bilingualism in: 30.
Irony: 1198 f.
Irrational final and v: 194, 219-21.
"Irregular" verbs: see list, 1212-20.
Isolating languages: 37.
Isolation of Greek, not true: 36-39.
Itacism: 72, 178 ff., 182, 191 ff., 194-7, 198-200, 239 f., 265 f., *ad libiturn*. See ch. on Orthography and Phonetics.

J

James, peculiarities of : 123 f. See Index of Quotations.
Jesus language of : both Aramaic and Greek 26 9.
"Jewish" Greek: see "Biblical Greek, Hebraisms, Aramaic, κοινή.
Jews: 83, 98 f., 102, etc.
John peculiarities of: 133 - 7. S Index of Quotations.
Josephus: 28; an illustration of Atticistic Gk. in contrast with 1 Maccabees, 87, 236, 269, *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Jude: peculiarities of, 124 f. See Index of Quotations.
Justin Martyr: see Index of Quotations.

K

Καθαρεύουσα: 18; artificial modern Greek, 36, 60, *passim*.
Kinship of Greek words: 174 f.

Κοινή: 17, 18, 21-4, 32, 46; chapter on, 49-74; term, 49; origin, 49; triumph of the Attic, 51; fate of the other dialects, 52 f.; influence of the dialects on the **κοινή**, 53; partial koines, 53; effect of Alexander's campaigns, 53 f.; spread of the **κοινή**, 54-60; a real world-speech, 54-56; vernacular, 56; literary, 57 f.; the Atticistic reaction, 58-60; characteristics of the vernacular **κοινή**, 60-73; vernacular Attic, the base of the **κοινή**, 60-2; the other dialects in the **κοινή**, 62-64; non-dialectical changes in, 64 f.; new words in, 65; new forms of old words, 65 f.; poetical and vernacular words, 65; new meanings to old words, 66; i/A.D. the climax of the **κοινή**, 66; provincial influences in, 66-9; **κοινή** in Asia Minor and in Alexandria, 67 f.; in Palestine, 69; **κοινή** a single language, 69; personal equation, 69-71; resume of the characteristics of the vernacular **κοινή**, 71-4 (phonetics and orthography 71 f., vocabulary 72, word-formation 72, accidence 72 f., syntax 73 f.); adaptability of the **κοινή** to the Roman world, 74 f.; place of the N. T. in the **κοινή**, 76-140, 152 f., 159 f., 161-3, 171; accent in, 228 f.; pronunciation in, 236-41; *ad libitum* in the book.

L

Labials: assimilation before, 216, 264, 1210.
Language of Jesus: 26-9, 99, 102 f., 105. See Jesus.
Language, study of: the fascination of, 3; the new point of view, 8-12; as history, 31; a living organism, origin of, evolution in, changes in vernacular, 33 f.; Greek not isolated, 36; common bond in, 37, *passim*.
Late Greek: see Byzantine.
Latin: 36, 39, 46 f.; late Latin as ill **κοινή**, 55, 74, 79, 103; Latinisms in the N. T., 108-11, 131, 137, 144; *passim*.
Latin authors: 85, 108 f., 128, *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Latin versions: *passim*.
Latinisms: 10S-10, 131, etc.
Lesbian: 17, 184, 249. See AEolic.
Letters: as distinct from epistles, 70, 85 ff.
Lewis Syriac: *passim*.
Lexical: new knowledge of words, 65 f.; N. T. lexicography needing reworking, 144, *passim*.
Limitative infinitive : see infinitive.
Linear action: see durative.
Literary element in N. T.: 83-8.
Literary κοινή: true part of the **κοινή**, 50, 57 f.; literary elements in the N. T., 83-8, 106; high standard of culture in the Greco-Roman world, 85.
Literary plural: 406 f., 677 f.
Litotes: 1205.
Local cases : 451. See cases.
Local clauses : 969 f.
Locative: form, 249 f.; name, 520; significance, 520 f.; place, 521 f. time, 522 f.; with adjectives, 523; with verbs, 523 f.; with substantives, 524; with prepositions, 524 f. and ch. XIII; pregnant construction, 525.
Lucian: see Index of Quotations.
Luke: literary element in, 106; peculiarities of, 120-3, 135, 179, 240, *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Luther's German Bible : influence of, 92.
LXX: see Septuagint.
Lycaonian: vernacular surviving in **κοινή**, 55 f.

M

Macedonian: influence on the **κοινή**, 63 f.; words, 111.
Magnesia: 196, 200, 208, 223, *passim*.
Manner: see adverbs, instrumental case, participle.
Manuscripts of N. T.: vary in orthography, 179-89, 191-231; show

changes in pronunciation, 239 ff.; have beginnings of chapters and paragraphs, 241 f.; uncials have no distinction between words, 242 ff.; *ad libitum.*
Mark: Aramaic influence in, 106; Latin, 110; peculiarities of, 118 f. See Index of Quotations.
Masculine: see gender.
Matthew: Aramaic influence in, 106; peculiarities of, 119 f., 135, passim. See Index of Quotations.
Means : see instrumental case, participle.
Meiosis: 1205 f.
Metaphor: 1206.
Metaplasm: 257-9, 261-3, 269.
Metathesis: 221, 1210.
Metonymy : 1207.
Middle : passive displacing, 333 f.; endings, 339 f., giving way to active, 356; perfect, 359; with reflexive pronoun, 690 f.; origin of, 803; meaning of, 803 f.; acute difference from active, 804; use of not obligatory, 804-6; transitive or intransitive, 806; direct, 806-8; causative or permissive, 808 f. ; indirect, 809 f .; redundant, 811; dynamic (deponent), 811-3; middle future though active present, 813 f.; retreating in N. T., 814.
Minuscules: 217, *passim*.
Mixed declension: 263. See declenlions.
Mode (mood): conjugation of, 320-30 (number of 320 f., distinctions between 321 f., indicative 322 f., subjunctive 323 ff., optative 325 ff., imperative 327-30); syntax of, ch. XIX, 911-1049; introductory discussion, 910-4; in paratactic sentences, 914-50 (indicative 914-24, subjunctive 924-35, optative 935-40, imperative 941-50); in hypotactic sentences, 950-1049 (use of modes in 950, use of conjunctions in 951 f., logical varieties of subordinate clauses 952-1049: relative 953-62, causal 962-6, comparative 966-9, local 969 f., temporal 970-9, final and consecutive 980-1003, wishes 1003 f., conditional 1004-27, indirect discourse 1027-48, series of subordinate clauses 1048 f.); change of mode in indirect discourse, 1030 f.
Modern Greek: literature on, 22-4; importance for N. T. Gk., 44-6; illustrating N. T. Gk., 137 f., 147, 150, 155, 177 f., 557, *ad libitum*.
Mood: see mode.
Music: 228.
Mycenaean age: 43 f.

N

Names of persons: see proper names.
Narrative, tenses in, in Greek: see aorist, imperfect, present, present perfect.
Negative particles: in relative clauses, 962; with inf., 1093-5; with participle, 1136-9; objective **οὐ** and its compounds, 1155-66 (origin 1155, history 1156, meaning 1156 f., with the indicative, independent sentences, subordinate clauses 1157-60, with the subjunctive 1160 Er with the optative 1161, with the imperative 1161 f., with infinitive 1162, with the participle 1162 f., with nouns 1163 f., **καὶ οὐ** 1164, redundant or pleonastic **οὐ** 1164, repetition of **οὐ** 1164, intensifying compound 1164 f., disjunctive 1165 f.); subjective **μή** and its coinpounds, 1166-75 (history of **μή** 1166 f., significance of 1167, uses of **μή**, indicative 1168 f., subjunctive 1169 f., optative 1170, impera,-tive 1170, infinitive 1171, participle 1172, nouns 1172, intensifying compounds 1172 f., **καὶ μή** 1173, disjunctive use 1173); combination of two negatives, 1173-5 (**μὴ οὐ** 1173 f., **οὐ μή** 1174 f.).
Negative pronouns: οὐδείς, οὐθείς οὐδὲ, εἷς, εἷς—οὐ, 750 f.; **οὔτις, μή τις,** 751 f.; **οὐ πᾶς, μὴ πᾶς** 76.5, 752 f.

Neuter: as substantive, 156, 267 f.; see gender.
Neutral type of text: 180, 212, 219, *passim*.
New material: ch. I, 3-30.
New Testament, Greek of: place in the κοινή, 76-140; chiefly the vernacular, 76-83; not a biblical Greek, 77-79; proof that in the vernacular, 79-83; the lexical proof from the papyri and inscriptions, 80-2; accidence corroborated by papyri and inscriptions, 82; syntactical peculiarities, 82 f.; phrases common to N. T. and papyri, 83; literary elements in N. T. Gk., 83-8; literary quality in the N. T., 84; controversy now whether there is appreciable Semitic colouring in the N. T., 88 f.; view of Deissmann and Moulton, 89-93; some real Hebraisms in the N. T., 92 f.; little direct Hebrew influence, list of probable Hebraisms, 94-6; deeper impress of the LXX in vocabulary, accidente and syntax, though great variety in the LXX, 96-102; Aramaisms in the N. T., in vocabulary and in syntax, 102-5; variation in Aramaic and Hebrew colouring in different parts of the N. T., 106-8; Latinisms in the N. T., names of persons and places, military terms, words and phrases, syntax, 108-11; sporadic foreign words in the N. T., 111; the Christian addition, 112-6; transfiguration of the vocabulary, 116; individual peculiarities of N. T. writers, 116-37; see separate writers by name; N. T. Gk. illustrated by modern Gk., 137 ff.; syntax of, 381-3.
N. T. authors: 28 f., 76-139. See Indcx of Quotations.
Nominative: *nominativus pendens* in the vernacular κοινή, 73; form as vocative, 264, 461; N. T. forms in, 267 f.; not the oldest case, 456; reason for, 457; predicate, 457 f.; sometimes unaltered, 458 f.; absolute, 459 f.; parenthetic, 460; in exclamations, 461; absolute, 1130.
Non-thematic present stems: see present tense.
Northwest Greek: remains of, in the κοινή, 53; influence of, 61, 63; on the N. T., 82, 266, *passim*.
Nouns : root-nouns, 145; substantive and adjective, 246; verbal, ch. XX; negatives with, 1163 f., 1172.
Number: in substantives, 251 f.; concord in, 403-9 (subject and predicate 403-7, substantive and adjective 407 f., representative singular 408, idiomatic plural in nouns 408, idiomatic singular in nouns 409, special instances 409); adjective and substantive, 654 f.; οὗτος, 704; ἐκεῖνος, 708; ὅς, 714; ὅστις, 729; οἷος, 731.
Numerals: declension of, 281-4 (origin of 281, different functions of 281, cardinals 281-3, ordinals 283 f., distributives 284, proportionals 284, adverbs 284); syntax of, 671-5 (εἷς and πρῶτος 671 f., simplification of the 'teens 672, inclusive ordinal 672, distributives 673, cardinal ἑπτά, 673 f., substantive not expressed 674, adverbs with 674, εἷς as indefinite article 674 f., εἷς-τις 675, distributive use of εἷς 675); τις with, 742; article with ordinals, 793 f.

0

Object of verb: see case.
Object-clauses: see hypotaxis.
Oblique cases: 247. See cases.
Old Testament: 99. See Septuagint and Index of Quotations.
Onomatopoetic: 1201.
Optative: origin of form, 320, 325-7; perfect, 360 f., 907 f.; use of aorist, 854 f.; future, 876; present, 889 f.; opt. and subj., 925 f.; history of, 935 f.; significance, 936 f.; three uses, 937-40 (futuristic or potential 937-9, volitive 939 f., deliberative 940); as imper., 943; in indirect dis-

course, 1030 f., 1043 f.; negative with, 1161, 1170.
Oratio obliqua: see indirect discourse.
***Oratio recta*:** see direct discourse.
***Oratio variate*:** 440-3 (distinctive from anacoluthon 441 f., heterogeneous structure 441 f., participle in 442, exchange of direct and indirect discourse 442 f.).
Oratory: in Hebrews, 1198.
Ordinals: see number.
Orthography: in the vernacular **κοινή**, 71 f.; ch. VI, 176-245; the ancient literary spelling, 177 f.
Ostraca: 17-21; texts of, 22, 91, 191, 266, *passim*.
Oxyrhynchus papyri: see Index of Quotations.

P

Palatals: 216 f., 1210.
Papyri: literature on, 17-22, 52, 56 f., 66 ff. ; illustrate the vernacular **κοινή**, 69; illiteracy in, 70 f.; and the N. T. Gk., 80-3; agreeing with the uncials in orthography, 181; accidence and syntax of, 381; *ad libitum* through the book.
Parable : 1206 f.
Paragraph: discussion of, 241 f.; connection between, 444.
Paraleipsis: 1199.
Parallelism: 1199 f.
Parataxis : 426, 428; modes in paratactic sentences, 914-50, 953, 980 f.; paratactic conjunctions, 1177-92.
Parechesis : 1201.
Parenthesis: 433-5; parenthetic nominative, 460.
Paronomasia: 1201.
Participle : in **–υῖα**, 256; forms of, 371-6 (name 371 f., verbal adjectives 372 f., with tense and voice 373 f., in periphrastic use 374-6); gender in, 412; case, 413; in clauses, 431 f.; in anacoluthon, 439 f.; in *oratio variata*, 442; ace. absolute, 490 f.; gen. absolute, 512-4; adverbs with, 546; as adverbs, 551; article with, 764 f., 777-9; use of aorist, 858-64; future, 877 f.; present, 891 f.; perfect, 909 f.; participle as imperative 944-6; causal, 966; temporal use, 979; purpose, 991; in indirect discourse, 1040-2; history of part., 1098-1100 (Sanskrit 1098, Homer's time 1098, Attic period 1098 f., **κοινή** 1099, modern Gk. 1099 f.); significance, 1100-4 (originally an adjective 1100 f., addition of verbal functions 1101, double aspect of 1101, relation between part. and inf. 1101-3, method of treating 1103 f.); adjectival aspects of, 1104-10 (declension 1104, attributive, anarthrous, articular 1105-8, predicate 1108, as a substantive 1108 f., as an adverb 1109 f.); verbal aspects of, 1110-41 (voice 1110 f., tense 1111-9, timelessness 1111, aorist 1112-4, present 1115 f., perfect 1116-8, future 1118f., cases 1119, supplementary 1119-24, periphrastic construction 1119 f., diminution of complementary 1120 f., with verbs of emotion 1121 f., indirect discourse 1122-4; circumstantial, participial clauses 1124-32 (general theory 1124, varieties of, time, manner, means, cause, purpose, condition, concession 1125-30, absolute nominative, accusative, genitive 1130-2); independent, 1132-5; co-ordination between, 1135 f.; **οὐ** and **μή** with, 1136-9, 1162 f., 1172; other partidies with, 1139-41).
Particles: elision with, 207; with subordinate clauses, 950-1049; with participle, 1036-41; scope, 1142-4; intensive or emphatic, 1144-55; negative, 1155-75; interrogative, 1175-7; conjunctions, 1177-93 (paratactic, 1177-92, hypotactic 1192 f.); interjections, 1193.
Partitive: apposition, 399, 746; genitive, 502, 519; ablative, 519; use of **ἐκ**, 599; with **ἕκαστος**, 746.
Passive: supplanting middle, 333 f.; endings, 340 f.; future, second and

first, 356 f.; perfect, 359; σ in aorist, 362; with accusative, 484-6; origin of, 814 f.; significance of, 815; intransitive or transitive, 815 f.; syntax of aorist, 816 ff.; passive "deponents," 817 f.; future, 818-20; agent with, 820; impersonal construction, 820.
Past perfect: relation of aorist to, 837-40; double idea, 903; a luxury in Greek, 903 f.; intensive, 904; extensive, 904 f.; of broken continuity, 905 f.; in conditional sentences, 906; periphrastic, ἐκείμην, 906; augment in, 1211 f.
Patronymics: 155.
Paul: 54 ff.; and Hellenism, 84-8,106; peculiarities of, 127-31, 135, 179, 195, 218, *ad libitum*. See Index of Quotations.
Perfect, future: see future perfect.
Perfect, past: see past perfect.
Perfect, present: of -μι verbs, 319 f.; imperative, 330; conjugation of, 359-62 (name 359, original perfect 359 f., κ perfect 358 f., aspirated 359, middle and passive 359, decay of perfect forms 359 f., in subjunctive, optative, imperative 360, indicative 360-2, σ in middle and passive 362); reduplication in, 363-5; completed state, 823 f.; relation of aorist to, 843-5; present as perfect, 881; perfect as present, 881; idea of, 892-4 (present, intensive, extensive, time); present perfect indicative, 894-903 (intensive 894 f., extensive 895 f., of broken continuity 896, dramatic historical 896 f., gnomic 897, in indirect discourse 897 f., futuristic 898, "aoristic" present perfect 898-902, pertphrastic 902 f.); subj. and opt., 907 f.; infinitive, 908 f. (indirect discourse 908 f., not indirect disc., subject or object, preposition 909); participle, 909 f. and 1116-8 (meaning, time, various uses, periphrastic).
"Perfective": use of prepositions, 563 f.; ἀπό, 576 f.; διά, 581 f.; 596 f.; ἐπί, 600; κατά, 606; παρά, 613; περί, 617; πρός, 623; σύν, 627 f.; ὑπέρ 629; "perfective" and " imperfective," 826-8.
Pergamum: a centre of culture, 56 ff., 61, 63, 66, 75, 111, 208, 223, *passim*.
Period: use of, 242 f.
Periodic structure: 432 f., 1200.
Periods of N. T. grammatical study: 3-7.
Periods of the Greek language: 43 f.
Periphrasis: with participle, 330, 357, 374-6, 826, 878, 887 f., 889, 906, 1119 f.
Persian: words in N. T., 111.
Person: concord in, 402 f., 712; change in ind. disc., 1028 f.
Person-endings: 329, 335; active, 335-9.
Personal construction: with adjective, 657 f.; with inf., 1085 f.
Personal equation: in the κοινή, 69 ff., 179.
Personal pronouns: question of αὐτοῦ 226; inflection of, 286 f.; nominative, 676-80 (emphasis in 676, first 677 f., second 678, third 679 f.); oblique cases, 680-2 (originally reflexive 680 f., αὐτοῦ 681, genitive for possessive 681, enclitic forms 681 f.); frequency of, 682 f.; redundant, 683; according to sense, 683 f.; repetition of substantive, 684.
Peter: peculiarities of, 125-7. See Index of Quotations.
Philo: see Index of Quotations.
Philology: see comparative grammar.
Phocian: 266.
Phoenician: words in N. T., 111, 182, 209, *passim*.
Phonetics: in the vernacular κοινή, 71 f.; ch. VI, 177-245.
Phrygia: old dialect of, 67.
Pindar: see Index of Quotations.
Pindaric construction: 405.
Plato: see Index of Quotations.
Play on words : 1201.

Pleonasm: in pronouns, 683; **οὐ**, 1164, 1205.
Pluperfect: see past perfect.
Plural: 251. See number.
Plutarch: see Index of Quotations.
Poetry: see rhythm.
Point-action: see punctiliar.
Polybius : see Index of Quotations.
Polysyndeton: 1194.
Pompeian: 186, *passim*.
Pontic infinitive: 1056, 1063.
Position: of words, 417-25 (freedom 417, predicate 417, emphasis 417 f., minor words in 418 f., euphony and rhythm 419-23, prolepsis 423, hysteron proteron 423, hyperbaton 423 f., postpositives 424 f., fluctuating words 424 f., order of clauses in compound sentences 425); of genitive, 502 f.; of article with attributive, 776-89; with predicate, 789 f.
Positive : adjective, 276, 659-61.
Possessive pronouns : inflection of, 288 f.; article as, 684; only first and second in N. T., 684; emphasis, 684 f.; with article, 685; possessive and genitive, 685; objective use, 685; instead of reflexive, 685; artide as, 769 f.; article with, 770.
Postpositive : 424; some prepositions, 553.
Potential: imperfect, 885-7; opt., 937-9.
Predicate : essential part of sentence, 390 f.; only predicate, 390 f.; verb not the only, 394 f.; copula not essential, 395 f.; one of the radiating foci, 396 f.; expansion of, 400 f. (predicate in wider sense 400, inf. and part. 400, relation between predicate and substantive 400, pronoun 400, adjective 401, adverb 401, prepositions 401, negative partides 401, subordinate clauses 401, apposition and looser amplifications 401) ; agreeing with subject, 403-6; position, 417; pred. nominative, 457 f.; vocative in, 464 f.; adjective, 655 f.; nouns with article, 767-9; article with, 789 f., 794; participle, 1108.
Prefixes: 146; inseparable, 161-3.
Pregnant construction: 525, 548, 584 f., 591-3.
Prepositional adverbs: new ones, 169 f.
Prepositions: double in composition, 160, 165; adverbs, 301; encroachment on cases, 450-3; accusative with, 491; genitive with, 505; effect of compound preps. on case, 511 f., 542 f.; with ablative, 516 f.; with locative, 524 f.; with instrumental, 534 f.; with dative, 537 f.; phrases, 550 f.; ch. XIII, 553-649; name, 553 f. (some postpositive 553, original use not with verbs 553, explanation 553 f.); origin of, 554 f. (originally adverbs 554, reason for use of 554, varying history 555); growth in use of, 555-7 (once none 555, still adverbs in Homer 555, decreasing use as adverbs 555 f., Semitic influence in N. T. 556 f., modern Greek 557); in composition with verbs, 557-65 (not the main function 557 f., prep. alone 558, increasing use 558, repetition after verb 559 f., different preposition after verb 560 ff., second preposition not necessary 562 f., dropped with second verb 563, intensive or perfective 563f., double compounds 565); repetition and variation of, 565-7 (same prep. with different case 565, repetition with several nouns 566, repetition with the relative 566 f., 721, condensation by variation 567); functions of, with cases, 567-71 (case before prep. 567, notion of dimension 567, original force of the case 567 f., groundmeaning of the prep. 568, oblique cases alone with 568, original freedom 568 f., no adequate division by cases 569, situation in N. T. 569 f.: with one case, with two, with three, one with four, each prep. in a case 570 f.); "proper"

prepositions in N. T., 571-636; ἀνα, 571 f.; ἀντί, 572-4; ἀπό, 574-80 (original significance 575 f., meaning " back " 576 f., "translation-Hebraism" in φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό 577, comparison with ἐκ 577 f., comparison with παρά. 578 f., compared with biro 579 f.); διά, 580-4 (root--idea 580, by twos or between 580 f., passing between or through 581 ff., because of 583 f.); ἐν, 584-91 (old use with accusative or locativeablative 584 f., older than εἰς 585 f., place 586, time 586 f., among 587, in the case of 587 f., as a dative 588, accompanying circumstance 588, amounting to 589, instrumental use of 589-91); εἰς, 591-6 (original static use 591-3, with verbs of motion 593 f., time 594, like a dative 594, aim or purpose 594 f., predicative use 595 f., compared with ἐπί, παρά and πρός 596); ἐκ, 596-600 (meaning 596, in composition 596 f., place 597, time 597, separation 597 f., origin or source 598 f., partitive use of 599, ἐκ and ἐν, 599 f.); bri, 600-5 (ground-meaning 600, in composition 600, frequency in N. T. 600 f., with the accus. 601 f., with the gen. 602-4, with the loc. 604 f., the true dative 605); κατά, 605-9 (root-meaning 605 f., distributive sense 606, in composition 606, with ablative 606 f., with genitive 607, with accusative 607-9); pera, 609-12 (root-meaning 609, in composition 609 f., loss of locative use 610, with genitive 610-2, with accusative 612); παρά, 612-6 (significance 612, compared with πρός 613, in composition 613, with the locative 614, with the ablative 614 f., with the accusative 615 f.); περί., 616-20 (root-meaning 617, in composition 617, originally with four cases 617, with the ablative 617 f., with the genitive 618 f., with the accusative 619 f.); πρό, 620-2 (original meaning 620, in composition 620 f., cases used with 621, place 621, time 621 f., superiority 622); πρός, 622-6 (meaning 622 f., in composition 623, originally with five cases 623, with ablative 623 f., with the locative 624, with the accusative 624-6); σύν, 626-8 (meaning 626 f., history 627, in composition 627 f., N. T. usage 628); ὑπέρ, 628-33 (meaning 629, in composition 629, with genitive 629 f., with 630-2, with accusative 632 f.); ὑπό, 633-6 (meaning 633, in composition 633, cases once used with 634 f., with the accusative 635, with the ablative 635 f.); the "adverbial" or "improper" prepositions, 636 48 (ἅμα 638, ἄνευ 638, ἀντικρυς 638, ἀντίπερα 638 f., ἀπέναντι 639, ἄτερ 639, ἄχρι(ς) 639, ἐγγύς 639 f., ἐκτός 640, ἔμπροσθεν 640, ἔναντι 640, ἐναντίον 640, ἕνεκα 641, ἐντός 641, ἐνώπιον 641 f., ἔξω 642, ἐπάνω 642, ἐπέκεινα 642, ἔσω 642 f ἕως 643, κατέναντι 643, κατενώπιον 644, κυκλόθεν 644, κύκλῳ 644, μέσον 644, μεταξύ, 645, μέχρι 645, ὄπισθεν 645, ὀπίσω 645, ὀψέ 645 f., παραπλήσιον 646, παρεκτός 646, πέραν 646, πλήν 646, πλησίον 646, ὑπεράνω 646 f., ὑπερέκεινα 647, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ 647; ὑποκάτω, 647, χάριν 647, χωρίς 647 f.); compound prepositions, 648; prepositional circumlocutions, 648 f. (μέσον, ὄνομα, προσώπον, χείρ); adjectives of comparison with, 661, 667; article with, 766; effect on active voice, 800; with infinitive, 1068-75.

Present tense : 73, 119 f., 123, 145, 150, 203; of --μι verbs, 311-9; classes of present stems, 350-3 (non-thematic reduplicated 350, non-thematic with -να and -νυ 351, simple thematic 351, reduplicated thematic 351, thematic with suffix 351, 351-3, with σ dropped 353); relation of aorist to, 841-3; punctiliar (aoristic), 864-70 (specific 865 f., gnomic 866, historical pres-

ent 866-9, futuristic 869 f.); durative (linear) indicative, 879-82 (descriptive 879, progressive 879 f., iterative or customary 880, inchoative or conative 880, historical 880, deliberative 880 f., as perfect 881, perfect as present 881, futuristic 881 f.); durative subj. and opt., 889 f.; durative imperative, 890; durative infinitive, 890 f.; durative participle, 891 f. and 1115-6 (relative time 891, futuristic 891, descriptive 891, conative 892, antecedent time 892, indirect discourse 892, with the article 892, past action still in progress 892, "subsequent" 892, durative future 892).

Principal parts of important verbs in N. T.: 1212-20.

Proclitics: accent of, 235; rules for accent of, 1211.

Prodiorthosis: 1199.

"Profane Greek": 5, 89.

Prohibition: see imperative, aorist subj., future indicative, infinitive.

Prolepsis : 423.

Pronouns: 226, 234; declension of, 284-93 (idea of 284 f., antiquity of 285, pronominal roots 285 f., classification of 286-93); syntax of, ch. XV, 676-753; personal, 676-84; possessive, 684 f.; intensive and identical, 685-7; reflexive, 687-92; reciprocal, 692 f.; demonstrative, 693-710; relative, 710-35; interrogative, 735-41; indefinite, 741-4; alternative or distributive, 744-50; negative, 750-3.

Pronunciation: 71 f., 236-41.

Proper names: abbreviated, 171-3, 184, 205; doubling of consonants in Hebrew and Aramaic, 214 f.; accent of, 235; foreign names, 235 f.; mixed declension of, 263; in third decl., 269 f.; article with, 759 ff., 791, passim.

"Proper" prepositions: 554, 636 f.

Προσῳδία: 228.

Protasis: see conditional clauses, 1007-27.

Prothetic vowels: 205 f., 1209.

Psilosis: 191, 222-5.

Psychological treatment of grammar: 32.

Ptolemaic: 210, 220, 256, *passim*.

Pun: 1201.

Punctiliar action: 823 f., 830-79 (aorist 831-64, present 864-70, future 870-9).

Punctuation: discussion of, 241-5 (the paragraphs 241 f., sentences 242 f., words 243 f., editor's prerogative 245).

Purists: 3, 76 ff., 88, 90 f., 160, *passim*.

Purpose: see final clauses.

Q

Qualitative use of anarthrous nouns: see article.

Questions: ὅς in direct, 725; 5 in indirect, 725 f.; ὅστις, direct 729 f., indirect 730 f.; οἷος, 731; ὅσος, 733; see direct discourse, indirect discourse, interrogative pronouns, interrogative particles, mode; indirect, 1043-6; deliberative, 1046; single, 1175-7; double, 1177; partides in direct, 1175 f.; indirect, 1176 f.

Quotations in 0. T.: 206, 242 f.

R

Reciprocal pronouns: inflection of, 292 f.; reflexive as, 690; syntax of, 692 f.

Recitative ὅτι: 1027 f.; see direct discourse.

Redundance: see pleonasm.

Reduplication: discussion of, 362-5 (primitive 362, both nouns and verbs 362, in three tenses in verbs 362 f., three methods in 363, in the perfect 363-5).

Reflexive pronouns: inflection of, 287 f.; personal originally so, 680 f., 685; distinctive use, 687 f.; no nominative, 688; indirect, 688; in

singular, 688 f.; in plural, 689 f.; article with, 690; in reciprocal sense, 690; with middle voice, 690 f., 811; use of ἴδιος, 691 f.; with active voice, 802.
Relative pronouns : inflection of, 290 f .; inverse attraction, 488; attraction to genitive, 512; attraction to ablative, 519 f.; repetition of prepositions with, 566 f.; list in the N. T., 710 f.; name, 711; bond between clauses, 711; ὅς, 711-26 (in Homer 711, comparison with other relatives 711 f., with any person 712, gender 712 ff., number 714, case 714-9, absence of antecedent 719 ff., prepositions with antecedent and relative 721, phrases 721 f., pleonastic antecedent 722 f., repetition of ὅς 723 f., consecutive idea 724, causal 724 f., direct questions 725, indirect questions 725 f., idiom οὐδείς ἐστιν ὅς 726); ὅστις 726-31 (varied uses 726, distinction between ὅς and ὅστις 726 f., indefinite use 727, definite exx. 727 f., =value of ὅς 728, case 728 f., number 729, direct questions 729 f., indirect 730 f.); οἷος, 731 f. (relation to ὅς 731, incorporation 731, indirect question 731, number 731, οἷόν τέ ἐστιν 732); ὁποῖος, 732 (qualitative, double office, correlative); ὅσος, 732 f. (quantitative, antecedent, attraction, incorporation, repetition, with ὄν, indirect question, comparison, adverbial); ἡλίκος, 733 f.; ὁ 734 f.; τίς as, 737 f.
Relative sentences: originally paratactic, 953; most subordinate clauses relative in origin, 953 f.; usually adjectival, 955 f.; modes in, 955 f.; definite and indefinite, 956 f.; use of ἄν in, 957-9; special uses of, 960-2; negatives in, 962; causal, 965 f.; purpose, 989; subfinal, 996; consecutive, 1001.
Relative time: see tense.
Repetition: of substantive, 684; of ὅς, 723 f.; of ὅσος or, 733.
Result: see consecutive clauses.
Reuchlinian pronunciation: 240.
Revelation: see Apocalypse.
Rhetoric: figures of speech, 1194-1208.
Rhetorical questions : with the ind., 924; with the subj., 930; in Paul, 1198.
Rhythm: metrical passages so printed in W. H., 242; position as showing, 417-23; poetry, 421 f.
Roman Empire and the κοινή: 74 f.
Romans: *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Roots: in Sanskrit, 38; discussion of, 144-6; verb-root, 344 f.
Running style: 432 f.

S

Sahidic: 202, *passim*.
Sanskrit: the discovery of Sanskrit, 10, 36 f., 39 f., 47, 143, 145 f., 246-8; voice in, 798 f., *ad libitum.*
Second Epistle of Peter: *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Second or o declension: 257, 259-63.
Semitic: 37, 88-108, 198, 205, 212, 225, 236, *passim*. See Aramaic and Hebrew.
Sentence, the: punctuation of, 242 f.; discussion of, ch. X, 390-445; the sentence and syntax, 390; sentence defined, 390-7 (complex conception 390, two essential parts 390 f., one-membered sentence 391, elliptical 391, only predicate 391-3, only subject 393 f., verb not the only predicate 394 f., copula not necessary 395 f., two radiating foci 396 f., varieties of the simple sentence 397); expansion of the subject, 397-400; expansion of the predicate, 400 f.; subordinate centres in the sentence, 402; concord in person, 402 f.; concord in number, 403-9; concord in gender, 410-3; concord in case, 413-6; position of words in, 417-25; compound sentences, 425-7; connection in sentences, 427-44

(single words 427, clauses 428-32, two kinds of style 432 f., parenthesis 433-5, anacoluthon 435-40, *oratio variata* 440-3, connection between sentences 443, between paragraphs 444, forecasts 444 f.); independent or paratactic, 914-50; subordinate or hypotactic, 950–1049.

Septuagint: influence of Jews in Alexandria, 84; in the vernacular κοινή of Alexandria, 91; Hebraisms in the LXX, 91; influence of the LXX on the N. T., nature of this influence and character of the LXX itself, 96-102; "septuagint-Graecisms" in Luke, 108,118-26,183–92,198-204,208-11,213-27, *ad libitum*.

Sequence, rules of: see indirect discourse.

Simile : 1206.

Sinaiticus, Codex : spelling of, 179, *passim*.

Singular: 251. See number.

Socrates: 75 f.

Solecisms: in the Apocalypse, 413-6.

Sophocles : see Index of Quotations.

Sources for study of κοινή: see ch. I and **κοινή.**

Southeast dialects: 211, *passim*.

Spoken Greek: see vernacular.

Stoic: grammarians, 143; dialectic, 1197.

Style: in Scripture, 87; two kinds of, 432 f.; in the N. T., 116-39, 1194-7. See individual peculiarities.

Sub-final: see final and consecutive.

Subject: essential part of sentence, 390 f.; ellipsis of, 391; only subject used, 393 f.; one of the radialing foci, 396 f.; expansion of the subject, 397-400 (idea-words and form-words 397, concord and government 397 f., group around 398–400, subordinate clause 398, with the article 398, the adverb 398, the adjective 398, the substantive in an oblique case 398, or in apposition 398-400); subject and predicate as to concord, 403-7 (two conflicting principles 403, neuter plural and singular verb 403 f., collective substantives 404 f., singular verb with first subject 405 f., literary plural 406 f.); suspended, 436 f.

Subjective: see genitive case, possessive pronoun and middle voice.

Subjunctive: origin of form, 320,323–5; perfect, 360 f., 907 f.; use of aorist, 848-54; future, 876; present, 889 f.; relation to other modes, 924 ff. (aor. subj. and fut. ind., subj. and imper., subj. and opt.); original significance of, 926-8; threefold usage, 928-35 (futuristic 928 ff., volitive 930-4, deliberative 934 f.); as imper., 943; negative with, 1160 f., 1169 f.

Subordinate sentences: see hypotaxis.

Subsequent action in participle: see participle.

Substantives: root-substantives, 145; with suffixes, 150-7 (primitive 150 f., derivative 151-7: from verbs 151–4, from substantives 154-6, from adjectives 156 f.); compound, 161-8 (inseparable prefixes, 161 f.; agglutinative 165-8); declension of, 246 70; number in, 251 f.; gender in substantives, 252-4; with genitive, 495-503; with ablative, 514 f.; with locative, 524; with dative, 536 f.; appositional use of, 651 f.; adjective as, 652-4; agreement of adjective with, 654 f.; substantival aspests of infinitive, 1058-79; with inf., 1075 f.; participle as, 1108 f.; negatives with, 1163 f.

Suffixes: 146; comparative without, 663.

Superlative: forms, 278-81; positive as, 660 f.; displaced by comparative 667-9; syntax of, 669-71.

Supplementary: see participle.

Syncope: 203 f.

Synonyms: in Greek words, 175 f.; phrases, 1200 f.

Syntax: in the vernacular κοινή, 73 f.; in the N. T., 82 f.; of LXX, 100; part III, 379-1208; meaning of syntax, ch. LX, 379-89 (backwardness in study of 379-81, N. T. limitations 381-3, advance by Delbruck 383 f., province of 384-7, the word 384 f., construction of words and clauses 385 f., historical 386, irregularities 386 f., method of this grammar 387-9, principles 387, original significance 387, form and function 387 f., development 388, context 388 f., translation 389, limits 389); the sentence and syntax, 390.
Syriac versions: *passim*.
Syrian text (α-text): 179f., 189, 210f., 214 f., 219, 260, *passim*.

T

Tarsus: new centre of culture, 67; Paul learning Greek in, 239.
Temporal clauses: kin to relative, 970 f.; conjunctions meaning "when," 971-4; group meaning "until," 974-7; some nominal and prepositional phrases, 977 f.; use of inf., 978 f., 1091 f.; participle, 979, 1125 f.
Tenses: of -μι. verbs in the N. T., 307-20; conjugation of, 343-68 (term tense 343 f., confusion in names 344, verb-root 344 f., aorist 345-50, present 350-3, future 353-7, perfect 359-62, reduplication 362-5, augment 365-8); infinitive, 369 f., 1080-2; participle, 373 ff., 1111-9; periphrastic tenses in N. T., 374-6; syntax of, ch. XVIII, 821-910; complexity of subject, 821-30 (Greek and Germanic tenses 821, influence of Latin on Greek grammarians 822, Hebrew influence 822, gradual growth of Greek tenses 822, "Aktionsart" of the verb-stem 823, three kinds of action 824, time-element 824 f., faulty nomenclature 825, analytic tendency (periphrasis) 826, "perfective " use of prepositions 826-8, *Aktionsart* with each tense 828f., interchange of tenses 829 f.); punctiliar action, 830-79 (aorist 830-64, present 864-70, future 870-9); durative (linear), 879-92 (indicative, present, imperfect, future 879-89, subj. and opt. 889 f., imperative 890, infinitive 890 f., participle 891 f.); perfected state, 892-910 (idea of perfect 892-4, indicative, present perfect, past perfect, future perfect 892-907, subj. and opt. 907 f., imperative 908, infinitive 908, participle 909 f.); tenses of imperative, 950; change in ind. discourse, 1029 f.
Textual criticism: *passim*.
Textus receptus: 199, 213, 217, *passim*.
Thematic vowel: see present tense.
Thessalian: 192, 202, *passim*.
Third declension: 258, 263-9.
Thucydides: 265, *passim*. See Index of Quotations.
Time: cases used, 460-527 f., (nom. 460, acc. 469-71, gen. 495, locative 522 f., instrumental 527 f.); διά, 580 ff.; ἐν, 586 f.; εἰς, 594; ἐκ, 597; πρό, 621 f.; element in tense, 824 f., 894; temporal clauses, 970-9; timelessness of participle, 1111.
Transitive verbs: 330 f.; with. accusative, 471-7; with genitive, etc., 506 ff.; transitiveness and voice, 797 f., 799 f., 806, 815 f.
Translation Greek: in the LXX and portions of Gospels and Acts, 89 f., 91 f., 93, 100 ff.
Transliteration of Semitic words: 225.

U

Uncials: 179-81, 186, 189, 192 f., 195, 200, 202, *ad libitum*.
Uncontracted vowels: see contraction.
Unfulfilled condition: see conditional sentences.

Unification of Greek dialects in the κοινή: 53-4; finally complete, 67.
Universal language: the Greek, 49 f.; Panhellenic, 49; origin of, 53 f.; march towards universalism, 54; a real world-speech, 54-56; limitations in, 64.

V

Vase-inscriptions: see inscriptions.
Vaticanus, Codex: 179, *passim*.
Verbal adjectives: in —τέος and —τος, 157 f.; relation to participles, 372 f.; syntax of verbals in —τος and —τέος, 1095-7.
Verbal nouns: eh. XX, 1050-1141; kinship between infinitive and participle, 1050 f.; the infinitive, 1051–95; the participle, 1098-1141.
Verbs : root-verbs, 145; with formative suffixes, 146-50 (primitive verbs 146 f., secondary verbs 147-50); compound verbs, 161-5 (with inseparable prefixes 161 f., agglutination or juxtaposition 163-5); conjugation of, 303-76 (difficulty of the subject 303, nature of the verb, relation to noun 303 f., meaning of 304, pure and hybrid 304, survival of —μι verbs, cross division 306, oldest verbs 306, gradual disappearance 306, second aorists 307-11, presents 311-9, perfects 319 f., modes 320-30, voices 330-43, tenses 343-68, infinitive 368-71, participle 371-6); accusative with, 471-86; genitive with, 505-11; ablative with, 517-20; with locative, 523 f.; instrumental with, 528-32; dative with, 538-43; adverbial use, 551 f.; compounded with prepositions, 557-65; syntax of voice, ch. XVII, 797-820; syntax of tense, 821-910: syntax of mode, 911-1049; inf. with, 1077 f.; verbal aspects of inf., 1079-95; verbal aspects of participle, 1110-41; list of important verbs in N. T., 1212-20; of hindering, 1061,1089,1094.
Vernacular: 17 f., 22 f., 34 ff., 44; "vulgar " Greek, 50; vernacular κοινή, 60-73; vernacular Attic, 60-2; N. T. chiefly in the vernacular κοινή, 76-83; vernacular writers in the N. T., 76; dialect-coloured, 178 f.; indifferent to hiatus, 207; *ad libitum*.
Verner's law: 11, footnote.
Verses: see rhythm.
Vocabulary: 65 f.; in the vernacular κοινή, 72, 80-3, 87, *passim*.
Vocative: 247; in first declension, 256; in second declension, 261; in third decl., 264; nominative form, 264, 461; nature of, 461; various devices 462 f.; use of ὦ, 463 f.; adjectives with, 464; apposition to, 464; in predicate, 464 f.; article with, 465 f.
Voice: conjugation of, 330-43 (transitive and intransitive 330 f., names of voices 331, relative age of 332, "deponent " 332 f., passive supplanting middle 333 f., personal endings 335, cross divisions 335, active endings 335-9, middle endings 339 f., passive endings 340 f., contract verbs 341-3); with infinitive, 369 f., 1079 f.; with participle, 373 f., 1110 f.; syntax of, ch. XVII, 797-820; point of view, 797-9 (distinction between voice and transitiveness 797 f., meaning of voice 798, names of the voices 798, history of 798, help from Sanskrit 798 f., defective verbs 799); syntax of active, 799-803; middle, 803-14; passive, 814-20.
Volitive: future, 874 f.; subj., 930-4; opt., 939 f.
Vowels: original of vowel symbols, 178; the original Greek vowels, 181 f.; vowel changes, 181-203 (changes with α 182-6, with ε 186 91, with η 191-5, with ι 195-9, with o 199-201, with υ 201 f.; with ω 202 f.); contraction and syncope, 203 f.; diphthongs and diaeresis, 204 f.; aphaeresis and prothetic vowels, 205 f.; elision, 206–8; cra-

sis, 208 f.; shortening stem-vowels, 230 f.
Vulgate: *passim*.

W
Wales bilingualism in: in 30.
Weltsprache: 44 f., 49-56, or 64, 79. *passim*. See universal or **κοινή**
Western text (δ-text): 180, 214, 216, 218 f., 253, 260, *ad libitum*.
Wish: mode and tense in impossible wishes, 923; ways of expressing, 1003 f.
Word-formation: see formation of words.
Words: number in the N. T., 81, 87, 115; relation of words in origin, 145; with formative suffixes, 146-60; composita, 160-71; history of, 173 f.; kinship of Greek, 174 f.; contrasts in, 175 f.; punctuation of, 243 f.; idea-words and form-words, 397; position of; in sentence, 417–25; connection between, 427; word relations, 449; glory of the words of the N. T., 1207 f.
World-language: see **κοινή**.

X
Xenophon, forerunner of the **κοινή** 55.

Z
Zeugma: 1200 f.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

Only words are here given which are discussed, not the words in the lists of examples, many thousands of which are given in the text. See Index of Quotations.

A

ἀ- (ἀν-): prefix, 161 f., 168, 170, 273, 516 1155.
ἀ--: collective or intensive, 161.
α: vowel, 181 f.
-α: voc. ending, 151, 256; vowel-changes with, 182-6, 191, 274, 341 f., 326; Doric gen. abl., 254 f.; stems in, 258, 267; acc. ending, 264.f.; imper. ending, 337; aor. ending, 305, 337-9, 348 f.; 2d perf. in, 358, 801; adverbs in, 526; prothetic, 1209.
-ᾳ: dat. ending, 249, 256.
ἀβαδδών: 95.
Ἀββά: 26, 105, 131, 236; case, 461.
ἀ-βαρής: 161.
ἀγαθο-εργέω: 163, 204.
ἀγαθο-ποιέω: 163.
ἀγαθο-ποιία: 165.
ἀγαθο-ποιός: 166, 168.
ἀγαθός: meaning, 176, 276, 653, 661; reading, 201; forms, 273.
ἀγθουργέω: 163, 204.
ἀγαθωσύνη reading, 201.
ἀγαλλιάω: constr., 509; formation, 150; forms, 1212.
ἀγανακτέω: c. ὅτι 965; c. part., 1122.
ἀγαπάω: constr., 478, 482; use, 1078, 1201.
ἀγάπη: in κοινή, 152; gen. use, 14, 65, 80, 115, 499; and art., 758; meaning, 115, 768.
ἀγαπητός: discussed, 372, 1096.
Ἄγαρ: 254, 411, 759, 766.
ἀγγαρεύω: 111.
ἀγγελία: ὅτι with, 1033.
ἀγγέλλω: compounds and forms of, 338, 349, 1212.
ἀ-γενεαλόγητος: 161.
ἁγιάζω: 97, 115, 125, 131, 147; constr., 855, 1003; part., 891.
ἁγιασμός: 151.
ἅγιος: accent, 232; use, 115, 125, 777.
ἁγιότατος: 125.
ἁγιότης: 65, 156.
ἁγιωσύνη: form, 156, 201.
ἁγνίζω: voice of, 816.
ἁγνισμός: 151, 280.
ἁγνόημα: 153, 161. 65, 156.
ἅγνυμι: compounds and forms of, 1212. See κατ-άγνυμι.
ἀγοράζω: constr., 483, 510.
Ἄγουστος: spelling, 185.
ἀγρι-έλαιος: 161, 166, 168.
ἄγω: compounds and forms, 299, 302, 328, 330, 346 (ἤγαγον), 348, 351, 363 (ἤγαγον), 368 (ἤγαγον), 391, 428, 430, 1212; –ῆξα,, 348; constr., 477; voice of, 330, 799 f.; meaning, 865; transitive and intransitive, 799, 800; use, 871, 931; part., 891; use of ἄγε, 124, 299, 302, 327, 328, 330, 391, 428, 799, 941, 949.
ἀγωγός: 326.
ἀγωνίζω ἀγῶνα: 478.
ἀδελφός: 80, 81, 115.
ἀδελφότης: 154.
ἀδηλότης: 156, 161.
ἀδιάκριτος: 124, 161.
ἀδιάλειπτος: 161.
ἀδιαλείπτως: form, 170, 295.
ἀδιαφθορία: 161.

ἀδικέω: voice of, 472, 808, 816; use, 878, 881, 889; c. two acc., 482, 484.
-ᾶδος 62.
Ἀδραμυντηνός: spelling, 210, 223.
ἀδυνατέω: 161.
ἀδύνατος: 372.
–άζω: verb ending, 147 *bis* and n., 151.
ἀεί: form, 185, 295; use, 300.
ἀθανασία: 130.
ἀθέμιτος: 161; c. inf., 1084.
ἄθεσμος: 65, 161.
ἀθετέω: 130, 161.
ἀθέτησις: 65, 80, 161.
Ἀθήνησι: case of, 249.
αι-: c. augment, 367.
αι: =ae, 238; =ε, 186, 239; vowel-changes, 186, 204, 327, 367.
-αι: dat. ending, 249, 370, 542; inf. ending, 249, 370, 542, 1001, 1051 ff., 1067; opt. ending, 327, 335.
αἰάν: form, 190.
ἴδιος: form, 272.
αἱματεκχυσία: 166.
--αίνω: verb ending, 147, 150, 349, 352.
αἱρετίζω: 149.
αἱρέω: voice of, 806, 809 f.; compounds and forms of, 339 (–εῖλαν), 1212.
αἱρόμενος: use, 1097.
αἴρω: class, 352; fut., 356; transitive, 799; voice of, 799; constr., 855 f., 1097; compounds and forms of, 1212.
–αίρω: verbs in, 349, 352.
-αις: dat. ending, 249.
αἰσθάνομαι: 131; constr., 509; in *or. obl.*, 1040; form of, 1212.
αἰσθητήριον: 132, 171.
αἰσχρία: 156.
αἰσχρόν ἐστιν: c. inf., 1084.
αἰσχρότης: 130.
αἰσχύνομαι: intransitive, 473; use, 1102; and part., 1122.
αἰτέω: constr., 480, 482, 850, 857, 1085; voice of, 805, 814, 820.
αἰτιατική: name of acc., 466.
αἴτίωμα: 153.
αἰχμαλωτεύω: 148, 479.
αἰχμαλωτίζω: 149.
αἰώνιος: 159, 272.
ἀκαθάρτης: 156.
ἀκαιρέω: 147, 161.
ἀκατάγνωστος: 80, 161.
ἀκατάλυτος: 65, 161.
ἀκαταπάστους: form, 161; spelling, 185.
Ἀκελδαμάχ: 105.
–άκι-ς: suffix, 296.
ἀκμήν: 160 , 294 , 488 , 546.
ἀκολουθέω: constr., 472, 528; in mod. Gk., 138 n.; use, 880.
ἀκούω: ἀκήκοα, 358, 363 *bis*, 364, 801; ἤκουσμαι, 362, 364; c. cases, 449, 454, 506 f., 511, 519; in D always c. acc., 475 n.; in mod. Gk., 138 n.; fut., 356, 813; voice of, 803; in *or. obl.*, 864, 1035, 1042; c. ὅτι, 1035, 1042; c. compl. part., 864, 1042, 1103; c. inf., 1042; use, 881, 901, 1103, 1116; compounds and forms of, 1212.
ἀκριβέστατος: form, 280 *bis*.
ἀκριβέστερος: meaning, 665.
ἀκροατήριον: 65, 154.
ἀκροβυστία: 102, 166.
ἀκρογωνιαῖος: 168 *bis*.
ἄκρος: and art., 775.
Ἀκύλας: 82.
ἄλας: 145, 254, 269.
ἀλεεύς: p1. form of, 188.
ἀλείφω: constr., 483.
ἀλεκτοροφωνία: 471.
ἀκέτωρ: 63, 65 n.
ἀλήθεια: 134-5, 256.
ἀληθής: 135.
ἀληθινός: 135, 158.
-άληθρον: suffix, 174.
ἀλήθω: 149 , 353.
ἀλλά: elision, 207; accent, 232-4; form, 244, 294, 301; c. negative, 424, 752, 1166; use, 427 ff., 443; and asyndeton, 440; in mod. Gk., 1146; discussed, 1185 ff.
ἄλλα: form, 249, 294.
ἀλλάσσω: constr., 473 n., 511; compounds and forms of, 1212.
ἀλληγορέω: 81, 163.
ἀλληλούϊα: spelling, 95, 205, 225.
ἀλλήλων: form, 292; use, 690; discussed, 692 f.

ἀλλογενής: 80, 168.
ἄλλομαι: compounds and forms of, 1212.
ἄλλος: use, 292 f., 692; in comparison, 662; c. εἷς, 671; c. art., 695, 775 f.; discussed, 746 ff.; and ἕτερος, 749; antithetic, 750.
ἀλλοτρι(ο)επίσκοπος: 65, 82, 165, 166, 204.
ἀλλότριος: and ἄλλος, 748.
ἄλογος: form, 273.
ἅλ-ς: root of, 145.
ἅμα: origin, 249; num. adv., 284, 295, 301; case with, 451, 534, 63S; and μετά, 609; and σύν, 627; c. inf., 1069; c. part., 1124, 1139; use, 1126, 1139.
ἀμαράντινος: 158.
ἀμαρτάντινος: compounds and forms of, 348, 1212; constative aor. of, 833; c. ἁμαρτίαν, 477; use, 850, 854.
ἁμαρτία: use, 134, 780.
ἀμαρτωλός: 157.
ἀμείνων: form, 277; use, 662.
–άμενος: ending, 374.
ἀμετανόητος: 80, 162.
ἀμήν: and art., 759; Heb. influence, 95 131.
ἀμπελών: 154 and n.
ἀμφί: in comp., 451, 553, 555 f., 558; use in Homer, 524; case form, 524; origin, 555; original use, 569; disuse, 451, 569; and περί, 620; non-use with inf., 1069.
ἀμφιάζω: reading, 184; compounds and forms, 352, 1212.
ἀμφιέννυμι: constr., 483; forms of, 352, 364, 1212.
ἄμφ-οδον: 166.
ἀμφότεροι: use, 80, 251 f., 2S2, 292; discussed, 744 f.; and art., 769.
ἄμφω: use, 282, 292, 744.
ἄν: form, 181, 190; =ἐάν, 190 f., 1018; crasis, 208, 984; position, 424; in LXX, 938, 958; use, 424, 841, 855, 887, 920, 922 f., 935 f., 937 ff., 956-9, 961, 967-71; c. temporal particles, 961, 970; and ὅσος, 733; meaning, 921; c. ἕως, 976; c. ἵνα 984; c. ὅπως, 985 f.; c. οὗ, 969; c. ὡς, 968-9, 974; in conditions, 961, 1007, 1010 f., 1013-8, 1021 f., 1025 f.; c. indic., 957, 959, 969, 1007, 1010; c. opt. 854 f., 936-8, 959, 1007; c. ὅστις and subj., 957, 959; c. inf., 959, 969, 1040, 1095; c. part., 1129, 1141; in apodosis, 841, 887, 920-3; not in indep. subj. sentences, 935; not repeated with second verb, 959; in *or. obl.*, 1030, 1040, 1044; statistics, 958. See ὅς, ὅσος, ὅστις, etc.
–αν: ending, 73, 155, 257; verb ending, 336, 338; for —ασι, 73; verb-stem in, 352; acc. s. in 3d decl., 67, 68, 82, 97.
–ᾶν: inf. ending, 194, 343.
ἀνά: cases with, 451, 491, 524, 569 f.; in comp., 163, 166, 16S, 170, 476, 561, 571; use, 556; in mod. Gk., 557 f.; case-form, 570; discussed, 571 f.; with ἀπό, 575, with εἷς, 673; in prepositional phrases, 791.
–ανα: in verbs, 349, 352.
ἀναβαίνω: forms, 328.
ἀναβάλλω: use, 863.
ἀνάβλεψις: 151.
ἀνάγαιον: 185, 260.
ἀνγεννάω: 65.
ἀνγινώσκω: ὅτι with, 1032.
ἀναγκάζω: constr., 857.
ἀναγκαστως: 126.
ἀνάγκη: c. inf., 1084.
ἀναζῆν: 80, 130, 147, 163.
ἀναθάλλω: forms of, 348, 1212; constr., 476.
ἀνάθεμα: spelling, 65, 153 bis and n., 187.
ἀναθεματίζω: 149.
ἀνακαινόω: 65, 149, 152.
ἀνκαίνωσις: 152.
ἀνάκειμαι: 66.
ἀνακεφαλαιόω: voice of, 809.
ἀνακλίνω: voice of, 66, 819.
ἀναλίσκω: compounds and forms, 1212.
ἀναλύω: 82, 130.
ἀναμένω: c. acc., 475.
ἀναμιμνήσκω: constr., 482, 509.
ἀνα-μίξ: fixed case, 294, 460.
ἀνάξιος: constr., 504.

ἀναπαύω: voice of, 807; use, 873.
ἀναπίπτω: forms, 66, 338; c. acc., 486.
ἀναστατόω: 80, 149, 163.
ἀναστρέφομαι: 80.
ἀναστροφή: 126, 166.
ἀνατρέφω εἰς: 481.
ἀναφαίνω: constr., 486; voice of, 817.
ἀναφέρω: 80.
ἀνεκδιήγητος: 82, 162.
ἀνεκλάλητος : use, 1096.
ἀνεμίζω: 149.
ἀνενέγκαι: form, 338.
ἀνεξεραύνητος: 82, 162.
ἄνεσις: use, 900 f.
ἀνετάζω: 163.
ἄνευ: use, 301, 553, 638.
ἀνέχομαι: c. augment, 368; constr., 508; voice of, 807; c. acc., 486; c. part., 1121.
ἀνεψιός: 162.
ἀνήκω: use, 886.
ἀνθ᾽ ὧν: 208, 223, 556, 574, 963.
ἀνθρωπάρεσκος: 65, 168 bis
ἄνθρωπος: use 120.
ἀνίστημι: forms, 310, 328
ἀνοίγω: c. augment, 368; compounds and forms of, 82, 349, 364, 368, 371, 895, 1212; intransitive, 800.
ἀνταναπληρόω: 160, 165.
ἀνταπόδομαι: 151.
ἀντάω: compounds and forms, 1213.
ἀντί: elision, 208, 223; cases with, 451, 569 f.; case-form, 524, 570; in comp., 163, 165, 170, 542, 563, 572; use, 556; in mod. Gk., 557; in condensation, 567; ἀντίς in mod. Gk., 570; discussed, 572-4; ἀνθ᾽ ὧν, 208, 223, 556, 574, 696, 714, 722, 724, 953, 962-3; c. πρό, 620; and ὑπέρ, 630; and ἀντίπερα, 639; base of compound prepositions, 639; c. ὧν causal, 963; c. inf., 1060, 1069 f.
–αντι: ending, 336.
ἀντικαθίστημι: 133.
ἄντικρυς: use, 221, 231, 638.
ἀντιλαμβάνομαι: 131, 163.
ἀντιλέγοντες: reading, 1171.
ἀντιλέγω: meaning, 66; c. inf., 1035.
ἀντιλήμπτωρ: 80.
ἀντίλημψις: 80.
ἀντίλυτρον: 65, 166.
ἀντιμισθία: 115.
ἀντίπερα: use, 231, 638.
ἀντίτυπος: 115.
ἀντίχριστος: 115, 166.
ἄντλημα: 153.
ἀντοφθαλμέω: 81, 164.
ἄνω: in adj., 160; use, 296; adv., 298, 300.
–άνω: verbs in, 147, 316, 352.
ἄνωθεν: 300.
ἀνωτερικός: 160.
ἀνώτερος: 160, 296-8.
ἄξιος: constr., 658, 996; c. gen., 504; c. inf., 369, 996, 1077, 1079.
ἀξιόω: meaning, 149; class, 351; constr., 511.
ἀξίως: constr., 505.
–αος: equal to –ως, 267.
ἀπαγγέλλω: in or. obl., 1032, 1036.
ἀπάγχομαι.: voice of, 807.
ἅπαις: form, 272.
ἀπαντάω: use, 873; in mod. Gk., 138 n.
ἀπάντησις: 65, 152; c. ds, 91.
ἀπάνωθεν: use, 637.
ἅπαξ: use, 284, 296, 300.
ἀπαρνέομαι: fut., 818, 819; voice of, 819; use, 873; in or. obl., 1036.
ἅπας: and art., 771 ff.
ἀπαύγασμα: 153.
ἀπειπάμεθα: spelling, 338.
ἀπελπίζω: constr., 476; form, 164.
ἀπέναντι: use, 170 bis, 639, 644.
ἀπέρχομαι: use, 905.
ἀπέχω: meaning, 828; use, 80, 577, 827, 866.
ἀπλοῦς: use, 284.
ἀπό: anticipatory position, 110; elision, 208; cases with, 111, 469, 482, 534, 554, 568, 570; in adv. phrases, 297, 300, 548, 550; c. ὁ ὤν 135, 414, 459, 574 f.; "translation-Hebraism," 472; c. verbs, 511, 517 f., 559, 562, 566; for "partitive gen.," 515, 519; in comp., 164 f., 542, 563, 827 f.; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 138, 557; use, 561, 977 f.; in condensation, 567; c. ἀντί, 574; dis-

cussed, 574-80; and **ἐκ,** 596; and παρά, 613 f.; and πρός, 624; and **ὑπό**, 634; in prepositional phrases, 791; for agent, 820.
ἀπογραφή: formation, 151; meaning, 82.
ἀπογράφω: form, 164; voice of, 807, 809.
ἀποδείκνυμι: constr., 480, 481.
ἀποδίδωμι: voice of, 810.
ἀποδοχή: 151.
ἀπόθεσις: 125.
ἀποθνήσκω: constr., 479; meaning, 345, 827, 838, 845; use, 635, 869; voice of, 802, 815.
ἀποκαθίστημι: augment of, 73, 368.
ἀποκάλυψις: 152.
ἀποκαραδοκία: 81, 166.
ἀποκαταλλάσσω: 160, 165.
ἀποκατάστασις: 152.
ἀποκατιστάνει: reading, 316.
ἀποκόπτω: voice of, 809, 819.
ἀπόκριμα: 80.
ἀποκρίνομαι: "deponent," 66, 334; aor. pass., 334, 340; aor. pass. part., 1126; constr., 473, 484; c. πρός, 626; voice, 818; c. **ὅτι**, 1036; c. inf., 1036.
ἀποκτείνω: use, 635; pass. voice of, 802, 815; meaning, 827; forms, 352, 1213.
ἀποκτέννω: 73, 82.
ἀπόλλυμι: 311; formation, 147; fut., 335; perf., 358, 363, 800; voice of, 800, 804; meaning of, 827 f.
Ἀπολλώς: reading, 172, 189, 235, 260.
ἀπολούω: voice of, 807, 809.
ἀπολύτρωσις: 115, 175.
ἀπονίπτομαι: voice of, 810.
ἀποπλέω: contract verb, 342.
ἀπορέομαι: intransitive, 472.
ἀποσκίασμα: 153.
ἀποστασία: 65, 152.
ἀποστέλλω: forms, 336; use, 894, 896, 905.
ἀποστερέω: constr., 472, 483; voice of, 808, 816.
ἀπόστολή: 115.
ἀποστολός: meaning, 53 n., 65, 65 n., 115.
ἀποστρέφομαι: and case, 472, 484.
ἀποτάσσομαι: 80.
ἀποτίθημι: voice of, 810.
ἀποτομία: 156.
ἀποτόμως: 170 bis.
ἀποφεύγω: constr., 476.
ἅπτω: compounds and forms, 353, 1213; ἅπτομαι: constr., 508, 853; c. **μή**, 853; voice of, 806 f.
ἀπωθέομαι: voice of, 810.
ἀπώλεια: 115.
ἆρα: accent, 232; reading, 244; in interrogation, 916 f.; use, 1176.
ἄρα: use, 135, 207, 425, 429, 916 f., 1146, 1157, 1176; position, 425, 1189; in apodosis, 429, 1190; c. **τίς** 916, 1176; c. **οὖν**, 1190; c. **οὐκ**, 917, 1157; lost in mod. Gk., 1146; discussed, 1189 f.; accent, 232; statistics, 135, 1190.
–αρα: in verbs, 349, 352.
ἀραβών: spelling, 81, 105, 211 n., 212,
ἄραγε: use, 425, 1190.
ἀρεσκεία: 152, 231.
ἀρέσκω: constr., 479, 487; c. dat., 540; **ἀρ. ἐνώπιόν τινος,** 94.
ἀρετή: 80, 101, 126 n., 148 n.
–άριον: diminutive, 66.
ἀριστερά: 449.
ἀρκετός: 80.
ἀρκέω: forms, 210, 324; constr., 541; use, 889.
ἄρκ(τ)ος: 210, 252.
Ἀρμαγεδδών: 95.
ἀρνέομαι: in *or. obl.*, 1035 f.; compounds and forms, 1213.
ἀροτριάω: 65, 150.
ἁρπαγμός: 130, 151.
ἁρπάζω: compounds and forms, 349, 1213; **ἡρπάγην**, 82.
ἅρπαξ: use, 272.
ἀρραβών: 81, 95, 111, 212.
ἄρρητα: breathing, 212, 225.
ἀρσενοκοίτης: 166.
ἄρτι: use, 548, 1146; c. part., 1139.
ἄρτος: 115.
ἀρχή: acc. form adv., 294, 298, 487, 546.
–άρχης: in comp., 231, 257 f.
ἀρχι–: prefix, 161 f.

ἀρχιερεύς: 115, 162.
–αρχος: in comp., 257.
ἄρχω: ἀρξάμενοι reading, 49; ἤρξατο redundant, 107; use, 1102, 1121, 1126; c. inf., 1077-8, 1102; not used with part. in N. T., 1102, 1121; ἀρξάμενος, 1126; and ellipsis, 1203.
ἄς: in mod. Gk., 430, 923, 931.
–ας: ending, 138, 254, 256, 265, 267, 337.
–ας, –ᾶς: in proper names, 172, 254 and n.
ἀσθένημα: 153.
–ασι: ending (perf.), 336.
Ἀσία: c. art., 788.
Ἀσιανός: 155 n.
Ἀσιάρχης: 80, 166.
ἀσπάζομαι: constr., 80, 853, 862 f.
ἄσημος: 80.
ἄσπιλος: 64, 162.
ἧσσον: meaning, 665.
ἀσύνετος: voice, 372; use, 1097.
ἀσύνθετος: voice, 372; use, 1097.
ἀσχημονέω: 147.
-ατε: per. end., 308.
ἀτενίζω: 149, 162.
ἄτερ: use, 639.
ἄτοπος: 80.
ἀτός: in mod. Gk., 185.
–ατος: ending, 277, 279 f.
–άτω: per. end., 308.
–άτωσαν: per. end., 308.
αὐθεντέω: 80, 148, 164.
αὐξάνω: constr., 478; trans., 799.
αὔριον: form, 294.
αὐτο–: in comp., 168.
αὐτόθι: use, 296.
αὐτομάτη: form, 273.
αὐτός: in problem of ἑαυτοῦ, 226, 232; intensive, 287, 399, 416; semi-demonstrative, 290, 686; gen. form, αὐτοῦ, adverbial, 298; position of gen., 503; 3d per. pro., 679, 683 f.; use of αὐτοῦ, 681, 683; discussed, 685-7, 709 f.; use, 688-90; **καὶ αὐτός, -ή**, 122, 680; **τὸ αὐτό**, 487; **ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό**, 83, 602; **αὐτή** and **αὕτη**, 232, 680; **ὁ αὐτός** "same," 290, 679, 687, 770; **αὐτός** emphatic "he," 679, 416; **αὐτός** "himself," 680; **αὐτὸς ὁ**, 686, 709, 770; c. per. pro., 687; c. **οὗτος**, 686, 705; and **ἐκεῖνος**, 707 f.; c. **ὅς**, 723; c. art., 770, 779; resumptive, 698; pleonastic, 722; in sense-figure, 1204.
αὐτοῦ: question of, 226, 688 f.; use, 232, 287, 289; feminine, 254.
ἀφαιρέομαι: constr., 480, 483; voice of, 819.
ἀφεδρών: 154.
ἀφελότης: 156, 162.
ἄφες: use, 82, 329, 430, 855 f., 931 f., 935.
ἄφεσις: 97.
ἄφέωνται: 63, 82, 342.
ἀφῆκα: 900.
ἀφῆκες: 135.
ἀφίημι: forms of, 107, 315, 329, 337, 342, 347; constr., 855 f.; use, 931; c. inf., 855-8; c. **ἵνα**, 431; aor., 900.
ἀφιλάργυρος: 80, 162.
ἀφίω: forms of, 315, 335.
ἀφοράω: 132.
ἄφρων: voc. of, 463.
ἀφυπνόω: 149.
-αχοῦ: suffix, 296.
ἄχρι: with final 3, 221, 296; use, 639, 954, 974; in prepositional phrases, 791; c. **ἄν**, 975; c. inf., 1074.
–άω: confused with –έω, 73, 82, 341; verbs in, 147 ff., 184, 203, 316; 341 ff., 351.

B

β: 209; =v, 238, 240; in mod. Gk., 217; verb root in, 353.
—β—: inserted, 210.
βάαλ: 254, 411.
Bαβυλών: 269, 494.
βαθέα: 232.
βαθέως: 160, 274.
βαίνω: forms and compounds, 305-8, 800, 1213; **-έβην**, 348, 350.
βαΐον: 111.
βάλλω: aor. of, 307, 338, 836, 847; class, 352; trans. and intrans., 799 f.; voice, 799 f., 815; meaning; 834, 838; use, 905; compounds and

forms, 1212 f.; ἔβαλαν, 338; βαλῶ, 356; βέβληκα, 364.
βαπτίζω: βάπτισαι accent, 943 f., and form, 329, 332, 944; formation, 149; meaning, 66, 81, 115; constr., 389, 47S, 482, 485, 520, 525, 533, 590, 592; voice of, 807 f.; use, 1073, 1111, 1128.
βαπτισμα: 65, 115, 153 *bis*.
βαπτισμός: 65, 115, 152 f.
βαπτιστής: 65, 153.
βάπτω: 149, 353.
βαρ—: 105.
βάρβαρος: form, 272, 362.
βαρέω: compounds and forms, 1213.
βαρύνω: forms, 1213.
βασιλεία: 115, 116, 125; β. τῶν οὐρανῶν, 119.
βασιλεύς: meaning, 116; "cases" of pl., 447; voc. of, 465; and art., 760, 769.
βασιλεύω: causative, 801; constative, 833; use, 902.
βασίλισσα: 55, 65, 155.
βασκαίνω: and cases, 473.
βαστάζω: constr., 80, 853.
βάτος: 95, 253.
—ββ—: 213 f.
βεβαίωσις: 80.
βέβηλος: 362.
βεελζεβούλ: spelling, 95, 210.
βέλτερος: form, 662.
βέλτιον: form, 277 f., 294, 299; adv., 488; meaning, 665.
βήρυλλος: reading, 199.
βιάζομαι: 80, 816.
βιαστής: 153.
βιβάζω: 362 n.
βιβάω: meaning, 865.
βιβλαρίδιον: 155.
βίβλος: spelling, 111, 199.
βιβρώσκω: 65 n.
βιόω: forms, 348 *bis*, 354; constr., 479.
βίωσις: 152.
βλάπτω: constr., 472, 482, 484.
βλαστάνω: trans. and intrans., 799; forms, 348, 1213.
βλασφημέω: and case, 473; constr., 479.
βλέμμα: 126.
Βλέπω: c. subj., 82; in John, 134 n.; constr., 330, 996; and asyndeton, 430; and case, 471; c. ἀπό, 73, 91, 577; use of βλέπετε, 330, 932 f., 955, 1110; in *or. obl.*, 1035, 1041; compounds and forms, 1213.
βλητέον: 157, 373, 486. See –τέον.
βοανηργές: 95.
βοάω: in *or. obl.*, 1036.
βοηθέω: case with, 472, 541.
βούλομαι: forms, 339; βούλει, 82, 193, 339; ἐβουλόμην, 886, 919; ἐβουλήθην, 817; use, 80, 430, 876, 878, 886, 919; c. subj., 876-8; c. ἵνα (not in N. T.), 1055; in *or. obl.*, 1036–S; c. inf., 1038, 1055 f., 1060.
βουνός: 111.
βραδεῖον: 154.
βραδύνω: forms, 230.
βραδὺς τῇ καρδίᾳ: 487.
βρέχω: trans. and intrans., 799, 802.
βροχή: 80.
βύσσος: 95 bis, 105, 111.

Γ

γ: 209, 216, 359.
–γ--: inserted, 210.
γάζα: 111 bis.
γαζοφυλάκιον: 166.
Γαλατική with art., 788.
γαμέω: constr., 111, 1204; forms, 348, 1213.
γαμίσκω: 150.
γάμοι: 408.
γάρ: use, 424, 433, 443, 962, 1189; in interrogation, 916; c. εἰ, 886, 940, 1003 f., 1020; c. τέ 1179; discussed, 1190 f.
γέ: use, 244, 291, 302, 424, 1144; καί γε c. part., 1129; discussed, 1147 ff.; enclitic, 207, 244, 1211.
γέεννα: 97, 105.
γεμίζω: constr., 506, 510.
γέμω: c. acc., 455, 474.
γενεσία: 65.
γένημα: reading, 80, 211, 213.
γεννάω: use, 866 f.
γένος: 448, 487.
γεύομαι: 105, 449; and case, 473, 507 f.
γῆ: and ellipsis, 272, 652, 1202.

γηράσκω: 150.
-γι.: in verbs, 351.
γιά: prep. in mod. Gk., 570, 982.
γίνομαι: 55, 61, 73, 82, 210; itacism in, 197, 210; ἐγένετο with καί, 95, 102, 107, 122, 122 n., 393, 426, 1042 f.; ἐγένετο c. acc. and inf., 1085; ἐγενάμην, 82; aor., 816; frequency in Mt., 122; followed by asyndeton, 429; in periphrastic forms, 330, 902; γίνεσθαι cases with, 497; c. advs., 545 f.; ἐγένετο, 658, 829; voice of, 801, 818, 820; γένοιτο with μή, 325, 854, 935, 939 f., 1003; imper. of, 855; use, 869, 871, 896 f., 905, 951, 1085, 1202; omission of, 396; pred. nom., 457; subj. forms, 890; perf., 900; γέγονα, 333, 358, 358 n., 801, 896, 900; γέγονεν, 68, 336; γέγονεν ὅτι, 1034; compounds and forms, 350-1, 1212 f.
γινώσκω: compounds and forms, 82, 134, 210, 308, 324, 328, 330, 346, 1214; perf. redupl., 364; use of γνωστόν, 656; meaning, 827 f., 834, 904; aor. of, 843, 856; use, 871; plupf. =impf., 904; in *or. obl*., 1035f., 1041; c. inf., 1062, 1103; c. part., 1103.
γλῶσσα: meaning, 115; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.
γλωσσόκομον: various readings, 204; formation, 166; accent, 231.
γνώστης: 151, 231.
γνωστός: 157.
γογγύζω: meaning, 80; formation, 150; form, 358, 363; constr., 853.
γογγυστής: 153.
Γολγοθά: spelling, 211; form, 105, 236, 259.
γονυ-: in comp., 164.
γονυπετέω: formation, 164; and case, 474.
γραμματεύς: meaning, 80.
γραπτός: 157.
γραφή: and πᾶς, 772.
γράφω: compounds and forms, 80, 346, 351, 406, 1214; γέγραφα, 358, 364; ἔγραψες, 82; ἔγραψα, 845; ἔγραφον, 346; constr., 845 f., 853; in mod. Gk., 851; use, 875, 895; in *or. obl*., 1035 f.
γραώδης: 168.
γρηγορέω: 65, 148, 351; ἐγρήγορα, 148, 363.
γυμνιτεύω: 148, 191.
γυμνότης: 156.
γυναικάριον: 155.
γυνή: and ellipsis, 652.

Δ

δ: 210, 240, 248.
-δ-: inserted, 210 *bis*.
-δα: adv. end., 295.
δαιμόνια: constr., 66, 404.
δάκρυ(ον): 262.
δανείζω: voice of, 809.
δέ: elision, 207; origin, 301; c. art., 290, 694 f.; conj., 301, 428 f., 440, 443f.; postpositive, 424, 1188; καί, 122; c. ὅς 695 f.; c. οὗτος, 705; c. ἐκεῖνος, 707; antithetic, 750, 1145, 1153; c. εἰ μή, 1025; c. negative, 1164; discussed, 1183-5; adversative, 1186.
–δε: suffix, 296, 1211.
δεῖ: form, 319; use, 880, 919 ff.; ἔδει., 886, 919; c. inf., 1058 (as subject); 1078, 1084 f.
δειγματίζω: 149.
δείκνυμι: use, 55, 135; compounds and forms, 174 f., 306 f., 311, 327, 1214.
δεικνύω: compounds and forms, 307, 311; in or. obl., 1035 f.
δεῖνα: use, 292, 744.
δειπνέω: meaning, 80.
δεισιδαιμονία: 65, 81, 166.
δέκα: use, 282; in comp., 169, 283.
δεκατόω: 65, 149.
δέν: in mod. Gk., 206, 928, 1011, 1156 ff., 1168.
δεξιός: in comp., 168, 232; in comparison, 662.
δέομαι: forms, 342; ἐδεῖτο, 203, 342; c. abl. and acc., 519; c. obj.-inf., 1059.
δέον: use with ἐστί, 80, 881, 1130.
δέρω: constr., 477 bis, 485; forms of, 1214.
δέσμη: 231.
δέσμιος: 65 n.

δέσμος: 262, 263 n.
δεσμοφύλαξ: 166.
δεῦρο: form, 299, 302, 328; use, 430, 931, 949, 1193.
δεῦτε: form, 299, 302; use, 328, 330, 430, 931, 949; in conditions, 1023.
δευτεραῖοι: use, 298.
δεύτερον: adv., 460, 488.
δευτερο-πρῶτος: 168.
δεύτερος: form, 277; ordinal, 283 f.; and εἷς, 671; ἐκ δευτέρου, 597.
δὲχομαι: voice of, 813; compounds and forms, 1214.
δέω: δέω δεσμάς, 479, 482; pass. of, with acc., 486; compounds and forms, 342, 1214.
δή: use, 302, 443; discussed, 1149.
δηλ-αυγῶς: 170.
δῆλον: c. ὅτι, 244, 1034.
δηλόω: in *or. obl.*, 1036.
δημόσιος: loc. form, 295; use, 691.
δηνάριον: 65, 108, 192.
δήπου: use, 302.
διά: elision, 208; c. enclitic, 244; in comp., 164, 168, 476, 529, 558, 561, 563, 800, 827 f.; cases with, 491, 534, 565, 569 f.; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 557; c. verbs, 560; in condensation, 567; case-form, 570; discussed, 580-4; and κατά, 606; and ὑπέρ, 629; and ὑπό, 636; c. μέσον, 648; διὰ τί . . .; 244, 730, 739, 916, 1176; in prepositional phrases, 791; for agent, 820; c. inf., 584, 858, 891, 909, 966, 1060, 1069 f., 1091; c. τοῦτο, 965.
διαβαίνω: constr., 476, 800.
διαβάλλω: meaning, 80.
διαζώννυμι: voice of, 810.
δοαθήκη: 116.
διακονέω: 540.
διάκονος: 115.
διακρίνομαι: constr., 478.
διαλείπω: c. part., 1121.
διαμαρτύρομαι: constr., 484; in *or. obl.*, 1035 f.
διανοίγω: in *or. obl.*, 1035 f.
διαπαρατριβή: 165-6.
διαπλέω: 476.
διαπορεύομαι: 476.
διαπορέω: 472.
διασπάω: meaning, 564, 828.
διασπορά: 97, 151.
διάστημα: 151.
διαταγή: 151.
διατελέω: c. part., 1121.
διατηρέω: meaning, 828.
διατιθεμαι: 479
διατρίβω: constr., 477.
διαφέρω: case with, 455.
διαφεύγω: meaning, 828; constr., 987.
διαφθείρω: 486.
διδάσκω: 150; form, 331; constr., 474, 482 *bis*, 485, 486, 1083; voice of, 816; in *or. obl.*, 1035 f.
δίδωμι: compounds and forms, 190, 306, 307 ff., 311, 324, 326 f., 335, 337, 347, 409, 876, 1044, 1214; δίδω, 311 n., 312, 335; διδῶ, 135, 307, 311; διδόασι, 82; ἐδίδετο, 190, 312; ἐδίδοσαν, 82, 312; ἔδωκα, 55; ἔδωσα, 309, 324, 348; δέδωκες, 82; δῴη, 326; δός, 329; constr., 855, 940, 983 f., 1032; use, 135, 905, 1062, 1080, 1135; δεξιὰν δ., 83; τιθέναι, 95, 102; in indirect command, 1047; δοῦναι, 1052, 1058, 1132.
διερμηνευτής: 166.
διερμηνία: 166.
διέρχομαι: constr., 472, 476, 477, 800, 869.
διηγέομαι: ὅτι with, 1032.
διισχυρίζομαι: in or. obl., 1036.
δικαιοκρισία: 65, 166.
δίκαιος: meaning, 80, 115, 174, 176; c. three endings, 273.
δικαιοσύνη: with subjective gen., 499; use, 781.
δικαίοω: 149, 174.
δίκη: 174.
διό: use, 132, 950.
Διόνυσος: reading, 200.
διόπερ: use, 1154.
Διόσκορος: 199.
διότι: use, 80, 244, 430, 962, 964.
διπλότερον: form, 278, 299.
διπλοῦς: use, 284.
δίς: adv., 284; spelling, 296, 298, 300.
δισχίλιοι: use, 283.
δίχα: adv., 284,

διχοτομέω: meaning, 80.
διψάω: formation, 147; aor. forms, 342; and case, 474, 508.
δογματίζω: formation, 149; voice of, 807.
δοκέω: constr., 541, 853, 1085.
δοκιμάζω: in *or. obl.*, 1041; c. inf., 1085.
δοκίμαιον: 80, 126 n., 156, 158.
δόκιμος: 80.
δολιόω: formation, 149; form, 336, 343.
δόμα: spelling, 153, 153 n., 200.
–δον: adv. suffix, 295 f.
δόξα: 134, 148 n.
δοξάζω: aor. of, 837, 843, 847, 853.
δουλ–: in comp., 164.
δουλεύω: 473 n., 540.
δουλόω: constr., 540.
δράσσομαι: use, 474.
δύναμαι: augment ε-- and η–, 368; compounds and forms of, 312, 340, 350, 351, 368, 1214; δύνῃ, 312, 314; voice of, 820; constr., 857; use, 879 f., 886, 920; c. inf., 1055 f., 1060, 1077 f.; c. τοῦ+Inf., 1077; c. ἵνα, 1055-6; in John, 1078.
δύναμις: use, 176.
δυναμόω: formation, 149.
δυνατέω: formation, 147.
δυνατός: c. inf., 369, 857, 1077, 1079.
δύνομαι: reading, 312.
δύνω: intrans., 800; compounds and forms, 1214.
δύο: forms, 251, 282; δύο δύο Hebraism (?), 74, 91, 284, 673; δυσί, 72, 82, 251; and art., 769.
δύρομαι: spelling, 206.
δυσ--: in comp., 161 ff.
δύω: compounds and forms, 348, 1214.
δώδεκα: use, 282.
δωδεκά-φυλον: 166.
δῶμα: use, 65 n., 66, 80, 138; spelling, 200.
δωρεάν: 294, 298, 488.

E

ε: short vowel, 178, 181 f.; vowel-changes with, 178, 183-91, 324; instead of o, 308; inserted by analogy, 349; with Doric fut., 354; reduplication and augment, 363-7; voc. ending, 462 f.; prothetic, 1209.
ἔα: use, 302, 391, 1193.
ἐάν: form, 181, 190 f.; for ἄν, 72, 80, 83, 97, 181, 190 f.; ἄν for ἐάν, 190 f.; crasis, 208; constr., 220, 325, 850, 928, 967, 969, 1129; c. indic., 82, 325, 1009; and ὅστις, 727; and ὅσος, 733; and ὅπου, 969; use, 948, 968, 971, 1129; c. ὅς, 957, 959; ὅς ἄν (ἐάν) not= ἐάν τις 961; c. ἐπεί, 965; in conditions, 1005-27.
ἐάνπερ: use, 1154.
ἐάντε—ἐάντε: use, 1189.
ἑαυτοῦ: form, 185, 226, 287; use, 287, 289, 687-90; for all three persons, 73, 97, 287-8; and ἴδιος, 691 f.; and art., 779; with mid. voice, 810.
ἐάω: εἴασεν, 365; c. οὐκ, 1156; compounds and forms, 1214.
ἕβδομος: 125.
Ἑβραϊκός: 159.
Ἑβραϊστί: form, 95, 205, 296, 298; use, 104, 106, 524.
ἐγγίζω: meaning, 81; formation, 149; constr., 623 f.; compounds and forms, 1214.
ἐγγύς: form, 248 n., 294, 298; in comparison, 298; constr., 538, 638; adjectival, 547; use, 549, 568, 639 f.
ἐγειρω: voice of, 799, 816, 817; usually trans., 799; use, 866, 896; gnomic, 866; c. εἰς , 482; ἠγέρθη intrans., 817; ἐγήγερται, 896; compounds and forms, 186, 1215.
ἐγκακέω: c. part., 1121.
ἐγκαλέω: constr., 511.
ἐγκομβόομαι: voice of, 808.
ἐγκρατεύομαι: 148, 478.
ἐγχρίω: 81, 232.
ἐγώ: crasis, 208; accent with enclitic; 230, 234 f., 286, 420; interchange with ἡμεῖς, 406; ἐγών old form of, 285, 466; discussed, 677 f.; enclitic forms of, 682, 1211; use, 685, 689, 693; and ἐκεῖνος, 707; and ἄλλος, 746; position of μου, 779; use of ἡμῶν, 785; c. particles, 1148,
ἐδαφίζω: forms of, 1215.
ἐδίδοσαν; 82,

εε: in contraction, 342.
ἐθελο-θρησκία: 166.
ἐθέλω: form, 205 f.; use, 878, 886, 919.
ἐθίζω: εἰθισμένος, 364.
ἐθνικός: 15S.
εθνικῶς: 160.
ἔθος ἐστίν: 1084.
ἔθω: forms of, 358, 364, 1215; εἴωθα, 801.
ει: 187, 191-4, 195 f., 198, 204, 324, 367; =ι, 196, 238, 239; proper names in, 198. augment of, 367.
-ει: 2d pers. mid. ending, 339.
-ει- : for -ιει-, 72.
εἰ: accent, 233 f., 244, 1211; and ὅτι, 430, 965; and οὗτος, 699 f.; and γάρ, 886, 940, 1003 f., 1020; use, 916, 928, 997, 1176; in interrogation, 122, 916; c. opt., 127; c. τις, 956; c. οὐ, 962, 1011, 1160; c. μήν, 1004; c. μή, 1160; c. καί, 1026; in conditions, 1005-27, 1129; εἰ δοθήσεται. σημεῖον, 94, 1024; in *or. obl.*, 1030, 1045; proclitic, 1211.
-εία: ending, 152, 196 f., 326.
εἰδέω: compounds and forms, 1215.
εἶδον: forms, 223 f., 325, 339, 344, 360, 366; no present, 344; εἶδαν, 339; perf. subj., 325, 360, 907, 983; use, 413 f., 437, 441, 892, 1135; in *or. obl.*, 1041.
εἶδος: meaning, 80.
εἴδω: ἴσμεν, ἴστε, ἴσασιν, 87, 238-9, 319; perf. subj., 325, 360; εἶδυῖα, 62; compounds and forms, 361, 906 f., 1215.
εἰδωλεῖον: 154.
εἰδωλο-λατρεία: 161, 166.
εἰδωλο-λατρεύω: 161.
-ειε: opt. end., 327, 335.
εἴθε: in wish constr., 886, 940, 1003 f,
--εῖκα: perf. end., 310.
εἰκῆ: 295.
Εἰκόνιον: spelling, 197.
εἴκοσι: form, 221, 283.
εἴκω: perf. ἔοικα, 124, 364, 895.
εἰκὼν θεοῦ: 97.
εἰλι-κρίνεια: 166, 223.
εἰ μή: use, 192 f., 747, 1011, 1014, 1016, 1024 f., 1160; 1169, 1187-8. Also see εἰ and μή.
εἶ μήν: discussed, 80, 1150.
εἰμί: compounds and forms, 188, 194, 220, 232 ff., 312 f., 325, 327 f., 330, 337, 340, 350, 395, 908, 1215; εἶμαι, 145, 307, 312, 340; ἦσθα, 312, 337; ἦς, 337; ἤμην, 68, 312, 340; ἤμεθα, 312, 340; ἦν in papyri sometimes is subj. ᾖ, 220, 313, 325; ἔστω, ἔστωσαν, 328; ἤτω, 82, 328; in periphrastic forms, 118, 122, 330, 860, 877 f., 887-90, 903, 906 ff., 950; constr., 330, 394 ff., 472, 481, 497, 545; c. nom., 457; c. gen., 497; c. dat., 457; inf. c. nom., 457; omission of, 395; c. εἰς, 95, 97, 458; ἔστιν c. τοῦτο, 234, 411, 705; meaning, 415, 865; use, 874, 945 f., 1030, 1202; καὶ ἔσται in *or. obl.*, 1042; ὁ ὤν, 1107; enclitic, 1211; accent of ἐστιν, 233.
εἶμι: accent, 232 f.; compounds and forms, 313, 350, 396, 1215; use, 869, 881.
-εῖν: inf. ending, 342, 370.
-ειν: inf. ending, 249, 370, 388; pluperf. ending, 339, 361.
-εινος: ending, 197.
-ειον: ending, 197.
-ειος: ending, 197.
εἴπερ: use, 1154.
εἰπόν: form, 231, 329, 338.
εἶπον: accent, 229, 231, 329; augment, 368; no present, 345; forms of, 327, 329, 338, 345 f., 363, 368; εἶπα, 55, 61, 73, 338 *bis*, 346; εἰπέ 714, 327, 329, 338; redupl., 363 *bis*; constr., 480, 484, 626, 902; c. prod. acc., 480, 484; c. subj. in question, 930; c. ὅτι, 1035; c. ρπρὸς αὐτόν, 626; and λέγω 838, 883; use, 930; in *or. obl.*, 1048.
εἰρηνεύω: constr., 486.
εἰρήνη: Hebraic use, 95, 105, 115; εἰρήνην διδόναι, 105.
εἰρηνο--: in comp., 164.
εἰς: spelling, 187; meaning, 80, 389, 449, 561; in idiom, 401; case with, 451, 481, 484, 491, 524, 535, 569 f.;

in mod. Gk., 453, 535, 557; Semitic influence, 457 f.; c. verbs, 469, 481, 540, 542, 559 ff., 562, 566; in "pregnant construction," 525, 1204; in adv. phrases, 550; frequency, 556; in LXX, 481; c. pred. acc., 481 f.; εἰς ἀπάντησιν, 91, 528; εἰς τί . . ., 739; rather than διά, 582; and ἐν, 97, 123, 449, 453, 584 ff.; discussed, 591-6; and παρά, 613; and πρός, 624, 626; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 658, 858 (aor.), 891 (pres.), 909 and 1072 (perf.), 990 f., 997, 1001 ff., 1060, 1069-72, 1088, 1090; c. 1088, and adj., 1072; reading, 862; anarthrous, 1070; proclitic, 1211.
εἷς: root of, 145; and οὐ, 232, 751; indeclinable use, 282 f.; supplanting τὶς, 83, 292; case, 460; and πρῶτος, 671; εἷς καθ' εἷς, 105, 450, 460; καθ' εἷς, 292, 294, 450, 460; τὸ καθ' εἷς, 487; εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν, 675; as indef. art., 674, 796; equal to τις, 675, 744; distributive, 675; and ἄλλος, 747; antithetic, 750.
–εῖς: nom. and ace. plural ending, 265.
-είς in aor. pass. part., 373.
εἰσέρχομαι: constr., 855.
εἰσπορεύομαι: voice of, 806; use, 880.
εἶτα: use, 300, 429.
εἴτε: εἴτε--εἴτε, 1025, 1045, 1179, 1189.
εἶτεν: literary, 119; form, 160, 183.
εἴ τις θέλει: 961.
ἐκ: in comp., 163 f., 168, 170, 215, 828; c. τούτου, 444; c. verbs, 510, 517 f.; for "partitive gen.," 515, 519; case with, 534, 570; in adv. phrases, 548, 550; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 558; use, 561; c. ἀπό, 575, 577; discussed, 596-600; and παρά, 614; and ὑπό, 636; for agent, 820; c. inf., 1061, 1073; proclitic, 1211.
ἕκαστος: use, 61, 292; discussed, 745 f.; c. plu. verb, 746; c. εἷς, 746; and art., 745, 769; and πᾶς, 771.
ἑκάτερος: use, 292, 745. See page 61.
ἑκατόν: use, 283.
ἐκβάλλω: voice of, 803; use, 880.
ἐκδύω: c. two ace., 483.
ἐκεῖ: and aphaaeresis, 206; loc. form, 249, 295; meaning, 299; constr., 443, 548; as root, 706; use, 969.
ἐκεῖθεν: 300.
ἐκεῖνος: Ionic κεῖνος, 206, 706; use in John, 134, 290; meaning and use, 693; resumptive, 698, 707; ἐκείνης in Luke, 494; and ὑμεῖς, 707 f.; and οὗτος, 702 f., 707; discussed, 289 n., 706-9; and art., 770.
ἐκεῖσε: form, 296; meaning, 299; constr., 548; and ὅπου, 722.
ἐκζήτησις: 152.
ἐκκακέω: 65.
ἐκκλησία: meaning 97, 115, 130; absent in John's Gospel, 134; origin, 174.
ἐκκρέμαμαι: form, 340.
ἐκλανθάνω: constr., 509.
ἐκλέγομαι: constr., 480; voice of, 808, 810,f.
ἐκλεκτός: meaning, 115; accent, 231; forms, 273.
ἐκμυκτηρίζω: 65.
ἐκπίπτω: voice of, 802.
ἐκπλέω: form, 342.
ἐκπορνεύω: c. ace., 486.
ἐκτένεια: 80, 166.
ἐκτινάσσω: use, 65 n.; meaning, 80; voice of, 810.
ἐκτός: use, 80, 296, 300, 640, 1025.
ἐκφεύγω: constr., 476; meaning, 828.
ἐκφύω: forms, 232, 341, 350.
ἐκχέω: forms, 213, 342, 352.
ἐκών: formation, 157 n.; three end., 274; use, 298, 373.
Ἐλαιών: case of, 232, 267, 269, 458 f.;. Ἐλαιῶν, 154 n.; ἐλαιών, 154.
ἐλάσσων: form, 72, 218, 277 f.; constr., 484 f.; adv,, 488.
ἐλάττων: 72, 218.
ἐλαττονέω: 148, 218.
ἐλαύνω: compounds and forms, 1215.
ἐλαφρία: 156.
ἐλάχιστος: form, 278 f., 669; double superlative, 278, 670.
ἐλεάω: forms of, 184, 342.
ἐλεέω: forms of, 342; transitive, 474.
ἐλεημοσύνη: 65, 156.

ἐλεινός: 204.
ἔλεος: 261, 262 n.
ἐλεύθερος: meaning, 662.
ἕλιγμα: accent, 230.
ἕλκω: compounds and forms, 1215; εἱλκωμένος, 364.
ἑλληνίζω: 150, 153.
ἑλληνιστής: 153.
Ἑλληνιστί: form, 160, 296, 298; use, 104.
ἑλλογέω: formation, 148, 184; forms, 342.
ἐλπίζω: meaning, 115, 125; aspiration of, 223 f.; forms, 338; constr., 476; use, 877, 884, 1080, 1082.
ἐλπίς: meaning, 115; ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι, 72, 224.
ἐλωΐ: 105, 205, 236.
ending, 188.
ἐμαυτοῦ: use, 287, 687-90.
ἐμβαίνω: forms, 328.
ἐμβατεύω: 65 n., 164.
ἐμβριμάομαι: forms, 341.
ἐμμέσῳ: assimilation of, 1210.
ἐμός: statistics, 69; ἐμοῦ compared with μου, 234, 286; use, 69, 134, 288, 496, 684; "case" of ἐμοί, 447; ἐμοί with ἐν 588; ἐμοῦ, 682; with αὐτός, 687; and art., 770.
ἐμπορεύομαι: transitive, 474.
ἔμπροσθεν: use, 300, 621, 640.
ἔμφυτος: 124.
ἐν. iv: c. inf., 91, 107, 122, 431, 490, 587, 858, 891, 978 f., 1042, 1062, 1069, 1072 f., 1092; ἐν τῷ c. inf., 91, 95, 107, 107 n., 122, 587; ἐν τῷ c. inf. in Luke, 91, 95, 107, 107 n., 122, 431, 587, 1042, 1062, 1092; in LXX, 452; assimilation, 216 f.; accent, 229, 1211; meaning, 80, 449; and case, 451, 484 f., 520, 522-5, 527, 531, 533 ff., 554, 569 f., 721; frequent use, 452 f., 556; in mod. Gk., 557; c. μέσῳ, 505, 521, 1210; c. verbs, 510, 540, 559 f., 562; case-form, 524, 570; in "pregnant construction," 525, 548, 559, 585, 592; in comp., 164, 542; as adverb, 554 f., 585; in adv. phrases, 550; origin, 555; discussed, 584-90; instrumental, 73, 91, 95, 102, 452, 525-34, 589; locative, 520, 522-5, 527, 531; agent, 534; place, 586; time, 586; accompanying circumstance, 588; sphere, 589; repetition, 566-7; ἐν τοῖς, 83; ἐν κυρίῳ, 587; ἐν Χριστῷ, 587; and εἰς, 453, 484, 520, 525, 559, 569, 585, 591-3; and ἐκ, 599; and ἐπί, 600; and ὑπό, 636; in prepositional phrases, 792, 978; c. ᾧ, 963; proclitic, 1211; statistics, 556, 572, 586-7, 801, 858, 1069.
ἔν: accent, 232.
ἕνα: in mod. Gk., 282.
–έναι: inf. ending, 370.
ἐναντίον: 80; form, 170; use, 639 f.
ἐνδείκνυμι: form, 170; use, 573, 639 f.
ἔνατος: 213.
ἐνδείκνυμι: reading, 946.
ἕνδεκα: use, 282.
ἔνδεσις: 57.
ἐνδιδύσκω: 80; formation, 150; acc. c. pass. of, 485; voice of, 810.
ἐνδόμησις: 152.
ἔνδυμα: 151.
ἐνδύω: c. two acc., 483; acc. c. pass. of, 485; voice of, 809.
ἐνδώμησις: spelling, 152, 201.
ἐνεδρεύω: meaning, 80; and case, 474.
ἔνεδρον: 166.
ἕνεκα: origin, 249; position, 301, 425, 641; use, 641; c. inf., 1060.
ἕνεκεν: spelling, 183, 187; aspiration, 225; position, 425; use, 55, 641; c. τοῦ+inf., 1073, 1091.
ἐνεργέω: transitive, 455; c. acc., 476; meaning, 564.
ἐνθάδε: meaning, 299; use, 548.
ἔνι: accent, 232; in mod. Gk., 313.
ἐνκακέω: formation, 164; use, 1102.
ἐννέα: use, 282.
ἐνορκίζω: constr., 484, 1085.
ἔνοχος: meaning, 80; constr., 504, 535, 537; c. gen., 504; c. dat., 504, 537; c. els, 535.
–εντ–: part. ending, 373.
ἐνταῦθα: use, 299.
ἐνταφιάζω: 147.
ἐνταφιασμός: 152.

ἐντέλλομαι: c. dat., 1084; c. inf., 1068.
ἐντεῦθεν: 300.
–εντο: in LXX, 340.
ἐντός: use, 296, 300, 641.
ἐντρέπω: c. acc., 65 n., 455, 473, 484.
ἐντροπή: 82.
ἐντυγχάνω: 80.
ἐνώπιον: in papyri, 90; in Luke, 122; constr., 80, 160, 170 bis, 540, 641.
ἐξ: form, 215; in mod. Gk., 557; in comp., 170; c. verbs, 558; cases with, 568; in prepositional phrases, 792; proclitic, 1211.
ἐξαγοράζω: voice of, 810
ἐξακολουθέω: 148.
ἐξανάστασις: 166,
ἑαυτῆς: 170 *bis*.
ἔξειμι: forms, 314, 339.
ἐξέραμα: 153.
ἐξέρχομαι: 473 n.
ἔξεστι: constr., 491, 1084 f.
ἐξηγέομαι: meaning, 829.
ἐξήεσαν: 87, 339.
ἐξῆς: adv., 296; constr., 547.
ἐξιστάνω: voice of, 806.
ἐξολεθρεύω: 148.
ἐξομολογέω: forms, 188; c. ὅτι, 965.
ἐξον: use, 1130.
ἐξορκιζω: constr., 475.
ἐξορκιστής: 153.
ἐξουδενέω: 149.
ἐξουδενόω: 149.
ἐξουθενέω: spelling, 219; forms, 342; constr. 853.
ἐξουσία: 115, 134 n., 148 n.
ἐξυπνίζω: 149.
ἔξω: adj. stem, 160; form, 296, 301; use, 300, 642.
ἔξωθεν: use, 296, 300, 548, 642.
ἐξώτερος: formation, 160, 278, 298; meaning, 662.
ἔοικα: intransitive, 801.
ἑορτή: c. ἐν, 523.
–εος: in contraction, 274.
ἐπαγγελία: 125, 479.
ἐπαγγέλλω: constr., 479, 1036.
ἐπαισχύνομαι: and case, 472, 485; trans., 473.
ἐπαιτέω: 65 n.
ἐπακούω: constr., 507.
ἐπάν: use, 971.
ἐπαναπαύομαι: voice of 819.
ἐπάνω: use, 642, 666.
ἐπάνωθεν: use, 637.
ἐπεί: use, 132, 954, 963, 965, 971, 1025 f.; not relative, 954.
ἐπειδή: use, 965, 971.
ἐπειδήπερ: use, 965, 1154.
ἐπεικῶς: 204.
ἐπείπερ: use, 1154.
ἔπειτα: use, 300, 549.
ἐπέκεινα: accent, 232, 244; use, 642.
ἐπεκτείνω: voice of, 807.
ἐπέρχομαι: transitive, 455.
ἐπέχω: meaning, 477, 828; ὅτι, with, 1032.
ἐπηρεάζω: and case, 473.
ἐπί: in comp., 161 f.; elision, 223; ἐφ᾽ , 223-4; ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι, 224; cases with, 451, 491, 524, 565, 568 ff.; case-form, 524, 570; in "pregnant construction," 525; c. verbs, 540, 542, 559 ff., 562, 566; in adv. phrases, 550; frequency, 556; meaning, 561; and εἰς, 596; discussed, 600-5; and κατά, 607; and πρός, 625; c. ὅσον, 733, 963; ἐφ᾽ ᾧτε not in N. T., 963, 1000, 1055, 1088, 1088 n.; ἐφ᾽ ᾧ 963; in prepositional phrases, 792, 963, 978; ἐπὶ τῷ + inf. in papyri, 909; c. inf., 1069, 1071.
ἔπιασε: in mod. Gk., 230.
ἐπιβαλών: **80.**
ἐπιγινώσκω: meaning of, 827; use, 125, 909; in or. obl., 1035, 1042.
ἐπιγράφω: use, 1135.
ἐπιδείκνυμι: voice of, 810.
ἐπιδεικνύω: in or. obl., 1036.
ἐπίθεμα: spelling, 188.
ἐπιθυμέω: and cases, 472, 473 n., 474, 508.
ἐπικαλέω: voice of, 509.
ἐπικατάρατος: 80.
ἐπιλανθάνομαι: constr., 472, 473 n., 509; c. inf., 1060.
ἐπιλησμονή: 151.
ἐπίλυσις: abl. use, 514.
ἐπιμαρτύρομαι: in or. obl., 1035, 1036.
ἐπιμελέομαι: constr., 509; voice of, 820.

ἐπιμένω: use, 850; c. part., 1121.
ἐπιούσιος: meaning, 80; origin, 159.
ἐπιπόθεια: 152.
ἐπιπόθησις: 152, 168.
ἐπισείω: 65 n.
ἐπίσκοπος: 80, 115.
ἐπίσταμαι: forms, 224, 314, 328, 340; in or. obl., 1035, 1041.
ἐπιστάτα: 122.
ἐπιστάτης: 151.
ἐπιστέλλω: meaning, 66; epistolary aor. of, 845; c. inf., 1068.
ἐπιστρέφω: meaning, 115; constr., 856; use; 948.
ἐπισυνάγω: 160, 486.
ἐπισυναγωγή: 80, 166.
ἐπιτάσσω: constr., 542, 1084.
ἐπιτίθημι: σοί, 477; ἐπί, 560.
ἐπιτιμάω: accent, 232; constr., 542.
ἐπιτρέπω: constr., 1084.
ἐπιτυγχάνω: constr., 473 n., 509.
ἐπιφαίνω: form, 341, 349, 371 (**-φᾶναι**).
ἐπιφάνεια: 81.
ἐπιφανής: 81.
ἐπιχορηγέω: 81, 164, 166.
ἑπτά: use, 282; cardinal, 673.
ἑπτάκις: use, 281, 298, 300.
ἔπω: constr., 473; εἴρηκα, 364, 899, 902; εἰρήκει, 905; compounds and forms, 342, 349, 1215.
ἐραυνάω: compounds and forms, 184, 329.
ἐργάζομαι: augment, 367; constr., 474, 484; meaning, 564; compounds and forms, 1215; εἰργασμένος, 364.
ἐργασίαν δοῦναι: 109.
ἔργον: ἔργα 115; breathing, 223.
ἔρημος: form, 231, 272 f.
ἐριθεία: 152, 231.
ἔρις: form, 265 bis, 267.
ἑρμηνεύω: use of part., 1135.
ἔρχομαι: constr., 313, 478 f., 538; compounds and forms of, 327 f., 800 f., 1215; ἦλθα, 82, 97; ἤλθοσαν, 68, 97; ἐλθάτω, 328; ἐλθέ, 327; ἐλήλυθα, 363, 801, 905; constative aor. of, 833; use, 869, 904, 905, 948; periphrastic use, 118; futuristic sense, 869; ἐλθοῦσα, 1105; use of part., 1118.
ἐρωτάω: meaning, 66, 80, 90; compounds and forms, 184, 341, 1215; ἠρώτουν, 63, 184, 341; constr., 482; in papyri, 90; in indirect command, 1046.
–ες: ending in mod. Gk., 138; acc. pl., 62, 63, 82, 139, 184, 266; perf. and aor., 82, 337.
ἐσθίω: compounds and forms, 204, 340, 1215; φάγομαι, 324, 354, 813; φάγεσαι, 340; meaning, 564; stems of, 823.
ἔσθω: compounds and forms of, 204, 353 f., 1215.
ἐσοῦ: for σοῦ, 68, 138.
ἑσπερινός: 158.
ἔσχατος: form, 279 f., 669; and art., 769, 775.
ἐσχάτως: use, 299, 546, 799.
ἔσω: use, 187, 231 n., 300, 642.
ἔσωθεν: use, 300, 505, 548, 643.
ἐσώτερος: 160, 278.
ἐτάζω: 143.
ἑταῖρος: use, 186, 725.
ἐτεός: 143.
ἑτερο--: in comp., 164, 168.
ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω: 115, 164.
ἑτεροζυγέω: form, 330.
ἕτερος: form, 277; use, 292; and ἄλλος, 746 f.; discussed, 748-50; and art., 775 f.
–ετης: suffix, 231.
ἕτοιμος: accent, 231; form, 272; c. inf., 1068, 1077.
ἑτοῦτος: in mod. Gk., 290.
ἔτος: form, 268; καθ' ἔτος, 223-4; c. ἐν, 523.
ἐτυμολογία: 143.
ἔτυμος: 143.
ευ: vowel-changes, 198, 201 f.
εὐ- verbs begin. with, 367 bis.
εὖ: in comp., 164, 367; adv., 299; c. πράσσω, 1121.
εὐαγγελίζω: meaning, 115, 125, 134; augment, 367; reduplication, 365; constr., 474, 483; trans. and intrans., 799; in or. obl., 1035 f.; compounds and forms of, 1215.
εὐαγγέλιον: 115, 133, 134.
εὐαγγελιστής: 115, 153.

εὐάρεστος: 80, 168.
εὖγε: use, 299.
εὐγενής: form, 272.
εὐδαιμονία: 156.
Εὐδία: case of, 460.
εὐδοκέω: meaning, 81; trans., 473 n., 474; compounds and forms of, 164, 837, 842, 1215.
εὐθέως: use, 549.
εὐθυ--: in comp., 164, 296.
εὐθύ(ς): form, 294, 296; use, 549; c. part., 1124, 1139.
εὐκαιρέω: 81.
εὐλογέω: and case, 473.
εὐλογία: 53 n.
εὐνοέω: forms, 330.
εὐοδόω: form, 325 n., 343.
εὐπερίστατος: 133.
εὐπροσωπέω: 80, 148, 164.
εὐρακύλων: 108, 166.
εὑρίσκω: 150; compounds and forms, 327, 338, 360, 1215; εὑρέ, 327; aspiration, 225; voice of, 809; use, 873, 883, 893, 1103, 1122, 1135; in *or. obl.*, 1035, 1041.
--εύς: ending, 272.
εὐσεβής: form, 272.
εὐσχήμων: 80.
εὐφαίνω: 150.
εὐχαριστέω: meaning, 66, 80; voice of, 474; c. ὅτι, 965.
εὐχαριτία: 81.
εὔχομαι: use, 886, 919.
--εύω: verbs in, 147 ff., 152.
ἐφφαθά: 105, 215.
Ἔφεσος: form, 295.
ἐφίστημι: form, 328.
ἐ(αἰ)φνίδιος: form, 272.
ἐχθές: 206.
ἔχω: compounds and forms, 200 f., 206, 319, 338, 346, 367, 870, 897, 900 f., 1215; εἶχοσαν, 63, 73, 82, 336, 887, 921; ἔσχα, 73; εἶχαν, 68, 73, 339; σχές, 329; ἔσχον, 823; ἔσχηκα, 364, 900; intrans., 799; intrans. in its compounds, 800, 802, 815, 828; aspiration, 223; periphrastic forms, 330, 360; in Rev., 414, 441; in anacolutha, 439; ἔχει impersonal, 457; constr., 477, 480, 487, 508, 789, 838, 843, 850; c. pred. ace., 480-1; c. adv., 299, 546, 799; voice of, 799 f., 809, 815; c. κακῶς, 802, 815; stems of, 823; meaning, 828; use, 879, 902, 906, 930, 946, 1122; ἔχων, 135, 881, 1106, 1122, 1126 f., 1134 f., 1202; "Latinism," 108, 1034.
--έω: verbs in, 147 ff., 184, 203, 341 ff., 351; confused with –άω, 73, 82, 184, 341 f.
ἕως: use, 80, 297, 550, 643, 674, 953, 975 f.; in phrases, 550, 792; c. κάτω, 297, 550, 643; c. ὅτου, 291, 729, 975-6; c. πότε, 643; c. ἄν, 976; preposition, 643, 674, 792, 975; adv., 643, 1075; conjunction, 953, 975 f.; c. inf. (ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν), 975, 979, 1060, 1070, 1074, 1092.
ἑωυτοῦ: Ionic, 203.

F

F: 365.
*F*ίδιος: 289.

Z

ζ: 218, 240.
ζάω: formation, 147; constr., 479; compounds and forms, 194, 341 f., 1215; future, 356, 813, 889; voice of, 807; meaning, 833 f.; ζῇν, 341; ζῶν 1105.
ζεστός: use, 1097.
ζεύγνυμι: compounds and forms, 314.
ζευτηρία: 157.
ζηλεύω: 148.
ζῆλος: 261, 262 n.
ζηλόω: forms, 148, 203, 342; ζηλοῦτε, 203, 325, 342.
ζημιόω: acc. c. pass., 485.
Zηνᾶς: 172 bis.
ζητέω: c. inf., 1038, 1078; c. ἵνα, 1078.
ζιζάνιον: 95, 111.
ζυγός: 262, 263 n.
-ζω: verbs in, 348, 352; -σα-forms, 348 f.
ζωή: meaning, 115, 134-5; spelling, 200 f. -
ζωο-: in comp., 164.

ζώννυμι: 311; compounds and forms, 314, 1215.
ζωννύω: compounds and forms, 314, 1215.
ζωοποιέω: 82, 164.
ζωοποιηθείς: use, 1114.

H

H: breathing, 222
η: origin, 178; long vowel, 178, 182, 191, 240; vowel-changes with, 184, 187, 191-6, 324, 341, 361; η=ι, 191, 192 n., 238-9; η and ει, 192, 240, 324; η and υ, 195; nom. end., 267; after ε, ι, ρ, 274; augment, 286, 368; in fut. pass., 356; in 2d aor., 340.
ἤ: use, 406, 412, 427, 432, 661, 663, 666, 789, 1158; "or," 406, 427, 666, 789, 1158; "than," 616, 661, 663 (μᾶλλον ἤ), 666, 789 (μᾶλλον ἤ); after comparative, 666; and παρά, 616; in interrogation, 917; ἢ τίς, 917; in mod. Gk., 1146; in comp., 1150; in double questions, 1177; discussed, 1188 f.
ἦ: use, 1150.
-ῃ: ending, 194, 232, 249, 256, 274.
ῃ: vowel-changes, 194 f., 198, 324; η=ι, 239; ῃ=οι, 326; in aor. subj. and fut. ind., 193; iota subscript, 194.
ἡγέομαι: meaning, 80; constr., 480, 481; in *or. obl.*, 1036, 1041.
ἥδη: position, 423; constr., 546; use, 1146.
ἥδιστα: form, 294; meaning, 670; adv. 488.
ἡδύ-οσμος: 166.
ηι: vowel-changes, 193 f.
--ηκα: in mod. Gk., 898.
ἥκω: compounds and forms, 337, 358, 907, 1215; perf. sense but pres. form, 337, 358, 865, 869, 893; 82.
ἠλεί: 95, 105.
ἡλικά: 80.
ἡλίκος: use, 291 f., 710, 741; discussed, 733 f.
ἥλιος: gender of, 252.
ἧμαι: compounds and forms, 314, 329, 340, 350.
ἡμέρα: Hebraic use, 95; gem use, 295, 497; loc. use, 522; gen.-abl. of, 256; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.
ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός: 495.
ἡμέτερος: form, 277; use, 286, 288, 684.
ἦ μήν: form, 192, 1024; use, 1150.
ἡμι-: prefix, 161, 163.
ἥμισυς: form, 199, 274 f.; c. art., 775.
ἡμίωρον: 204.
--ην: noun end., 256; acc. sing. of adj. in –ής, 62, 72, 97; verb end., 347, 349; in 2d aor. pass., 340, 347, 349.
-ῆν: inf. end., 343.
-ηνα: adverbs, 349.
-ήνη: suffix, 151.
ἡνίκα: 301; use, 300, 971.
ἤπερ: disputed reading, 633; use, 1154.
ἤρεμος: 159.
῾Ηρῴδης: gen.-abl. of, 255; and art., 760.
῾Ηρωδιανοί: 110, 155.
--ης: adj. in, 272; suffix, 296.
--ῆς: proper names, 172, 214, 255; gen.-abl. end., 255, 256, 295.
ἥση: accent, 230.
ἡσσόομαι: constr., 479; forms, 1216.
ἧσσον: form, 218, 277.
ἡσυχία: 80.
ἥσυχος: form, 272.
ἤτοι: use, 1154.
ἡττάομαι: form, 341, 1216; meaning, 865.
ἧττημα: 153, 218.
ηϋ: vowel-changes, 205.

Θ

θ: consonant, 222.
-θ-: verb-stem, 353.
θά: in mod. Gk., 353, 870, 889, 907, 926.
-θα: ending, 337.
-θαι: inf. end., 370.
θάλασσα: constr., 794.
θαλάσσοις: 159.
θάλπω: 65 n.
θάνατος: meaning, 115; use, 784, 794.
θανατωθείς: use, 1114.
θάπτω: compounds and forms, 1216.

θαρρέω: in anacolutha, 440, 1135; constr., 474.
Θάρσος: spelling, 217.
θαυμάζω: various readings, 188; constr., 474, 532, 965; use, 879; **θ. θαῦμα**, 478; **θ. εἰ**, 965; aorists, 818; coin-pounds and forms, 1216.
θεάομαι: aorists, 818; meaning, 829, 893 f.
θεατρίζω: 149.
θεῖος: 116.
θειότης: 65.
θέλημα: 151.
θέλησις: 151.
θέλω: form, 205 f.; augment, 368; in mod. Gk., 353; constr., 353, 391, 430, 431, 551, 857, 878; for fut., 67; use, 919, 923 f., 933; as auxiliary verb, 1056; **θέλω ἵνα**, 431, 933, 1046, 1055-6; **οὐ θέλω**, 1093; in or. obl., 1036; in indirect command, 1046; c. inf., 551, 1038, 1055 f., 1060, 1078, 1093; c. aor. inf., 878; inf. of, 1058 f.; in John, 1078.
θέμα: spelling, 153, 200.
θεμέλιον: 80, 262, 263 n.
θεμελιόω: formation, 149; form, 1212.
--θεν: suffix, 250 n., 296, 300.
--θεντ-: in nor. pass. part., 373.
θεο—: in comp., 168.
θεόπνευστος: 65, 168.
θεός: gender of, 252, 253; double decl., 257; vocative of, 261, 261 n., 463, 465; **θεέ**, 463; reading, 477; use of gen., 499 f., 516; ab1. of, 514; meaning, 116 *bis*, 768; and art., 758, 761, 780, 786, 795; omitted, 1202.
θεόφιν: form, 269.
θέτω: in mod. Gk., 149.
θεωρέω: durative meaning, 80, 838; in John, 134 n.; impf. of, 843; in *or. obl.*, 1032, 1035, 1041.
aor. suffix, 332, 357.
-θη-: in mod. Gk., 898.
--θην: aor, pass. end., 334, 340, 347.
θηριο--: in comp., 164.
-θης: aor. end., 332, 340, 356 f.; fut., 357.
θησαυρίζω: constr., 853.
--θήσομαι: verb end., 340, 357, 818.
--θθ-: 215.
--θι: imper. suffix, 328.
θιγγάω: constr., 508.
θλίβω: class, 351; use of part., 1135.
θλῖψις: accent, 230.
θνήσκω: compounds and forms of, 319, 1216; meaning, 345, 827, 845, 893; use of inf., 1030.
θνητός: use, 1097.
θορυβέω: aor. of, 851.
θρησκεία: 124, 231.
θρησκός: 124, 231.
θριαμβεύω: meaning, 81, 108; formation, 148; constr., 474; voice of, 800.
θυγάτριον: 118.
θυμιάω: 150.
θυμός: 151.
θυσιαστήριον: 138.
-θῶ: subj. end., 310.
-θω: verbs in, 149, 353.

I

ι: vowel-changes with, 187 f., 191 f., 195-9, 204 f., 207, 230, 237; **ι**, 205; loc. end., 249, 452, 520, 1067; class of verbs, 351, 363; in reduplication, 363; in augment, 366 f.; dat. end., 520; prothetic, 1209.
ι-: verbs begin. with, 367.
-ί: adv. suffix, 296, 452.
-ία: suffix, 156, 196 f., 273; for **-εια**, 197.
-ιανός: suffix, 155.
ἰάομαι: fut., 819; voice of, 819; compounds and forms, 232, 1216; aorists, 818.
--ίας: gen. end., 259.
--ιάω: verbs in, 150, 351.
ἴδε: accent, 231; adv., 302; interj., 328, 391; **ἰδέ**, 327, 328.
ἴδιος: compared with, **αὐτός**, 62, 80, 83, 134, 287, 289; **ἰδίαν** with **κατά**, 223-4, 609; discussed, 691 f.; and art., 770.
ἰδού: adv. and interj., 302; **καὶ ἰδού**, 120, 122, 396; in elliptical sentences, 391, 396; case with, 413, 441, 460; c. nom., 460; use, 1193.
ἴδω: forms, 1216.

᾽Ιερᾷ Πόλει: declension, 257.
ἱερατεία: 152.
ἱεράτευμα: 153.
ἱερατεύω: 80, 148.
ἱερεύς: 115.
ἱερός: spelling, 223, 225.
᾽Ιεροσόλυμα: spelling of, 225; gender of, 253, 257; and art., 760; use, 120, 253, 253 n., 257, 263.
ἱερουργέω: form, 204; constr., 474.
᾽Ιερουσαλήμ: use, 120, 253.
ἱερωσύνη: spelling, 156, 201.
–ιέω: fut. end., 355.
–ίζω: verbs in, 147, 149 ff., 351 f., 355; fut. of, 355.
ιη: in opt., 326.
῎ημι: compounds and forms, 306, 309, 314, 1216.
᾽Ιησοῦς: form, 263; and art., 760.
ἱκανός: τὸ ἱκανὸν λαμβάνειν, 108; τὸ ἱ. ποιεῖν, 108; in Luke, 122; c. 658, 1077.
ἱκανόω: constr., 480.
ἱκνέομαι: compounds and forms, 1216.
᾽Ικόνιον: spelling, 197.
–ικός: words in, 158 f.; three terminations, 273; constr. of words in, 504.
ἱλάσκομαι: constr., 474.
ἱλαστήριον: 80, 154, 157.
῎ιλεως: spelling, 62; meaning, 80; reading, 260; form, 272.
ἱματίζω: 80, 149.
ἱμάτιον: meaning, 408; and ellipsis, 1202.
ἱματισμός: 152.
--ιν: in mod. Gk., 261.
῞ινα: in John, 24, 64, 69, 74, 82, 134, 138, 1055, 1077; rather than inf., 111, 371, 996, 1054 f., 1071, 1077; use, 120, 244, 393 f., 400, 430 f., 584, 907 f., 928 f., 933, 935, 940, 943, 950, 960 f., 980, 1054 f., 1087 f.; ῞ινα πληρωθῇ, 120; c. pres. indic., 325; ῞ινα μή c. indic., 127, 194, 984, 1169; c. fut. indic., 127, 194; =an auxiliary, 933; constr., 201, 203, 292, 325, 330, 850; origin, 249, 301; c. oin-os, 699; c. μή, 134, 983-4, 987, 995, 1169; ῞ινα clause as subject, 393, 430, 992; in apposition clauses, 1078; in final clauses, 981-5, 991-4; non-final, 1072; ῞ινα τί, 244, 739, 916; and ὅπως, 987, 1056; in consecutive clauses, 997-9, 1002; and ὅτι, 1032, 1049, 1055, 1056; in indirect command, 1046 f.; and ἀλλά, 1187; and ellipsis, 1202; statistics in N. T., 985.
--ινος: suffix, 158, 197.
–ιον: ending, 154-6, 197, 273; dimin. end., 66.
᾽Ιόππη: spelling, 214.
–ιος: ending, 159, 197, 273, 276.
ἰουδαΐζω: 150.
᾽Ιουδαϊκῶς: 160, 205.
᾽Ιουδαῖος: 95.
–ιοῦσι: fut. end., 355.
–ις: ending, 261, 296.
–῎ισασι: 87, 319.
–ισέω: fut. end., 355.
῎ισθι: 328, 330.
--ίσκω: verb suffix, 869.
῎ισμεν: 87, 238-9, 319.
ἰσο--: in comp., 168.
῎ισος: accent, 231.
᾽Ισραήλ: and art., 760.
–ισσα: suffix, 155.
ἱστάνω: 316.
ἱστάω: compounds and forms, 316.
῎ιστε: 87, 238-9, 319, 329, 360, 941.
῎ιστημι: compounds and forms, 225, 231, 305, 306, 310, 315 f., 319 f., 346, 359, 366, 1212, 1216; ἵστω, 307; ῎ιστη, 327; ἔστην, 346-8, 800, 817; ἐστάθην, 817; ἕστακα, 320, 359; ἕστηκα, 320, 358-9, 364, 895; (ε)ἱστήκειν, 366; ἑστώς, ἑστηκώς 320, 734 f.; voice of, 800, 817.
ἱστορέω: 80.
--ιστος: ending, 276 ff.
ἰσχύς: 148 n., 231.
ἰσχύω: 351; constr., 478.
–ίσω: fut. end., 355.
᾽Ιτουραία: c. art., 788.
ἰχθύδιον: 155.
–ιῶ: fut. in, 355.
᾽Ιωάνης: forms, 194, 214, 255, 258.
–ίων: ending, 276 f.
᾽Ιωσῆς: form, 263, 268.
᾽Ιωσήφ: and art., 761.

K

κ: 216, 223, 346 f., 358 f., 1210; in perf., 358.
-κα: suffix, 296, 308 ff., 319, 346, 358 f., 801; -κα aor., 308, 310, 346, 347, 359.
καθ᾽: in phrases, 62, 195, 209, 223 f., 282, 963, 967, 1210.
καθαίρω: compounds and forms, 1216.
καθάπερ: use, 967, 1154.
καθαρίζω: meaning, 80; formation, 150; augment of, 1209; compounds and forms, 183, 183 n., 1216.
καθαρός: 80.
καθέξομαι: forms and other compounds, 1216.
καθείς: in mod. Gk., 292,
καθεῖς: 68.
καθεξῆς; 171.
καθηγητής: 138.
καθήκω: use, 886.
κάθημαι: compounds and forms, 232, 314, 329, 340, 350, 1216; κάθη, 314.
καθημερινός: 158.
καθίζω: use, 866; compounds and forms, 1216.
καθίστημι: constr., 480, 481, 486.
καθό: use, 967; c. ἐάν, 967.
καθότι: use, 722, 963, 967; c. ἄν, 967.
κάθου: 157, 314, 329, 340.
καθώς: use, 433, 963, 968; in or. obl., 1045.
καθώσπερ: use, 968, 1154.
καί: crasis, 208, 984; use, 94, 133, 134, 135, 393, 426-9, 432, 443 f., 680, 947 f., 951, 1041, 1136, 1188; δὲ καί 122; καί ἰδου, 120, 122; καὶ αὐτός, -ή 122; καί= ὅτι, 393, 426; καί= 'and yet,' 426; καί ταῦτα, 1129, 1140; c. αὐτοῦ, 441; c. τοῦτο, 460, 487, 1140; c. καί, 427, 566; c. numerals, 672; c. art., 694 f., 724; and οὗτος, 705; with several attributives, 785-9; and can, 968; correlative, 969; in concessive clauses, 1026; in *or. obl.*, 1047; c. γε, 1129, 1140; in mod. Gk., 1146; c. negatives, 1164, 1173; discussed, 1179-83.
καινός: meaning, 80, 176.
καίπερ: use, 431, 1129; c. part., 1124, 1129, 1140.
καιρός: form and meaning, 522 f.
καίτοι: use, 1129, 1140, 1154.
καίτοιγε: use, 1129, 1154.
καίω: meaning, 828; compounds and forms, 185, 350, 352, 1216.
κακ–: in comp., 164.
κἀκεῖ: 208.
κἀκεῖνος: crasis, 208.
κακλογέω: and case, 473.
κακοπάθεια: 80, 156.
κακόω: ὁ κακώσων, 127; e. inf., 1068.
κακῶς ἔχειν: 546, 799.
καλέω: meaning, 115; constr., 478, 480; as copula, 394, 457; c. pred. acc., 480, 485; use, 485, 885; imperf. tense, 885; καλέσω, 349, 355; compounds and forms, 349, 355, 907 f., 1216.
κάλλιον: form, 277 f.; meaning, 665.
καλο: in compounds, 164, 166.
καλός: meaning, 661; c. infinitive, 1084; καλόν c. εἰμι, 276, 886, 1084.
κάλύπτω: class, 353.
καλῶς: form, 248, 295; use, 299; καλῶς ἔχειν, 299, 457, 546, 799.
κάμηλος: 95, 192.
καμμύω: 204.
κάμνω: c. part., 1121; forms of, 1216.
κἄν: 208, 984, 1025.
κανείς: in mod. Gk., 292.
καραδοκέω: 164.
καρδία: inst., 487; loc., 523.
καρτερέω: forms of, 833; c. part., 1121.
κατ: 204.
κατ᾽: 207.
κατά: form, 80, 204, 223; in comp., 163-5, 166, 169, 476, 511, 558, 561, 827 f.; cases with, 491, 531, 569 f.; in adv. phrases, 550; κατ᾽ ὄναρ, 83; τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν, 487; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 557, 570; with verbs, 560; case-form, 570; contrasted with ἀνά, 571; contrasted with ἀντί., 523; discussed, 605-9; and παρά, 616; and ὑπέρ, 630; with εἰς, 673; with ὅσον, 733, 963, 967; with ὅς, 967; in prepositional phrases, 792; with inf., 1069.

καταβαίνω: forms, 328, 330; constr., 856; use, 895
καταβαρέω: trans., 455, 476.
καταβραβεύω: c. ace., 477.
καταγγελεύς: 80, 166.
καταγελάω: meaning, 330, 833.
κατάγνυμι: κατεάξει, κατεαγῶσιν, 365, 1212.
καταγωνίζω: 477.
καταδουλόω: voice of, 802.
καταί: case-form, 296, 605
κατακαίω: meaning, 828.
κατάκλίνω: constr., 482.
κατάκριμα: 80, 156, 166.
κατακρίνω: constr., 784; meaning, 828; in or. obi., 1035 f.
κατάκρισις: 156.
καταλαλέω: trans., 455.
καταλαμβάνω: voice of, 812; in or. obl., 1036.
καταλέγω: form, 341.
καταλλαγή: 115.
καταλλάσσω: 115.
κατάλυμα: 151, 166.
καταλύω: meaning, 828; constr., 857.
κατανεύω: c. inf., 1068.
καταντάω: use, 80, 863.
κατάνυξις: 151.
καταπαύω: trans. and intrans., 800.
καταπέτασμα: 80, 167.
καταπονέω: 455.
καταράομαι: and case, 473.
κατάρατος: use, 1096.
καταργέω: aor. of, 851.
κατσκηνόω: form, 343.
κατασοφίζω: c. acc., 477.
καταστέλλω: 65 n.
καταφεύγω: meaning of, 827 f
καταφρονέω: c. gen., 573.
καταχέω: form, 342.
καταχράομαι: 476-7.
κατέναντι: formation, 160, 171, 297; use, 639, 643 f.
κατενώπιον: formation, 160, 171, 297; use, 644.
κατεργάζομαι: meaning, 564.
κατεσθίω: meaning, 564.
κατέχω: 139.
κατηγορέω: constr., 136, 473 n., 475 n., 511.
κατήωρ: 80, 166.
κατήχεσις: 65.
κατηχέω: 65, 485, 486.
κατισχύειν: trans., 455.
κατόπισθεν: use, 647.
κατοπτρίζω: voice of, 810.
κατόρθωμα: 153.
κάτω: adj. stem, 160; case, 296; use, 298, 300.
κατώτερος: 160, 278, 297, 298.
καῦδα: spelling, 211
καυματίζω: acc. c. pass., 485.
καυσόω: 149.
καυχάομαι: forms of, 341, 876; constr., 475.
καφαρναούμ: 180, 184, 219.
κε: use, 354.
κεῖ: in mod. Gk., 206.
κεῖμαι: compounds and forms of, 316, 350, 357, 375; voice of, 813; special use of ἐκείμην, 906.
κεῖνος: Ionic, 206.
κειρία: form, 197.
κείρω: voice of, 809.
κελεύω: constr., 514, 1084; in *or. obl.*, 1036 f.; c. acc. and inf., 111, 857, 1078, 1084; c. obj. inf., 1036 f.
κέλλω: spelling, 206.
κέν: in rel. clauses, 958.
κεν--: in verbs, 164.
κενός: in comp., 169; c. abl., 372.
κεντυρίων: 109.
κενῶς: 160.
κεράννυμι: compounds and forms, 317, 1216.
κεραννύω: compounds and forms, 1216.
κερδαίνω: forms of, 232, 349, 1216.
κερδάω: forms of, 1217.
-κες: 2d pers. sing. end., 309, 337.
κεφαλαιόω: 149.
κεφαλή: use, 781.
κεφαλίζω: 149.
κεφαλιόω: 149.
κῆνσος: 109.
κῆρυξ: accent, 230.
κηρύσσω: meaning, 115; use of part., 1106.
Κηφᾶς: 105.
-κι-: 742.
κινδυνεύω: use, 884.

κιννάμωμον: 111.
κίς (κί): Thessalian Gk., 291.
-κκ-: 214.
κλαίω: constr., 475, 853; meaning, 834; forms, 185, 352, 355, 1217.
κλαύδα: form, 211.
κλάω: compounds and forms, 185, 1217.
κλείς: accent, 231; forms, 265.
κλείω: compounds and forms, 340, 1217.
κληρονομέω: constr., 475.
κλητός: 115, 125.
κλίβανος: 63.
κλίμα: spelling, 230.
κλινάριον: 155.
κλίνη: 80, 119.
κλινίδιον: 155.
κλίνω: trans. and intrans., 800; compounds and forms, 1217.
κνήθω: 149, 353.
κοδράντης: 109.
κοιμάω: 65 n.; voice of, 817, 819; aor. of, 817, 848.
κοινός: readings, 202; use, 691.
κοινωνία: 115.
κοινωνός: constr., 504.
κόκκινος: 80, 158.
κολάζομαι:80.
κολαφίζω: 80, 149.
κολλάω: meaning, 80; voice of, 817, 819.
κολλυβιστής: 120, 154.
κολλούριον: readings, 202.
Κολαβόω: 149.
Κολοσσαί: form, 184 f.
κολωνία: 109.
κομίζω: use, 878; compounds and forms 813, 1217
κόπος: 65 n., 80.
κόπτω: constr., 475; voice of, 809; compounds and forms, 1217.
κοπιάω: meaning, 150; forms, 341
κοράσιον: 64, 80, 118, 155.
κορβάν: 95, 236, 270.
κορέννυμι: forms, 1217
κοσμικός: use, 777.
κόσμος: meaning, 115, 134; and art., 796.
κουστωδία: 109.
κράβατος: spelling, 65, 119, 213.
κράζω: intrans., 801; use, 895 1.; compounds and forms, 325, 348, 361, 907, 1217; κέκραγα, 896, 898.
κραταιόω: 149.
κρατέω: constr., 455, 473 n., 475, 475 n., 508, 511; kind of action, 865.
κράτιστος: 278.
κράτος: 148 n.
κρείσσων: form, 218, 277 f., 299, 669; superlative of, 670; κρεῖσσον with ἦν, 886.
κρείττων: 72, 218.
κρέμαμαι: compounds and forms, 316 f., 350, 1217.
κρεμαννύω, κρεμάζω and κρεμάω: compounds and forms, 317, 1217.
κρι: root, 175.
κρῖμα: 153.
κρῖμα: accent, 186; form, 230.
κρίνω: constr., 478, 511; meaning, 828; use, 905; compounds and forms, 233, 1217.
κρίσις: in John, 134; ὅτι with, 1033.
κρύβω: new pres., 147; imperf. of compound, 351.
κρυπτός: and art., 764.
κρύπτω: constr., 483; voice of, 807, 817; compounds and forms, 1217.
κρυσταλλίζω: 150.
κρυφᾶ: Doric, 249, 295.
κτάομαι: meaning, 80; constr., 472; voice of 810; forms of, 871.
κτίζω: use, 896.
κτίσις: and πᾶς, 772.
κτίσμα: 151.
κτίστης: 151, 231.
κυκλόθεν: use, 644.
κύκλῳ: case-form, 295 f.; constr., 521, 644.
κυλίω: compounds and forms, 1217.
κύμινον: 95, 105, 111.
κυνάριον: 118, 155.
κυρία: 81, 173.
κυριακός: 80, 116, 158.
κυριεύω: 473 n.
κύριος: voc. of, 466; gen. or abl., 503; and art., 761, 785 f., 795; meaning, 80, 81, 97, 116; ἐν κυρίῳ, 115.

κυριότης: 154.
κωλύω: use, 838, 863; constr., 1089, 1171.
κκωμόπολις: 167.

Λ

λ: 211, 216, 352, 356.
λα-: in comp., 164, 169.
λαγχάνω: c. inf., 1060.
λάθρα: 295.
λακέω or λάσκω: form, 1217.
λαλέω: use of fut., 873; c. **ὅτι**, 1034; in *or. obl.*, 1048; a Hellenism, 1077.
λαμά: 105.
λαμβάνω: compounds and forms of, 210, 231, 327 f., 939, 1217; **ἔλαβα**, 82; **ἔλαβαν**, 339; λάβε, 231, 327-8; **εἴληφα**, 359, 364, 899, 901; c. pred. acc., 480; c. 482; use of aor. part., 859, 1127, 1135; perf. use, 897, 899 ff.; meaning, 829.
λανθάνω: constr., 551, 1102, 1120; compounds and forms, 1217.
λαός: 63, 65 n., 407.
λατρεύω: 164.
λατρεύω: constr., 540.
λεγιών: 108, 188.
λέγω: compounds and forms, 329, 339, 1217; **λέγων**, 136; **ἔλεγας**, 82; constr., 97, 473, 479, 480, 484, 626, 1084; **λέγων** and **λέγοντες,** , indecl. in LXX, 415; and **εἶπον**, 835, 883; use, 866; c. pred. acc., 480, 484; c. acc. and inf., 1084; in or. obl., 1035 ff., 1039, 1048.
-λειπ-: root, 197, 351.
λείπω: compounds and forms, 348, 351, 358, 1217; constr., 541; **ἔλειψα**, 82.
λειτουργία: 81, 193.
λειτουργικός: 80, 158, 169.
λέτιον: 109.
Λευείς: 263.
ληνός: 253, 410.
ληστής: forms, 409.
λίβανος: 95, 96, 105.
Λιβερτῖνος: use, 109; constr., 788.
λιθο–: in comp., 164.
λίθος: gender of, 253; reading, 718.
λικμάω: 80.
λιμός: gender of, 63, 63 n., 253, 253 n., 410.
λιμπάνω: 65 n., 147.
-λιπ- : root, 197.
λίτρα: 109.
λίψ: 80.
--λλ—: 214.
λογεία: 80, 152, 197.
λογία: 65.
λογίζομαι: voice of, 816, 819; c. **εἰς**, 481; c. two acc., 489; **ὅτι** with, 1035; compounds and forms, 1217.
λογο-: in comp., 164, 167.
λόγος: meaning, 97, 134-5; formation, 151; forms, 327; **ὅτι** with, 1033.
λοιδορέω: and case, 473.
λοιπόν: **τὸ λοιπόν**, 294, 487, 488; **τοῦ λοιποῦ,** 295.
λούω: compounds and forms, 80, 340, 1217; constr., 486.
λυμαίνομαι: and case, 473.
λυπέω: use, 871; c. acc., 473 n.; c. part., 1122.
λύπη: gen., 515.
λυσιτελέω: c. dat., 472
λύτρον: 115, 175.
λυτρόω: 97, 115.
λυτρωτής: 154.
λυχνία: 65.
λύω: accent, 230; reading, 202; form, 328, 333, 347; constr., 856; in mod. Gk., 870; meaning, 828.

M

μ.: 210, 216, 362.
-μ-: inserted, 210.
-μα: suffix, 151, 153, 230.
μαθητεύω: formation, 148; constr., 475; trans., 65, 800.
Μαθθαῖος: spelling, 215.
--μαι: per. end., 340.
μάκαρ: adj., 272.
μάκελλον: 109.
μακράν: adv., 294; adjectival, 547.
μακρο-: in comp., 164, 169.
μακρόθεν: **ἀπὸ μακρόθεν**, 297, 300, 54S.
μάλιστα: use, 279, 298, 488, 663, 670.
μᾶλλον: constr., 276, 278 f., 298, 663;

positive, 278, 663; **μᾶλλον** c. comparative, 278, 488; adv., 298, 663.
μαμωνᾶς: 95, 105, 111, 214, 254.
Μανασσῆς: form, 268.
μανθάνω: in *or. obl.*, 1040; c. inf., 1038, 1040, 1103, 1122; c. part., 1040, 1122; compounds and forms, 1217.
μάννα: 95, 270.
μαρανά, θά: 105.
Μαριάμ: 96, 214, 259.
μαρτυρέω: **μαρτυροῦμαι**, 80; aor. of, 850; use, 134, 135, 894; constr., 479, 1085; in or. obl., 1036.
μαρτυρία: use, 135; **ὅτι** with, 1033.
μάρτυς: c. art., 136, 414; **ὅτι** with, 1033.
ματαιότης: 156.
μάχαιρα: 82, 256.
μέ: prep. in mod. Gk., 535, 570.
μεγαλιότης: 148 n., 156.
μεγαλωσύνη: spelling, 156, 201.
μέγας: forms, 294; use, 661; superlative of, 278-9, 670.
μεγιστάν: 155.
μεθοδεία: 152.
μεθόριον: 156.
μεθύσκω: formation, 150; constr., 854.
μείζων: forms, 272, 274, 277; **μειζότερος**, 80, 277; in comparison, 80, 663.
μείρομαι: spelling, 206.
μελαντώτερον: use, 277.
μελίσσιος: 159.
μέλλω: augment, 82, 368; forms of, 368 f., 1217; and tense, 824; constr., 857, 870, 877 ff.; in periphrastic forms, 889, 891; imperf., 884; use, 882, 884, 921, 1082, 1126; as adj., 157 n.; **μέλλων** = 'future,' 373; c. inf., 1056, 1078; c. pres. inf., 870, 882, 889, 891, 1081; c. fut. inf., 369, 877, 882, 1080, 1082; c. aor. inf., 857, 878, 882, 1056, 1078, 1081; c. part., 877-8, 1118, 1126; use of part., 373, 1118.
μέλω: **μέλει** c. **ὅτι**, 965; compounds and forms, 1217.
μέμβράνα: 109.
μέμνημαι: in *or. obl.*, 1040
μέμφομαι: constr., 473, 475
μέν: particle, 302; postpositive, 424; c. **δέ,** 127, 132, 135, 428, 432, 747, 749, 1145, 1186; without **δέ,** 440; and asyndeton, 440; and art., 694; c. **ὅς**, 695 f.; c. **οὗτος**, 705; c. **ἄλλος**, 747; c. **ἕτερος**, 749; antithetic, 750, 1145; discussed, 1150-3; c. **καί**, 1183; c. **οὖν**, 695, 1151, 1191.
--μεν: per. end., 370; Homeric inf. end., 249.
-μεναι: Homeric inf. end., 370.
--μενο--: part. suffix, 373.
μενοῦγε: use, 80, 425.
μέντοι: use, 424, 1154, 1188.
μένω: constr., 475; compounds and forms, 233, 475, 1218; fut., 356; aor. of, 850, 856.
μέριμνα: 62.
μεριμνάω: c. **μή** and imperative, 853.
μεριστής: 154.
μέρος: use, 487.
μεσιτεύω: 148.
μέσον: adverb, 488; use, 294, 644, 648.
μεσονύκτιον: 471.
Μεσοποταμία: c. art., 788.
μέσος: in comp., 167; use, 550; c. **διά**, 581; and art., 775; **μέσῳ** c. **ἐν**, 1210.
Μεσσίας: spelling, 105, 214 f.; use, 105, 416, 433.
μετά: in comp., 164, 561; elision, 223; in phrases, 226; origin, 249; cases with, 491, 524, 531, 533, 569 f.; and **σύν**, 526, 626 f.; frequency, 556; in mod. Gk., 557; c. verbs, 560, 562; case-form, 570; and **ἐν**, 588; and **κατά**, 607; discussed, 609 12; and **πρός**, 625; c. **ταῦτα**, 704; c. inf., 626, 858, 909, 979, 1039, 1060, 1069, 1074, 1092; c. perf. inf., 909; statistics c. inf., 858, 979, 1069, 1074, 1092.
μεταβαίνω: forms, 328.
μεταδίδωμι: constr., 510.
μεταλαμβάνω: constr., 510, 519.
μεταμέλομαι: voice of, 819.
μεταμορφόω: constr., 486.
μετανοέω: meaning, 115, 134; reading, 1010.
μεταξύ. verbs, 562; origin, 626; use, 645; c. art., 789.

μετατίζθημι: use, 879.
μετέχω: constr., 509.
μέτοχος: constr., 505.
μετριο--: in comp., 164.
μέχρι: and final 5, 221, 296; and **ἄχρι**, 639; use, 645, 954, 975; not relative, 954; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. **ἄν**, 975; c. inf., 979, 1074.
μή: form, 244; in mod. Gk., 1167; encroaches on **οὐ**, 74, 82, 1167; use, 330, 401, 423, 430, 436 f., 751, 850-4, 890, 916, 925, 931, 933 f., 937, 941 f., 962 f., 981; in interrogation, 436, 850, 917 f., 1157, 1168, 1175; meaning, 930; in prohibitions, 630, 851 f., 854-6, 947; in relative clauses, 962, 1169; c. ind., 963, 1168-9; c. pres. imp., 430, 851-4, 890, 1170; c. aor. imp., 330, 851 ff., 856, 925, 933, 1170; c. subj. in prohibitions, 330, 850 ff., 854, 925, 930-3, 934, 941, 943, 981, 1169-70; c. subj., 437; c. nouns, 1172; c. **ὅρα**, 430, 854, 932; c. **βλέπετε**, 430, 932; c. **γένοιτο**, 325, 401, 854, 939 f., 1003; c. **πᾶς**, 292, 437, 752 f.; c. **οὐ** (see ob), 874 f., 917, 929, 934, 962, 1004, 1156-66; **μὴ οὐ . . .**, 1169, 1171, 1173; c. **τίς**, 951; c. **ἵνα** (see **ἵνα**); c. **πως**, 985, 987 ff., 995 f.; c. **ὅπως**, 985 f.; c. **ποτε**, 987 ff., 995 f.; c. **εἰ**, 1011, 1024 f., 1169; **ὅτι μή**, 1169; in final clauses, 987 ff., 995 f.; in conditions, 1011 f., 1016 ff.; in indirect command, 1046; c. inf., 423, 1061, 1066, 1093 ff., 1170-1; c. part., 74, 127, 1136 ff., 1172; discussed, 1166-77; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
-μή: suffix, 151.
μηδέ: use, 428, 1173, 1185.
μηδείς: form, 219; use, 282, 292, 750 f., 1094, 1156 ff.
μηδέν: use, 1156
μηθείς: form, 72, 181, 219, 282; use, 282, 750 f., 1094, 1156 ff.
μήν: form, 929, 1151; c. **εἰ**, 1004, 1024; c. ob, 1161.
μήποτε: use, 135, 203, 244, 1173; c. fut., 203, 988, 1147; c. subj., 988.
μήπως: use, 135, 244, 1173; discussed, 988, 995.
μήτε: use, 427, 1179; discussed, 1189.
μήτηρ: constr., 501.
μήτι: use, 292, 917, 1172.
μήτις: form, 292; use, 743, 751, 933.
--μι-verbs: use, 147, 335 f.; discussed, 306-20; forms of, 345 ff., 350 ff., 358.
-μι: suffix, 306; in opt., 335.
μιαίνω: forms, 1218.
μίγμα: spelling, 230.
μίγνυμι: compounds and forms, 317, 1218.
μικρός: 80.
μίλιον: 109.
μιμνήσκω: constr., 448, 487, 509; c. gen., 482; c. 67-1., 1035; c. **πάντα**, 479, 487; compounds and forms, 893, 1218.
μίσγω: compounds and forms, 1218.
μισθαποδοσία: 65, 167.
μίσθιος: 159.
μισθόω: voice of, 809.
Μιτυληναῖος: use, 199.
Μιτυλήνη: readings, 199.
--μμ--: 214.
μνᾶ: 111.
μνημονεύω: c. gen. and acc., 509; c. **ὅτι**, 1035, 1041; c. part., 1041; in *or. obl.*, 1035, 1041.
μνηστεύω: forms, 364, 1218.
μογιλάλος: 80, 169, 210, 231.
μόδιος: 109.
μόλις: use, 296.
μονή: 80.
--μονή: suffix, 151.
μονο--: in comp., 164.
μονογενής: 97.
μόνος: use, 423, 549, 657, 659; **μόνον** adv., 657, 659; and art., 776; **μόνον** c. **οὐ**, 947, 1161 f.; **μόνον** c. **μή**, 947, 1162.
μονόφθαλμος: 62, 65, 120.
--μός: suffix, 151 f.
μοσχο--: in comp., 164.
μυκτηρίζω: 150.
μυλών: 154, 231.
μυριάς: 283.
μύριοι: use, 233, 283.

μυστήριον: 81, 133, 146.
μωρέ: 95.
Μωσῆς: spelling, 203, 205; forms, 268.

N

ν: medial, 214 f., 340, 352, 356, 362, 1210; final, 216, 219-21, 258 f., 264 f., 274, 296.
–ν: acc. sing. end. in 3d decl., 258, 264, 274; adv. suffix, 296; becomes **-μ,** 362.
–ν–: class. in pres., 352; in root of verb, 352.
νά: in mod. Gk., 138, 923, 933, 940, 982, 994.
-να--: in verbs, 351.
ναί: discussed, 1150.
--ναι: inf. end., 370 f.
ναός: 55, 63, 97.
νάρδος: 96.
ναῦς: 80, 145.
–νε–: in verbs, 352.
νεανίας: type, 256.
νεκροί: 80.
νεκρόω: 149.
νέος: meaning, 176; comparative of 664.
νεόφυτος: 80, 169.
νεωτερικός: 159.
νή: discussed, 80, 487,
νη--: prefix, 161, 163.
νήθω: 149, 353.
νηπιάζω: 147.
νηστεία: 53 n.
νηστεύω: constr., 478.
νῆστις: form, 266, 275.
νικάω: use, 135; **νικῶν** with art., 136, 243, 414; forms, 203; constr., 475; meaning, 865.
νίπτω: new pres., 147; voice of, 806.
νίτρον: 96.
–νν–: 213 ff.
-ννω: in verbs, 352.
νοέω: in or. obl., 1036.
νομίζω: constr., 480; in or. obl.,1036 f.
νόμος: in Paul, 129 n.; in comp., 167; use, 780; and art., 796.
νοσσός: 204.
νοσφίζω: voice of, 810.
νουθεσία: 65.
νουμηνία: 204.
νουνεχῶς: use, 297, 298; form, 170, 171.
νοῦς: 261.
--νς: acc. end., 265.
—ντ—: part. end., 373.
--νυ--: in verbs, 147, 306, 351.
νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν: 470, 495.
--νυμι: verbs in, 311.
νῦν: constr., 546 f.; form, 296; use, 424, 548, 1117, 1147; **ἀπό τοῦ νῦν,** 83; **τό τὰ νῦν**, 487; c. **δέ** 1013.
νυνί: use, 290, 1147; loc. form, 296, 523.
νύξ: dat. form, 249; gen. merging into adverb, 295; acc. **νύκταν**, 97; c. **ἐν**, 523.
νύσσω: compounds and forms, 1218.
–νω: verbs in, 147, 352.

Ξ

ξ: 209, 216, 230.
--ξα: aor. in, 349.
ξενίζομαι: constr., 475.
ξενοδοχεῖον: 138.
ξε,στης: 109.
ξηραίνω: compounds and forms, 836, 847, 1218.
ξύν: form, 626 f.
ξυράω: forms of, 184, 342, 1218; voice of, 809.

O

ο: vowel, 178, 181 f.; vowel-changes, 189 f., 196, 198-201, 367; o-verbs, 308, 324, 367; **ο**/**ε** suffix, 147, 305, 323, 327; prothetic, 1209.
ὁ, ἡ, τό: c. **δέ** 290; c. **νικῶν**, 136, 243, 414; crasis of **τοῦ**, 208; as d strative, 290; constr., 502; c. **ἐστίν**, 411; **τοῦ** and inf. as subject, 1059; **τοῦ** and inf., 97, 122, 512, 858, 990, 996, 1067, 1077, 1086-88 f.; as ablative, 1061; after nouns, 1061, 1063, 1066; and inf., 765, 858, 1053-4, 1059, 1065; **τῷ** and inf. (see c. inf.); c. inf., 122, 512, 584, 587, 659, 858, 990, 996, 1001 ff.,

1039 f., 1042, 1054-69, 1078, 1080; reading, 599; discussed, 693-5, 754-96; **ὁ ἦν**, 135; **τό τά** c. prep., 486, 487; c. **οὗτος**, 700; c. **ἐκεῖνος** and **ὅλος**, 708; in Homer, 711; as relative, 734 f.; c. **τίς**, 739; c. **ἄλλος**, 747; and aor. part., 859 f.; in relative clauses, 956; in *or. obl.*, 1045; c. **ὤν**, 1107; proclitic forms of, 1211.
ὄγδοος: uncontracted, 275.
ὅδε: use, 289 1., 693 f., 709; discussed, 290, 696 f.; and **οὗτος**, 696, 702 f.; and art., 770.
ὁδηγέω: reading, 1010.
ὁδός: meaning, 115; **ὁδῳ** true dative, 248; gender, 260; **ὁδὸς θεοῦ**, 105; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.
ὀδυνάω: forms, 341.
οε: contraction of, 325, 342.
ο/ε: thematic vowel, 145, 147, 323, 356.
οη: contraction of, 325, 342.
οῃ: contraction of, 308.
ὅθεν: constr., 132, 300, 548, 962, 963, 969.
οι: vowel-change, 195, 198, 204, 326; **οι=ι**, 238; **οι=υ**, 239; **οι-ῃ**, 326; **ο+ι=οι** 326; and augment, 367; old dat. end., 520.
οι-verbs, 357.
ὄγνυμι: compounds and forms, 317, 1212.
οἶδα: forms, 239, 319, 329, 337, 357-8, 360, 363, 406; **οἶδας**, 337; **οἶδες**, 82; **ἴστε**, 87, 319, 329, 360, 908, 941; **ᾔδει**= imperf., 904; pres. perf., 898; non-redupl. perf., 357, 363; intrans., 801; use, 135, 838, 1122, 1128; meaning, 881, 895, 904; in *or. obl.*, 1035 f., 1045; c. **ὅτι**, 1035, 1103, 1122; c. inf., 1045, 1062, 1103, 1122; **οἰδ. τί**, 1044, 1045.
οἴκαδε: form, 296.
οἰκία: 80.
οἰκοδεσπότης: 65, 164, 167.
οἰκοδομέω: compounds and forms of, 365, 1218; constative aor., 833; fut., 889; **οἰκ. οἰκίαν**, 479.
οἴκοδομή: 65, 167.
οἴκοι: adv., 249, 295.
οἰκονόμος: 161.
οἰκτείρω: 474.
οἰκτήριον: 65 n.
οἶμαι: use, 406, 1082; c. **οὐ**, 1162.
-οῖν,: inf. end., 194, 343, 371.
-oio: archaic gen. end., 494.
οἷος: use, 291, 429, 1139; and **τοιοῦτος**, 710; discussed, 731 f.; and **ὅτι**, 1034; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
-οις: dat. end., 249, 266; loc. end., 452.
οἱ τὴν παραλίαν: disputed reading, 469.
οἴχομαι: use, 1120.
ὀκ: for **οὐκ**, 199.
ὀκτώ: use, 282.
ὀλεθρεύω: compounds and forms, 189 f.
ὀλίγον: adv., 488.
ὀλίγος: in comp., 167, 168, 169; use, 660.
ὀλίγως: 160.
ὄλλυμι: use, 893; compounds and forms, 317, 1218.
ὀλλύω: compounds and forms, 1218.
ὀλοθρεύω: 148, 189, 189 n.
ὅλος: in comp., 167, 169; c. **κατά**, 607; c. **οὗτος**, 705; c. art., 708, 768, 771 ff.; c. **πολύς**, 774.
ὀμείρομαι: form, 164, 198, 206, 225.
-ομεν: per. end., 200.
ὄμνυμι: compounds and forms, 317, 371; constr., 475, 479, 484, 1032; c. **ἐν,** 120, 588; c. **εἰς**, 120; use of aor. part., 859.
ὀμνύω: constr., 479, 484.
ὁμοθυμαδόν: form, 295, 296.
ὅμοιος: constr., 530, 1206; accent, 135, 231; fem., 272.
ὁμοιόω: constr., 530; compounds and forms, 1218.
ὁμολογέω: meaning, 80; forms from, 295, 298; constr., 475, 478, 480, 541, 1103, 1122; **ὁμολ. ὁμολογίαν**, 478; c. **ἐν** 108, 524, 588; in *or. obl.*, 1035, 1041.
ὁμολογουμένως: 160, 298.
ὁμοῦ: in comp., 164; adv. of place, 295, 299.
ὅμως: accent, 233; adv., 295; use, 423, 1140, 1154, 1188; in mod. Gk., 1146.

–ον: per. end., 335, 348.
ὄναρ: κατ᾽ ὄναρ, 120.
ὀνάριον: 155.
ὀνειδίζω: constr., 473, 475, 480, 482.
ὀνειδισμός: 66, 152.
ὀνικός: 158.
ὀνίνημι: forms, 310, 348, 350.
ὄνομα: in "pregnant construction," 525; "cases" of, 447; ὀνόματος, 452; ὀνόματι, 487; c. εἰς, ἐν, ἐπί, 120; in circumlocution, 649; of God, 135; meaning 'person,' 80, 91; ὅτι in opposition with, 1033.
ὀνομάζω: constr., 480.
ὄνπερ: reading, 291, 710, 1154.
—οντο: per. end., 340.
ὄντως: form, 160, 295, 298, 302.
οο: use, 202.
ὅπερ: use in LXX, 710.
ὄπισθεν: use, 300, 645.8s:
ὀπίσω: c. verbs, 562; use, 301, 645.
ὁποῖος: use, 291, 1176 f.; and τοιοῦτος, 710; and ποῖος, 740; discussed, 732; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
ὁπόταν: use, 971.
ὁπότε: use, 300, 971; origin, 954.
ὅπου: adv., 295, 288 f., 548; use, 712, 722, 969; ὅπου ἄν c. ind., 972 f.; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
ὀπτάνω: new pres., 73, 147; voice of, 820.
ὀπτασία: 66.
ὅπως: in John, 134; use, 430, 731, 933, 953, 980, 982; discussed, 985-7; c. μή, 980, 987; c. ἄν in N. T. and LXX, 986; and ἵνα, 992 f., 994; ὅπως πληρωθῇ, 120; in final clauses, 994 f.; in *or. obl.*, 1045; in indirect command, 1046; c. inf., 1056; disappearance of, 980 n., 981, 1056.
ὅρα: use, 330, 430, 874, 932, 935, 949.
ὁρατός: 157.
ὁράω: in John, 134 n.; compounds and forms, 188, 324, 339, 344, 348, 364, 368, 876, 1211, 1218; fut., 813; no aorist, 344; ὄψει, 193, 339; ἑώρακες, 68, 359; ἑόρακα, 364; ἑώρακα, 97, 134 n., 359, 365, 368; ἑώρων, 368; voice, 819.f.; roots, 823; in *or. obl.*, 864, 1035, 1038, 1041; use, 871, 893, 901; use of ὅρα and ὁρᾶτε, 932 f., 949; use of parts., 1118; perf. of, 1211.
ὀργίζομαι: meaning, 834.
ὀρέγομαι: constr., 508.
ὀρθο–: in comp., 164.
ὀρθός: use, 549, 659.
ὀρθρίζω: 65, 150.
ὀρθρινός: 158.
ὀρθῶς: use, 549, 659.
ὁρίζω: constr., 863.
ὁρκίζω: constr., 475, 483.
ὄρνεον: 269.
ὄρνιξ: spelling, 219, 267.
ὄρος: contraction, 203, 268; and art., 760.
–ορος: ending, 199.
ὀρύσσω: compounds and forms, 349, 1218.
ὅς: demonstrative, 290; relative, 291; followed by pronoun, 97; c. ἄν and ἐάν, 72, 191; c. γε, 244, 291; c. τε, 290; ὅν not expressed, 425; reading, 438; ὧν with verbs, 511; ᾧ with ἐν, 587; =καὶ οὗτος, 111; ἐν οἷς, 696, 714, 722, 953; use, 693, 706, 928, 953 f., 956, 959; discussed, 695 f., 711-26; and οὗτος, 698, 703; and τοιοῦτος, 710; in n Homer, 711; ὅ with ἐστίν, 411, 713; and ὅστις, 726; value of, 728; and οἷος, 731; and μέν, antithetic, 750; and attraction, 820; c. ἐάν, 959; and ἄν, 961; c. κατά, 967; in consec. clauses, 1001; in *or. obl.*, 1044 f.
–ος: ending, 157, 260 f., 263, 268, 274.
ὁσάκις: use, 973.
–οσαν: per. end., 63 bis, 73, 335, 343; in mod. Gk., 138.
ὅς ἂν θέλῃ: use, 961.
ὁσδήπερ: reading, 710.
ὁσδήποτε: use, 291.
ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας: 97.
ὅσος: form, 291; and οὗτος, 698; and τοιοῦτος, 710; discussed, 732 f., 966 f.; καθ᾽ ὅσον, and ἐφ᾽ ὅσον, 963; in rel. clauses, 956 ff.; in or. obl., 1045; use, 1177.
ὅσπερ: use, 291.
ὀστέα: 62, 203.

ὀστέων: 203, 225, 260.
ὅστις: form, 290 f.; in LXX, 727, 729; use, 693, 928; for **ὅς**, 67; and **τοιοῦτος**, 710; discussed, 726-31; and **τίς**, 737; **ὅ** for **ὅτι**, 960; **ἕως ὅτου**, 291, 729; in rel. clauses, 956 f., 959-61; in *or. obl.*, 1044 f., 1176.
ὀστράκινος: form, 158.
--οτ--: in perf. part., 373.
ὅταν: use, 300, 325; in LXX, 325, 927 f.; and **οὗτος**, 700; c. ind., 82, 118, 972; in temp. clauses, 958, 970 ff.
ὅτε: adv., 296, 300 f.; origin, 953; use, 953, 970 ff.; c. subj., 972.
ὅ τε: in Attic, 290.
--ότερος: compar. end., 278.
ὅτι: in John, 134; origin, 953; wider use, 74, 82, 97, 111, 134; consecutive, 1001; recitative, 97, 120, 433, 442, 951, 1027; epexegetic use, 1034; repetition of, 1034; driven out by **πῶς**, 1032 f.; drives out **ὡς**, 1032; position of verbs with, 965, 1034 f.; and inf., 111, 120, 371, 437, 442, 489 f., 584, 1047, 1054 ff.; in place of inf., 111, 371, 489-90, 584, 1055 f.; ousts inf., 1054 f.; **ὅτι** and **ἵνα** blending, 1055-6; causal, 962, 964, 997, 1192; and hiatus, 206; c. **ἐστίν**, 233; and **ὅ τι**, 243, 291; **ὡς ὅτι**, 964, 1033; **τί ὅτι**, 916, 1034; **ὅτι** clauses, 120, 393, 400, 426, 430, 951, 952, 954, 1001; **ὅτι** clause as subject, 393, 430, 1034; in apposition, 400, 699, 1034, 1079; as object, 430, 951, 1034; with verbs of saying, 120; 'prolepsis' of subst. before, 1034; and **οὗτος**, 699; and **ἐκεῖνος**, 708; use, 724, 951-3, 962-5, 997, 1054 f., 1085 f., 1122, 1192; in interrogation, 730, 916; in *or. obl.*, 1027-49; c. negatives, 963, 965, 1034, 1173; c. **καί**, 1182; c. **πλήν**, 1187.
ὅ τι: see **ὅστις**.
ου: vowel-changes, 199, 202 ff.
-ου: in gen., 62, 255, 295; in acc., 265; adv. end., 295.
οὐ, οὐκ, οὐχ: use, 401, 418, 423 f., 928 f., 937, 962 f., 965, 995; **οὐχ**, 224; C. **τις**, 751; c. **εἷς**, 751; **μή**. 850, 854, 873 ff., 889, 929, 933, 942, 962, 9S0, 957, 1004; **οὐ μή** c. fut., 874-5, 889, 929, 942, 1157, 1168, 1174; **οὐ μή** c. subj., 854, 929, 934, 962, 1004, 1161, 1174; **οὐδ' οὐ μή**, 854, 1165, 1175; **οὐ** c. fut., 889, 1157, 1162; **μή οὐ**, 987, 1161, 1169; **οὐ . . . πᾶς**, 94; in interrogation, 917 f.; meaning, 930; c. **μόνον - ἀλλὰ καί**, 947; in conditions, 1011 f., 1016 ff.; c. inf., 947, 1093 ff., 1162; c. part., 1136 ff.; discussed, 1154-77; c. **καί**, 1183; proclitic, 1211.
οὗ: accent, 229; personal pronoun (not in N. T.), 286, 679; relative, 229, 298 f., 301 *bis*; adverb, 717, 722, 969; use, 286, 298 f., 301, 717, 722, 969.
οὐά: accent, 231; use, 302, 1193.
οὐαί: gender, 270, 410; interjection, 302; in ellipsis, 391; case with, 135, 487; use, 1193.
οὐδέ: elision, 207, 1210; and **εἷς**, 741; use, 1156, 1165, 1185.
οὐδείς: form, 219; use, 282, 292, 1094; c. **ἐστιν ὅς**, 63, 726; discussed, 750.
οὐδέν: adverb, 457; use, 1156
οὐθείς: form, 72, 97, 181, 219; use, 282, 750, 1094.
οὐκοῦν: accent, 233, 1165, 1175; use, 917, 1165, 1175.
-ούμενος: part. end., 374.
οὖν: in Mark, 119; in John, 133-4, 134 n., 841; position, 424, 1192; use, 133, 424, 434, 443 f., 841; **τί οὖν . . .;** 916; in interrogation, 916; discussed, 1111 f.
-ουν: verb end., 341, 343.
οὔπω: form, 296.
οὐρανόθεν: 296, 300.
οὐρανός: use, 408.
-ουρος: ending, 199.
οὗς: 145, 156.
-ους: adj. end., 274.
-ουσαν: in mod. Gk., 138.
οὔτε: use, 428, 1156 ff., 1179; discussed, 1189.
οὔτις: form, 292; use, 743, 751.

οὗτος: c. ἔστι, 207, 233, 244, 289 n., 399, 411 f., 416; use, 290, 401, 411, 419, 437, 693, 720, 843; with proper names, 701; resumptive, 437, 693, 698; deictic, 693, 697; relative, 693, 710; anaphoric, 697; contemptuous use, 697; preceded by articular part., 698; preceded by ὅς 698; followed by ὅτι, 699; followed by ἵνα, 699; followed by εἰ, ἐάν, 700; followed by τό-clause, 700; c. αὐτός, 686; αὐτοὶ οὗτοι, 700, 705; αὐτὸ τοῦτο, 705; and ὅδε, 696, 702; discussed, 697-706; and ἐκεῖνος, 270, 708; pleonastic, 722 f.; and ὅσος, 732; τοῦτο with τί, 736; τοῦτ' ἔστιν, 207, 233-4, 244, 399, 411, 412, 416, 705; and art., 419, 770; c. articular noun, 419, 701, 770; c. ἅπας, 771; ταῦτα πάντα and πάντα ταῦτα, 705; and ὅς, 723; c. πολύς, 774; ὅτι with prep. and, 1033 f.; c. inf., 700, 1059; in idioms, 1111; c. καί, 460, 487, 1181; τοῦτο with clause in apposition, 401, 698.
οὕτω(ς): form, 221, 248 295 f.; adv., 286, 298, 710; and οὗτος, 705; use, 965, 968, 1140, 1146.
οὐχί: form, 290; use, 296, 391, 917.
ὀφείλη: 80, 153.
ὀφείλημα: 153.
ὀφείλω: use, 841, 886; constr., 1003.
ὄφελον: use, 82, 841, 886, 923, 940, 1003 f.
ὀφθαλμός: 95, 102.
ὄφρα: not in N. T., 981-2.
ὀχλο--: in comp., 165.
ὄχλος: breathing, 225; use, 404, 407; c. πολύς, 774.
ὀψάριον: 65, 66, 155.
ὀψέ: constr., 517, 645 f.; meaning, 517.
ὀψία: 119.
ὀψώνιον: 65, 66, 80, 155.
-όω: verbs in, 147, 149, 342 f., 351.

Π

π: 210, 223, 353, 1210.
-π-: inserted, 210.
παγαίνω: meaning, 865.
παγιδεύω: 148.
πάγω: meaning, 865.
παθητός: use, 157, 372, 1097.
παιδάριον: 66.
παιδεύω: 66, 138.
παιδιόθεν: 119.
παιδίον: 155.
παιδίσκη: 1361.
πάλαι: form, 249, 296.
πάλιν: in comp., 167; form, 296; use, 300, 551.
παμπληθεί: form, 170, 171; spelling, 197.
πανδοχεύς: 66, 219.
πανήγυρις: 132.
πανοικεί: form, 170, 171; spelling, 197.
πανταχῇ: form, 295, 300, 526.
πανταχοῦ: form, 296, 300; use, 299.
πάντη(ῃ): 295.
πάντοθεν: 300.
πάντοτε: form,
πάντως: 423. 170, 171; use, 300.
παρά: in comp., 80, 165, 169, 565; elision, 208; origin, 80, 249, 301; case-form, 301, 482, 570; cases with, 451, 491, 524, 534, 554, 565, 567, 569 f.; instrumental case, 301, 613; c. abl., 482, 517-8, 554, 614; c. acc., 477, 491, 614, 792; c. loc., 524-5, 542, 614; c. three cases, 451, 567, 569-70, 613; constr. in comp., 132, 477, 542; c. verbs, 517 f., 560, 562; agent, 534, 636, 820; παρα-- παρά, 560; παρα—ἀπό, 561; ὑπερ- παρά, 562; ἐκ- παρά, 561; παρα- in mod. Gk., 558, 570, 613, 615, 616, 625; in "pregnant construction," 525; adv. phrases, 550; in comparison, 83, 132, 615-6, 667; frequency, 556; use, 561; 'beside,' 613; and ἀπό, 578 f.; and εἰς, 596; and ἐκ, 596; discussed, 612-6; and πρός, 625; and unto, 636; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 1069.
παραβαίνω: 477.
παραβολεύομαι: 80, 148, 165-.
παραβολή: 134.
παραγγέλω: constr., 1047, 1084; c. ὅτι, 1035; c. ἵνα, 1046.
παράδεισος: 80, 111.

παραδίδωμι: forms, 309, 347.
παραθαλασσία: form, 273.
παραθήκη: 80, 166.
παραί: form, 260, 296, 301, 537.
παραινέω: constr., 475.
παραιτέομαι: voice of, 810.
παρακαλέω: meaning, 66; form, 943; constr., 475, 1035, 1085; c. **τοῦ** and inf., 1068.
παράλητος: 115, 161, 167.
παρακύπτω: 80.
παραλαμβάνω: readings, 336.
παράλιος: form, 273.
παραπλέω: 472.
παραπλήσιον: use, 646.
παραυτίκα: 297.
παραφρονία: 66, 156.
παραφυλακή: 57.
παραχρῆμαι: use, 297, 550.
παρεισδύω: forms, 341.
παρείσέρω: 80, 126 n.
παρεκτός: form, 171, 244; use, 646.
παρεμβολή: 64.
παρεπίδημος: 80.
παρέρχομαι: c. acc., 477, 800.
πάρεσις: 80.
παρέχω: voice of, 810; constr., 480, 853.
παριστάνω: meaning, 950.
παίστημι: constr., 473 n., 542, 855.
πάροικος: 65, 80, 102.
παρόν: 1130.
παροξύνομαι: 80, 150.
παρός: gen. form, 301.
παρουσία: 81.
παρρησία: meaning, 66; **ὅτι** with, 1033; spelling, 212, 1210.
πᾶς: in Luke, 122; **ἐν παντί, ἐν πᾶσι** by Paul, 116, 117; indeclinable rap, 274; c. **μη**, 292, 752 f.; use, 419, 436, 744; **πάντα** adv., 487; c. negatives, 437, 751-3, 1163; c. **οὗτος**, 705; c. art., 708, 771 ff., 1107; c. **ὅστις**, 727; c. **ὅσος**, 732; c. **πολύς**, 774; c. **ὅς**, 957.
πάσχα: 95, 105, 270.
πάσχω: compounds and forms of, 327, 1218; c. **κακῶς**, 802; constr., 858.
Πάτερα: use, 183.
πατήρ: voc, 461 f., 464; art. with voc. of, 465; **ὁ πατ. ὁ οὐράνιος**, 120; **ὁ πατ. ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς**, 120.
πατροπαράδοτος: 80, 169.
Παῦλος: and art., 788; use, 1038.
παύω: c. part., 1102, 1121; compounds and forms, 1218.
πεδά: case of, 249; for **μετά**, 609.
πεζῇ: form, 295.
πειθαρχεῖν: 163 n.
πειθός: 157.
πείθω: constr., 454, 478, 540, 1084; acc. c. pass., 485; voice of, 801, 810; compounds and forms of, 351, 871, 895, 1215; **πέπονθα** intrans., 801; **πέποιθα**, 895.
πεινάω: aor. form, 342, 371; and case, 474, 508.
πειράζω: voice of, 802.
πειρασμός: 152.
πεισμονή: 151.
πελεκίζω: 150.
πέμπω: 359; epistolary aor. of, 845 f.
πένης: use, 272.
πενθέω: constr., 475.
πεποίθησις: 151.
πέρ: intensive, 302, 617, 1144; discussed, 1153 f.; enclitic, 1211.
πέραν and ἀντίπερα: c. ace., 294; use, 646.
περί: in comp., 165, 167, 477, 487, 542, 562, 564; form, 301 f., 524, 570; c. cases, 471, 491, 509, 524, 569 f.; c. verbs, 511, 560, 566; frequency, 556; in condensation, 567; and **κατά**, 608; discussed, 616-20; and **πρός**, 626; and **ὑπέρ**, 629, 632; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 1069; use, 616.
περιάγω: c. two acc., 480; trans. and intrans., 477; followed by **ἐν**, 562; literal sense, 617.
περιβάλλομαι: constr., 475, 483, 485 f., 855; voice of, 807, 809, 819.
περιβλέπω: voice of, 809, 813; meaning, 838.
περιέρχομαι: constr., 477; use, 1103.
περιέχω: 800, 802.
περιζώννυμι: form, 330.
περιίστημι: c. acc., 477.

περίκειμαι.: 65 n.; constr., 485; voice of, 815-6.
περιλαμβάνω: constr., 483.
περιμένω: c. acc., 475.
περιούσιος: etymology of, 159.
περιπατέω: constr., 855.
περιποιέω: voice of, 810.
περιρραίνω: reading, 211.
περισπάομαι: 66, 80.
περισσεία: 80, 156.
περισσεύσαι: form, 940.
περισσός: use, 279; constr., 516; in comparison, 664; περισσότερος, 279, 298, 488.
περιτέμνω: 80.
περιτίθημι: constr., 477, 483, 485; voice of, 815.
περιτομή: 167.
περιτρέχω: c. acc., 477.
περπερεύομαι: 148.
πέρυσι: form, 221, 295.
πέτρα: use, 1201.
πήγνυμι: and compounds, 317.
πηλίκος: use, 292; discussed, 741; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
πήχυς: forms, 80, 268.
πιάζω: 63, 184; constr., 508; forms, 1218.
πιέζω: forms, 184, 1218.
πιθός: use, 1206.
πίμπλημι: c. gen., 510; compounds and forms, 317, 350, 1218.
πίμπρημι: compounds and forms, 233, 318.
πίνω: compounds and forms, 204, 340, 343, 371, 1218; πεῖν, 72, 204, 343, 371; πίομαι, 354-5; πίεσαι, 340; use, 838, 883.
πιπράσκω: forms, 900, 1218; πέπρακα; 900.
πίπτω: compounds and forms, 338, 351, 843, 1218; ἔπεσα, πέσατε, 338; πέπτωκαν, 135; parts., 864, 1116.
πιστεύω: in John, 134; constr., 115, 120, 453, 475, 485, 487, 540, 601; c. ἐν, 540, 601; c. ἐπί, 453, 601; pass. of, 816; πιστεύετε, mood of, 329; aor. of, 850, 856; 'entrust,' 485, 540, 816; in *or. obl.*, 1036.
πιστικός: origin, 159 f.
πίστις: meaning, 115, 134; gen. use, 499, 515, 704; πίστει in Heb., 11, 533.
πιστός: 115, 125.
πλανήτης: 125.
--πλασίων: proportional, 284, 673.
πλαστός: 126.
πλατύνω: constr., 486.
πλεῖον: constr., 516, 666; stereotyped form, 667.
πλεῖων: spelling, 187; use, 665; superlative of, 278, 670, 775; τὸ πλεῖστον, 487; πλείω indecl., 276, 277 n.; in idiom, 775.
πλέκω: compounds and forms, 1218.
πλεονεκτέω: 80, 455.
πλέκω: compounds and forms, 1218.
πλεονετέω: 80, 407.
πληθύνω: use, 125, 127, 871.
πλημμύρα: 155, 214, 232, 250.
πλήν: use, 646; in mod. Gk., 1146; discussed, 1187.
πλήρης: indecl., 72, 97, 188, 274 ff., 413, 463, 464; voc., 264, 463 f.; constr., 1204.
πληρο--: in comp., 72, 165.
πληροφορέω: 72, 80, 147, 165.
πληρόω: forms of, 119, 133, 325, 343; constr., 473 n., 483, 485, 510, 857; ὅπως, ἵνα πληρωθῇ, 120; meaning, 834; aor. of, 851; use, 948.
πλήρωμα: 105.
πλησίον: form, 294; use, 547, 646.
πλήσσω: compounds and forms, 1218.
πλοιάριον: constr., 82, 521.
πλοός: 261.
-πλοῦς: adj. end., 284.
πλοῦτος: 63, 262, 262 n.
πνεῦμα: meaning, 97, 115, 125; use, 436, 590, 709; and art., 761, 795.
πνευματικός: 115, 158 f.
πνευματικῶς: use, 299.
πνέω: form, 342.
πνίγω: class, 351; compounds and forms, 1218.
πόθεν: 300; constr., 548; in or. obl., 1045; in questions, 1176.
ποῖ: form, 295.
ποιέω: forms, 325, 327; act. and mid., 802, 812; c, εὖ, and κακῶς, 473; c.

καλῶς, 473; c. καρπόν, 105; c. συμβούλιον, 105; μή c. pres. inf. and aor. subj., 852, 854, 856; constr., 480, 850, 852, 854, 856; c. τί and subj., 850, 923, 934; c. pred. acc., 480; c. two acc., 484; voice, 802, 812; use, 884, 923, 934; in narrative, 884; c. inf., 1068.
ποιμαίνω ποίμνην: 478.
ποῖος: interrogative, 291 f., 916; ποίας in Luke, 494; and ὁποῖος, 732; equal to τίς, 735; c. art., 735; discussed, 740; in or. obl., 1045; in indirect question, 1176.
πόλις: dat. form, 204; πόλεως, 447; c. θυάτειρα, 498; ἐκ, 578.
πολλάκις: form, 296.
πολύς: in comp., 169, 171; acc. form, 294; πολύ adv. 188; τὰ πολλά, 487; πολλά, adv., 120, 488; constr., 532, 660; in comparison, 664; c. art., 774 f.
πὸμα: spelling, 230.
Πόντος: and in 788.
πορεύομαι: voice of, 816-7, 820; constr., 473n., 479, 856; use, 122, 869, 874.
πόσος: use, 292; discussed, 740 f.; in direct question, 292, 916; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
ποταπός: origin, 160; use, 292, 917; discussed, 7 c. τίς, 736; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
ποτέ: adv., 29f,; 300; c. μή, 987 ff., 995 f., 1173; c. part., 1124, 1139; meaning, 1147; enclitic, 1211.
πότε: adv., 300; interrogative, 915, 917, 1176; in *or. obl.*, 1045.
πότερον: in double questions, 1177.
πότερος: use, 292 and τίς, 736; discussed, 741; πότερον an adv., 292, 741, 1177.
ποτίζω: constr. 484, 485.
ποῦ: accent, 234; adv. (gen.), 295; use, 291, 298 f.; in mod. Gk., 723; in *or. obl.*, 1945.
πού: use, 298 f., 1146; enclitic, 1211.
--πουλος: suffix, 146.
πούς: use, 95; root, 145; accent, 231.
πρᾶγμα: 80.
πραιτώριον: 108, 131.
πράκτωρ: 81.
πρᾶος: readings, 200; form, 274.
πρασιαί: in Mark, 119; case, 487; distributive, 673.
πράσσω: c. two acc., 484; use of inf. of, 1058; c. εὖ, 1121; compounds and forms, 359, 1218.
πρέπω: constr., 541, 1086.
πρεσβύτερος: meaning, 81 *bis*, 90, 115; in comparison, 277, 664.
πρεσβύτης: spelling, 201.
πρίν: use, 431, 954, 976 f., 1049, 1053; origin, 954; as prep., 977; c. subj., 977; c. opt., 970, 977, 1049; c. ἤ, 970, 1049; use in Homer, 977, 1075, 1091 n.; common in Homer c. inf., 977, 1053, 1075; c. inf., 431, 977, 1074 f., 1091; statistics, 977, 1091.
πρό,: position, 110; elision, 206; cases with, 451, 569 f.; constr. in comp., 165, 167, 169, 477; separation implied, 517; frequency, 556; c. verbs, 560; discussed, 620-2; and πρός, 622 f.; and ὑπέρ, 630; πρό τοῦ c. subj., 1056; c. abl., 1061; in prepositional phrases, 792; c. inf., 621, 858, 891, 977, 978, 1061, 1074 f., 1091; c. pres. inf., 891; statistics of c. inf., 858, 977-8.
προάγω: constr., 477, 857, 871.
προαιτιάομαι: in *or. obl.*, 1036.
προγράφω: old word, 81, 125; epistolary aor. of, 845.
πρόδηλον: c. ὅτι, 1034.
πρόδομα: spelling, 200.
προεῖπον: spelling, 338.
προέρχομαι: constr., 477.
πρόθεσις: 80.
προκαταγγέλλω: in *or. obl.*, 1036.
προορίζω: constr., 480.
πρός: in comp., 165, 167; accent, 234; final letter of, 248; frequency of use, 122, 451, 491, 556; cases with, 491, 524, 569 f.; c. ace., 122, 451; separation implied, 517; case-form, 524, 570; c. verbs, 542, 560 ff., 566; c. verbs of speaking instead of αὐτῷ, etc., 625-6; in mod. Gk., 570;

and ἀπό, 575; and εἰς, 596; and παρά, 613; discussed, 622-6; c. με 234, 286, 682; πρὸς τί, 736, 739; in prepositional phrases, 234, 792; in papyri, 990-1, 1069; c. inf., 858, 990 f., 1003, 1060, 1069, 1075, 108S; c. purpose inf., 1088; statistics c. inf., 858, 1003, 1069, 1075.
προσαναβαίνω: form, 328.
προσδοκάω: in *or. obl.*, 1036.
προσέρχομαι: use, 120.
προσευχή: 80, 91, 151.
προσεύχομαι: form, 328; use, 874.
προσέχω: 81, 477.
προσήλυτος: 157.
πρόσθεμα: spelling, 188.
πρόσκαιρος: 65, 169.
προσκαλέω: voice of, 809.
προσκαρτερέω: 81.
προσκαρτέρησις: 80, 167.
πρόσκομμα: 115, 151.
προσκυλίω: constr., 543.
προσκυνέω: constr., 448, 455, 476 f., 540 990.
προσκυνητής: 80, 154.
προσλαμβάνω: constr., 510, 519; voice of, 809.
προσμένω: 623.
προστάσσω: constr., 1084.
προστίθημι: c. inf., 87 n., 94, 96 n., 1078.
προσφάγιον: 156, 167.
προσφάτως: 171.
προσφέρω: form, 338.
προσφωνέω: use, 65 n.; trans., 455; constr., 477.
προσωπο–: in comp., 165, 167.
προσωπολημπτέω: 94, 165.
προσωπολημψία: 165, 167.
πρόσωπον: use, 94, 95, 97, 102, 285 n, 649; c. λαμβάνειν, 94, 97.
πρότερος: form, 280, 283; adv., 487; meaning, 662; use, 669.
προτίθημι: constr., 480; voice of, 810; in periphrastic forms, 822.
προϋπάρχω: c. part., 1103, 1121
προφήτης: 81, 116.
προφητικός: 169.
προφθάνω: use, 1120.
προχειρίσασθαι: constr., 700.
πρωί: spelling, 205; use, 295, 471; and ἅμα 638.
πρωϊνός: new word, 158; readings, 201, 205.
πρωτο–: in comp., 167, 169.
πρῶτος: comparison, 73, 280; ordinal, 283 f.; πρῶτον adv., 294, 297, 298, 300, 460, 487, 488, 657, 659, 1152; πρώτως numeral, 160, 298; meaning, 516; use, 73, 97, 280, 306, 549, 657, 659, 662, 669 f.; and εἰς, 671.
πρωτοτόκια: 132.
πρωτότοκος: 80, 169, 233.
--πτ--: in verbs, 351, 353.
πτερύγιον: 156.
πτῶμα: 66.
πτωχεύω: meaning, 834.
πυκνότερος: meaning, 665; c. part., 1139.
πυνθάνομαι: forms, 1218.
πύρινος: 158.
πυρράζω: 147, 213.
πυρρός: spelling, 212 f.
πω: enclitic, 1211.
–πω: origin, 296.
πώποτε: form, 249; use, 896.
πως: use, 298; c. μή, 987 ff., 995 f.; enclitic, 1211.
πῶς: use, 302, 741, 985, 1032 f.; exclamation, 302, 741; for ὅτι 1032 f.; τὸ πῶς, 985, 1028; in mod. Gk., 102S, 1032; in or. obl., 1045; interrogative, 1176.

P

ρ: 211-4, 216 f., 225 f., 352, 356, 364.
ρ-verbs: redupl., 364.
–ρα: words in, 256.
ῥαββεί: 95, 416, 433.
ῥαβουνεί: 105.
ῥακά: 105, 219.
ῥαντίζω: 66, 149; forms of, 211 f., 225, 1218; ῥεραν–, 211, 225, 364; voice, 807; constr., 486.
ῥαντισμός: 152.
ῥάπισμα: 153.
ῥέδη: 111.
ῥέω: compounds and forms, 212, 342, 355, 1219.

ῥῆμα: ---'thing,' 94; breathing, 225.
-ρης: ending, 72, 82, 256, 275.
ῥήσσω: compounds and forms, 212, 318, 1219.
ῥητῶς: 160.
ῥίπτω: forms, 21 , 364; ῥερ-- in D, 211;
ῥομφαία: 65.
-ρρ-: 217.
ῥύμη: 64.
ῥύομαι: aor. of, 818.
῾Ρωμϊκός: 159.
῾Ρωμαῖος: 159.
῾Ρωμαϊστί: 160, 205, 296.
῾Ρώμη: initial ῥ, 212.
ῥώννυμι: forms, (ἔρρωσθε), 212, 318, 330, 364, 908.

Σ

σ, ς: 210, 214 f., 218, 220 f., 223, 248, 267, 296, 34c 114-6, 362, 1210.
--σ--: in fut., 354, in pres., 362; in perf. pass., 340,
-ς: 221, 296 (adv.)
--σα: per. end., 305, 339, 346; 1st aor. end., 346.
σαβαχθανεί: 105, 219, 236.
σαβαώθ: 95.
σαββατισμός: 152.
σάββατον: 95, 105, 262; c.
σαγνήνη: 151.
--σαι: verb end., 329, 340 f., 369 f.; imper. end 329; 2d pers. sing. pass. end., 340.; inf. end., 370, 388.
σαλπίζω: constr., 853.
Σαμσών: form,
σάν: in mod. Gk., 974.
--σαν: 3d pl. end., 82.
σανδάλιον: 111.
Σαούλ: 96.
σάπφειρος: 95, 9
σαπρός: 80.
σαρκικός: etymol gy, 158 f.
σάρκινος: etymology, 158.
σάρξ: meaning, 115; use, 754.
σαρόω: 149.
σατανᾶς: 95, 105
σατόν: in pap? 105, 287.
σβέννυμι: forms, 318, 1219.
σβεννύω: forms, 1219.
--σε: suffix, 296.
σεαυτοῦ: form, 226, 287; use, 288, 687-90.
-σει: itacism in, 240, 928.
--σείω: verbs in, 150, 351.
σείω: compounds and forms, 1219.
σελήνη: gender of, 252.
σεο/ε: fut. suffix, 354 f.
--ση: itacism in, 240, 928.
σημαίνω: in or. obl., 1036.
σημεῖον: use, 176.
σημειόω: 149.
σήμερον: form, 219, 294.
σήπω: class, 351; voice of, 801.
-σθαι: inf. end., 186, 240, 370.
-σθε: per. end., 186, 240.
σθενόω: 149.
--σθω: per. end., 328.
--σθωσαν: per. end., 61, 73, 82, 328.
--σι: dat. end., 249; pronominal suffix, 306.
-σιάω: verbs in, 150.
σιγάω: meaning, 834; constr., 857.
σικάριος: 108.
σίκερα: 105.
σιλωάμ: 95.
σιμικίνθιον: 108, 189, 192.
σίναπι: forms, 111 bis, 268.
σινδών: 111.
σινιάζω: 147.
-σι-ς: denoting action, 151 ff.
σιτιστός: 158.
σιτομέτριον: 80, 167.
σιωπάω: use, 883, 908; reading, 1010.
--σκ-verbs: 150, 352.
σκάνδαλον: history of, 174.
σκάπτω: compounds and forms, 1219.
--σκε: verb suffix, 352.
σκέπτομαι: root, 145-6; compounds and forms, 1219.
σκνηο--: in comp., 167.
σκηνόω: meaning, 829.
σκληρο: in comp., 167, 169.
σκληρύνω: 150.
--σκο: verb suffix, 150, 352.
σκόλοψ: 81.
σκοπός: 146.
σκορπίζω: 150.
σκότος: 134, 262.

σκύλλω: meaning, 65 n., 81; voice of, 807.
--σκω: verbs in, 150, 352.
σμαράγδινος: 81.
--σο: per. end., 340.
--σο/ε: fut. suffix, 340, 355.
Σολομών: spelling, 268.
–σον: imp. end., 329.
σός: form, 288; use, 288, 684.
σουδάριον: 81, 108.
σοφία: 134.
σπάω: meaning, 564, 828; redupl. in perf., 364; voice of, 805, 810; compounds and forms, 364, 1219.
σπείρης: 62, 82, 232, 256.
σπείρω: constr., 478; compounds and forms 1219.
σπεκουλάτωρ: 81, 108.
σπλαγχνίζομαι: 150.
σπλάχνα: form, 410.
σπουδαίως: comp. adv., 488; use, 299.
σπουδῇ: form, 296.,
--σσ--: 55, 61, 62, 72, 97, 218.
στασιαστής: 154.
στασις: 81.
σταυρός: 115.
στέγη: 65 n.
στείβω: form, 198.
στείρω: form, 275.
στέλλω: compounds and forms, 346, 1219; use of part., 1134.
στερέωμα: 153.
στήκω: reading, 65, 66, 150, 1010; forms, 188, 224, 315, 320, 351, 1219.
στηρίζω: c. inf., 1068; compounds and forms, 230, 1219.
στό: in mod. Gk., 453.
στ(ο)ιβάς: 198.
στοιχέω: use, 329.
στόμα: use, 95, 102, 649.
στρατεύομαι: 81; στρ. στρατείαν, 478.
στρατο--: in comp., 165, 167.
στρέφω: trans. and intrans., 800 *bis*; compounds and forms, 1219.
στρώννυμι: compounds and forms, 318, 1219.
στρωννύω: compounds and forms, 1219.
στυγνάζω: 147.
στῦλος: accent, 186, 231.
σύ: position of, 418; voc., 461; discussed, 678 f.; use, 693; c. αὐτός, ἑαυτοῦ, 687, 689; and ἐκεῖνος, 707; σοῦ, position of, 779; enclitic forms of, 234, 286, 682, 689, 1211.
συγγενής: 81, 272.
συγκρίνω: 66.
συζεύγνυμι: 314.
συκάμινος: 95, 96, 105.
συμβαίνω: συνέβη in *or. obl.*, 392, 1043.
συμβουλεύω: voice of, 811; in *or. obl.*, 1036 f.
συμβούλιον: c. ποιεῖν and διδόναι, 105; c. λαμβάνειν, 108, 119.
συμμορφίζω: 150.
σύμμορφος: constr., 528.
συμπόσια: form, 460; case, 487; distributive, 119, 284, 673.
συμφέρω: impersonal, 1058, 1084; c. dat., 539, 1084; c. ἵνα clause, 992; c. acc. and inf., 1084; inf. subject of, 1058, 1084.
συμφυτος: constr., 528.
συμφύω: form, 341.
συμφωνέω: reading, 1010; constr., 1084.
σύν: in comp., 165, 167, 169, 216 f., 527 f., 528 ff., 558, 562; LXX use, 451; case with, 451, 534, 569 f.; συν-- c. dat., 528; σύν=καί, 111; c. acc., 451, 628; c. gen., 138 n., 628; συν--...μετά, εἰς, ἐπί, πρός, 562; use in Attic, 553; frequency, 122, 556; c. verbs, 560; and ἐν, 588; and κατά, 606; and μετά, 526, 610; and πρός, 625; and ἅμα, 627; οἱ σὺν . . ., 628; discussed, 626-8.
συνάγω: use, 120, 871.
συναγωγή: 65, 124.
συναγωγή: 65 n.; use of part., 1135.
συναντιλαμβάνομαι: 72, 80, 160, 163, 171.
συνείδησις: 81, 115.
συνεργέω: trans., 455, 477.
συνεργός: substantival, 504.
συνετός: use, 1097.
συνευδοκέω: 81.
συνευωχέομαι: 81.
συνέχω: voice of, 808; meaning, 81, 828.

—σύνη: ending, 15
συνίημι: accent, 233; forms, 315; in or. obl., 1040.
συνιστάνω: const., 480.
συνίστημαι: meaning, 81; use, 896.
συνπαραλαμβάνω: constr., 857, 862.
συνσταυρόω: 115.
συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος: 120.
συντηρέω: meaning, 627, 828.
συντίθεμαι: c. inf., 1068.
σφάγιον: 157.
σφάζω: compound and forms, 1219.
σφαγίζω: 81.
σφυ(δ)ρόν: 210.
σφυρίς: 81, 219.
σχεδόν: form, 295.
σχολή: 66, 82.
σώζω: Aramaic, 105; meaning, 115; constr., 598; part., 891; compounds and forms, 1219.
σῶμα: meaning, 81; use, 1206.
σωματικῶς: 160.
σωτήρ: meaning, 81 *bis,* 115, 116; and art., 786.
σωτηρία: old word, 81, 97, 115, 116, 125, 157.
σωτήριος: form, 157, 272.
σωφρονισμός: 152.

T

τ: 218, 223, 218, 1210.
–τ–: verbs, 352.
ταβέρναι: 109.
τάδε: use, 289 f., 696.
—ται: per. end., 340
ταλειθά: spelling of, 105; voc. of, 465.
ταμεῖον: 66, 72, 204.
--ταμος: early end., 279.
ταπεινός: 115.
ταπεινοφρονσύνη: 115, 156, 167.
ταρταρόω: 126.
τάσσω: constr., 1084; compounds and forms, 349, 359, 1219.
–τατος: form, 277, 279 f., 670; in mod. Gk., 668.
ταὐτά: crasis, 208.
τάφος: 120.
τάχα: 295.
τάχειον: adv., 488; use, 197, 278, 664.
ταχέως: 298.
ταχινός: 158.
τάχιον: form, 278 f., 297.
τάχιστος: for, 294, 297, 669; adv., 488.
ταχύ: form, 294, 298, 488.
τέ: origin, 301; c. rel., 290; conj., 301, 1178 f.; position, 424; c. τέ, 427; c. καί, 122, 427 f., 432, 566, 789; use, 135 n., 207, 434; in Luke, 122, 135 n., 428 (Acts); in Heb., 132; in Homer, 711; enclitic, 1211.
–τε: adv. end., 296.
τεκνίον: 66, 232.
τεκνο–: in comp., 163 n., 165, 167.
τέκνον: c. gen., 497, 651.
τεκτο–: in comp., 165.
τελειόω: reading, 987.
τελειωτής: 154.
τελέω: meaning, 834; use, 901; c. part., 1121; fut. τελέσω, 349, 355; pres. τελ(έ)σω, 362; compounds and forms, 349, 1219.
τέλλω: compounds and forms, 1219.
τελώνιον: 65, 154.
τέμνω: compounds and forms, 1219.
—τέος: verbal form, 157, 304, 320, 372 f., 486; discussed, 1095
τέρας: use, 176.
—τέρος: compar. end., 277 f., 298, 660.
τέσσαρες: reading, 63, 266, 282.
τεσσαρεσκαιδέκοτος: form, 244, 284.
τέσσερα, τεσσεράκοντα: form, 62, 63, 97, 183, 282-3.
τέταρτος: form, 284.
τετρα–: in comp., 165, 167, 204.
τετράδιον: 154.
τετράκις: form, 296.
τήκω: 351.
τηλικόσδε: use, 709.
τηλικοῦτος: form, 290; use, 709, 731; and art., 771.
τηρέω: constr., 598, 850; meaning, 828; τετήρηκα, 895.
τήρησις: 81.
--τήριον: suffix, 154, 157, 157 n.
—της: suffix, 151, 153 f., 156, 256, 272.
—τι: adv. suffix, 296.
τί ἂν θε,λοι: in *or. obl.*, 1044.
τίθημι: constr., 480; use, 900; τιθέω, 318; τίθω, 318; τιθῶ, 82; θές, 329;

τέθεικα,, 364; c. εἰς, 482; compounds and forms, 306, 310, 318, 347, 350, 1219.
τίκτω: class, 351; forms, 1219.
τιμάω: formation, 147; forms, 305, 334, 351.
τιμή: 151.
τίς: τίς for πότερος, 61, 736; τί and hiatus, 206; c. opt. in LXX and N. T., 940; interrogative, 291 f., 916, 940; τί...; 'why,' 298, 487, 738-9; τί . . .; 'what,' 739, 916; τι . . .; 'how,' 739, 1176; τί ὅτι . . . , 730, 739, 965, 1034; τί τοῦτο . . .;, 736; τί γὰρ . . ., 132, 739; τί οὖν.. . , 132, 739; ἵνα τί, 739; κατὰ τί, 739; διὰ τί, 584, 739; εἰς τί, 739; indeclinable τί, 736; τί ἐμοί (ἡμῖν) καὶ σοί, 395, 539, 736; τίς . . .ἥs . . .;, 1177; as relative 'who,' 737 f.; in object clauses, 739; for ὅστις, 67, 72; τί in idioms, 395, 539, 730; c. gen., 515; discussed, 735-40, 1176; c. ποῖος, 740; and τις, 233, 739, 741, 1040; in subj., 934 f.; τί c. ὅτι, 1034; accent of τίνα, 233, 740, 1040; in *or. obl.*, 1044.
τὶς: τι and hiatus, 206; enclitic, 233, 234 f., 1211; position in sentence, 235, 425; τινὰ constr., 490; c. gen., 515; τι adv., 547; and οὗτος, 698; in Homer, 711; and τις, 233, 292, 739; τι c. διά, 584; c. εἷς, 292; discussed, 741-4; antithetic, 750; c. negative, 751, 987 f., 1164; and art., 778, 796.
τίτλος: 109.
τό: substantivized neut. adj., 156 f.; τό before clauses, 118, 122; not the art., 185; denoting quotation, 243; c. Ἄγαρ, 254, 411; forming adv. phrase, 249 f., 487; c. λοιπόν, 470, 487; c. inf., 118, 966.
τοί: use, 302; discussed, 1154 f.
τοιγαροῦν: use, 425, 1154.
τοίνυν: use, 425, 1154.
τοιόσδε: form, 290; use, 709; and art., 771.
τοιοῦτος: use, 290, 710, 731; and ὁποῖος, 732; and art., 771.
τολμάω: roots of, 823.
τόπος: 81.
—τος: verbal form, 157 f., 276, 304, 320, 372 f.; adv. form, 296; comparison of verbals in, 276; superlative end., 283; constr., 504; discussed, 1095 ff.
τοσόσδε: use, 709.
τοσοῦτος: use, 290, 710; and art., 771.
τότε: pronominal, 298; use, 300; constr., 429; in Mt., 119, 443, 549.
--τοῦ: gen., 262.
τοὐναντίον: 208.
τοὔνομα: 208.
τοῦ ἔστιν: see οὗτος.
Τραχωνῖτις: c. art., 788.
τρεῖς: forms, 282.
τρέπω: compounds and forms, 359, 1219.
τρέφω: use, 203; compounds and forms, 359, 1220.
τρέχω: compounds and forms, 870, 1220.
τριάκοντα: form, 283.
τριακοστός: 284.
τρίβω: compounds and forms, 1220.
τρίς: form, 284, 296; τριά, 282; τρία τρία, 91, 284.
τρισχίλιοι: use, 283.
τρίτος: in mod. Gk., 284; adv., 488.
—τρον: nominal suffix, 174.
τροπο--: in comp., 165, 219.
τρόπον: ὃν τρόπον, 486, 487.
τρόπω: 487.
τροφο--: in comp., 165, 219.
τρώγω: 351.
τυγχάνω: constr., 509, 1120; τέτυχα trans., 801; compounds and forms, 1220.
τυπικῶς: 160.
τύπτω: class, 353.
Τυχικός: 159.
Τυχόν: adv. acc., 160, 488, 490, 1121, 1130.
τω: accent, 233.
—τω: per. end., 328, 338.
—τω-verbs: 352.
—τωρ: suffix, 151.
—τωσαν: per. end., 55, 61, 63 n., 73, 82, 328, 336, 338.

Υ

υ: vowel-changes, 185, 195, 198-202, 205, 230, 265; **υ=ι**, 238; dropped, 185; stems in, 24k, 249.
ὕαλος: 184, 253.
ὑβρίζω: and case, 473.
ὑγεῖα: 204.
ὑγιής: 275.
ὕδωρ: gen. use, 495; loc. use, 521, 533, 590.
ὑετός: 65 n.
-ύζω: verbs in, 150.
υι: 238.
-υῖα: participles in, 256, 274 f.
-υίης: forms in, 275
υἱός: meaning, 81 *bis*, 91, 95, 115, 116; voc. of, 463; c. gen., 102, 497 f., 501, 651, 781; **υἱός φωτός**, 133.
υἱοθεσία: 65, 81, 115, 167.
ὕλη: 124.
ὑμεῖς: form, see a-a, 195 f.; discussed, 289 n., 678.
ὑμέτερος: form, 277; use, 288, 684.
-υμι: verbs in, 311.
-ύνω: in comps., 147, 150, 213.
ὑπάγω constr., 855; use of **ὕπαγε** with another imperative, 428, 949.
ὑπακούω: constr., 507; meaning, 634.
ὑπαντάω: constr., 47 n.; meaning, 634.
ὑπάντησις: 152; **εἰς ὑπάντησιν**, 528.
ὑπάρχω: c. part., 1112, 1121.
ὑπείκω: meaning, 63
ὑπέρ: in comp., 16 , 167, 171, 477; adv., 293, 450; constr., 784; cases with, 491, 569 f; **ὕπερ ἐγώ** 244, 450; separation implied, 517; frequency, 556; c. verbs, 560; in condensation, 567; c. **ἀντί**, 573 f.; and **ἐπί** 600; and **κατά**, 607; and **περί**, 616, 618; and **πρός**, 623; discussed, 628-33; c. comparatives, 83, 667; c. inf., 1069.
ὑπεράνω: form, 161, 170, 171, 297; use, 550, 646.
ὑπεράνωθεν: use, 647.
ὑπερβαλλόντως: origin, 160, 297 f.
ὑπερβίαν: use, 550.
ὑπερέκεινα: form, 171 bis, 244, 297; use, 647.
ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ: form, 170, 171, 297; **--σῶς** adv., 171, 297; use, 647.
ὑπερεκτείνω: 477.
ὑπερεντυγχάνω: 82, 165.
ὑπερέχω: c. acc., 477.
ὑπερκάτωθεν: use, 647.
ὑπερῷον: 157.
ὑπηρετέω: constr., 540.
ὑπό: elision, 208; form, 223, 226; constr. in comp., 165, 167, 477, 542; cases with, 491, 517, 524, 532, 534, 536, 569 f.; case-form, 524, 570; frequency, 556; c. verbs, 560, 562; in condensation, 567; c. **ἀπό**, 575, 579; and **διά**, 582; and **ἐπί**, 600; and **παρά**, 615; and **ὑπέρ,** 630; discussed, 633-6; in., prepositional phrases, 792; for agent, 820; c. inf., 1069.
ὑποβάλλω: meaning, 634.
ὑποδείκνυμι: aor. of, 848.
ὑποδέχομαι: meaning, 633.
ὑποζύγιον: 81.
ὑποζώννυμι: meaning, 633.
ὑποκάτω: use, 637.
ὑποκάτωθεν: use, 637.
ὑποκρίνομαι: in or. obl., 1036.
ὑπόκρισις: meaning, 633.
ὑποκριτής: meaning, 633.
ὑπολαμβάνω: constr., 480; meaning, 633; c. **ὅτι**, 1034.
ὑπολείπω: c. acc., 477; meaning, 634.
ὑπολήνιον: 157, 167.
ὑπομένω: c. acc., 477.
ὑπομιμνήσκω: constr., 483, 509; meaning, 634.
ὑπονοέω: in *or. obl*., 1036.
ὑποπλέω: meaning, 634.
ὑποπνέω: constr., 475; meaning, 634.
ὑποπόδιον: 65, 81 , 167.
ὑπόστασις: 81.
ὑποστολή: gen., 515.
ὑποταγή: compounds, 167; use, 819.
ὑποτάσσω: voice of, 807, 809, 817; use, 946.
ὑποτίθημι: trans., 455; meaning, 633.
ὑποτρέχω: constr., 477; meaning, 634.
-ύριον: ending, 202.
ὕσσωπος: 95.

ὑστερέω: constr., 476, 478, 519, 541; voice of, 814.
ὕστερος: form, 294; meaning, 662; adv., 488.
ὑψηλοφρονέω: 163 n.
ὕψιστος: form, 279, 669.
ὑψόω: constr., 480.
—**ύω**: verbs in, 62.

Φ

φ: 215, 222, 353, 359.
--φα: perf. in, 359.
φάγος: 157.
φάγω: form., 340; **γάγομαι**, 324, 354; use 883 1063.
φαίνω: class, 352; futs., 356; compounds and forms, 328, 341, 349, 871, 1220; **ἐφάνη**, 340, 347, 350; **φάνῃ** 349; use, 868; in *or. obl.*, 1040; c. part., 1040; 1102, 1120.
φανερός: and art., 764.
φαρισαῖοι: 105.
φάρις: **ὅτι** with, 81, 1033.
φείδομαι: origin, 295, 298; compounds and forms, 295, 298, 1220.
φειδομένως: 160, 295, 298.
φείδωλος: 157.
φελόνης: 109.
φέρω: compounds and forms, 338, 363, 430, 1220; **ἤνεγκα**, 55, 338; **-ενέγκαι** 338; **ἤνεγκον**, 338, 363; roots, 823; constr., 855; use, 81, 882, 1097; use of **φέρε**, 949.
φεύγω: compounds and forms, 346, 351, 355, 828, 1220; constr., 476.
φημί: compounds and forms, 144-5, 305, 310, 319, 337, 346, 434, 902; gory, 337, 346; punctuation, **φησί**, 434; 'aoristic' pres., 865; in *or. obl.*, 1036, 1039; c. **ὅτι**, 1036, 1039; constr., 1083; c. inf., 1036, 1039, 1083; c. **οὐ**, 1156, 1162; enclitic forms of, 1211.
φθάνω: meaning, 66, 81, 138; constr., 551; use, 842, 1102, 1120; compounds and forms, 1220.
φθείρω: compounds and forms, 1220.
-φι: suffix, 249.
φιάλη: 184.
φιλαδελφία: 65, 81.
φιλέω: use, 1063, 1201; and **ἀγαπάω**, 1201.
Φιλιππήσιοι: 110.
φιλο--: in comp., 81, 165, 169.
φιλοπρωτεύω: 80, 165.
φίλος: 81.
φιλοστοργία: 81.
φιλοτιμέομαι: 81.
φιμόω: reading, 330; use, 908.
φοβέω: accent, 232; and case, 472 f., 485; constr., 479; 000. **φοβ. φόβον**, 478; **ἐφβήθη**, 817-8; c. **ἀπό**, 577; aor. of, 852 f.; use, 472, 871, 995, 997; in indirect command, 1046.
φόβος: and art., 758.
φοινικίσσα: 155.
φοῖνιξ: accent, 230.
φορά: in mod. Gk., 284.
φορέω: spelling, 201; forms, 349.
φόρον: 109.
φορτίζω: constr., 484.
φραγέλλιον: 109.
φραγελλόω: 109.
φράζω: 352.
φράσσω: forms, 1220.
φρεν--: in comp., 165, 167, 169.
Φρυγία: c. art., 788.
φυγάς: use, 272.
φυλακή: c. **ἐν**, 523.
φυλακίζω: 150.
φυλακτήριον: 154, 157.
φυλάσσω: constr., 476, 477, 483; form, 352; c. **ἀπό**, 111; **φυλ. φυλακάς**, 477, 479; voice of, 807.
φυσικῶς: 160.
φυσιόω: spelling, 203, 342.
φύω: intrans., 800; compounds and forms, 350, 1220.
-φφ-: 215.
φωνή: in or. obi., 1033, 1042.
φῶς: in John, 134; gen. use, 496 f.

X

χ: 215 f., 222, 359.
-χα: adv. suffix, 296.
χαίρω: inf. with imp. sense, 329; **χ. χαράν**, 477; constr., 509, 855; voice of, 817; aor. pass., 817; aor. mid., 818; use, 871; use of **χαίρειν**, 944, 1093; c. **ὅτι**, 965; c. part., 1122;

compounds and forms, 1220; fut., 356.
χαμαί: case-form, 249, 296, 521, 537.
χαρά: gen., 515.
χάραγμα: 81, 116.
χαρίζομαι: forms, 311, 1220.
χαριν: adv., 294, 298; position, 425; prep., 488; use, 72, 647; c. inf., 1069.
χάρις: 81, 115, 265 *bis*.
χαριτόω: 149.
χάρτης: 109.
χειλέων: 62, 203, 208.
χείμαρρος: forms, 275.
χείρ: in comp., 167 168, 169; use, 95, 102, 649; and ellipsis, 652, 1202.
χειρόγραφον: 72, 16
χείρων: form, 278, 69.
χερουβίμ: 95.
χέω: accent, 354; compounds and forms 342 352, 354 1220. .
χθές: form 206.
χιλιάς: 283.
χίλιοι: use, 281 f., 283.
χίς: 283.
χιτών: 105, 111.
χξς: 283.
χοῖνιξ: accent, 230.
χολάω: c. ὅτι 965.
Χοραζίν: spelling, 205.
χορηγέω: trans., 455
χορτάζω: meaning, 66, 82, 138.
χράομαι: compounds and forms, 319, 341, 1220; con .tr., 454, 473 n., 476, 530, 532, 920.
χρεία: 81.
χρεοφειλέτης: 168, 201.
χρή: 124, 319.
χρῄζω: c. gen., 518
χρηματίζω: in or. ob1., 66, 1036.
χρηστεύομαι: 149.
χρίσμα: accent, 2311
χριστιανοί: 110, 15 .
Χριστός: meaning, 97, 101, 115; spelling, 192, 230; c. ἐν, 115, 587, 784; c. εἰς, 592 and art., 760 f., 795; and **Ἰ**ησοῦς, 795 f.
χρίω: constr., 483; compounds and forms, 1220.
χρόνος: c. ἐν, 523; case, 527 f., 543.
χρονο-: in comp., 165.
χρυσέον: 62, 203.
χρυσός: in comp., 168, 169; form, 202; reading, 274.
χύννω: new pres., 147, 213, 352.
χώρα: form, 248; and ellipsis, 272, 1202.
χώρέω: form, 369; use of inf., 1030; reading, 1082.
χωρίς: form, 296; position of, 425; use, 647 f.
χῶρος: 109.

Ψ

ψ: 209, 230.
ψάλλω : use, 874.
ψευδάδελφος: 115, 168.
ψευδαπόστολος: 115, 168.
ψευδ(ο)–: in comp., 165.
ψεύδομαι: constr., 854.
ψηλαφάω: opt. form, 327; constr., 508.
ψιθυρισμός: 152.
ψιχίον: 156.
ψυχή: meaning, 81, 115, 126; instr., 487; use, 689.
ψυχικός: meaning, 115, 125; origin, 158.
ψύχω: compounds and forms 1220.
ψωμίζω: constr., 484.
ψωμίον: 81.

Ω

ω: 178, 182, 196, 199-203, 324, 367; ω and o, 200 f.
ω-: augment of, in verbs, 367.
–ω: compar. end., 276; verb end., 306, 315 f., 335, 350 f.
ὦ: use with voc., 111, 264, 302, 463, 1193.
ὧδε: pronominal, 298; use, 299, 548; reading, 696.
ω/η: thematic vowel, 323.
–ωλος: ads. end., 157.
--ωμεν: per. end., 200.
--ων: nom. end., 154, 272; gen. end., 257; part. end., 374.
ὠνέομαι: forms, 1220.
ὥρα: ὥραν acc. of time, 470; c. ἐν, 523.
ὡς: origin, 295, 301; constr., 302, 401, 431, 481, 661, 674; c. pred. acc.,

481; and τοιοῦτος, 710; temporal (in Lu. esp.), 122, 974; use, 953 f., 963, 967 f., 974, 980, 982, 1032, 1130, 1140, 1193; causal, 963; ὡς 'about' c. numeral, 674, 968; c. ὅτι, 964, 1033, 1049; c. part., 966, 1124, 1127; in indirect questions, 1032; discussed, 987, 1032; disappearance of, 980 n.; c. inf., 990, 1091, 1093; in consec. clauses, 1000 f.; in conditions, 1021, 1025; in 1 Peter, 127; in Homer, 954; in Lu., 122, 974, 1030; c. ἄν, 974, 1040 f.; οὐχ ὡς, 1140; proclitic, 1211.
-ῶς: names, 172; adv., 248.
-ως: adv. end., 160, 295, 297 f.; neut. substantives, 267; part. end., 274, 295, 374.
--ωσαν: 62.
ὡσαννά: 95.
ὡσαυτώς: adv., 298.
ὡσεί: use, 674, 968, 1140.
ὥσπερ: use, 431, 969, 1130, 1140, 1154.
ὡσπερεί: use, 1154.
ὥστε: connecting particle, 431; c. inf., 431, 909, 990, 1000, 1088, 1090; c. perf. inf., 909; c. indic., 999 f., 1088; c. subj., 931, 990, 999; pure purpose, 990, 1072, 10S9, 1090; and ἵνα, 999; intro. inferential particle, 999; in consec. clauses, 999 f., 1088; use and statistics, 135, 999.
-ωσύνη: 201.
ὠτάριον: 82, 156.
--ώτερος: compar. end., 278.
ὠτίον: 65, 82, 156.
ωϋ: 203, 205.
ὠφελέω: accent, 233; constr., 472, 483 f., 485, 541.
--ως: in perf. part., 373.

IIDEX OF QUOTATIONS

Complete for Scripture references and reasonably so for the other sources quoted. (Figures at end of lines refer to pages.)

(a) NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew

1:1 780, 793, 795
1:2 263
1:2-16 760, 788, 1184
1:4 269
1:6 255, 268 bis, 501, 1184
1:10 263 bis
1:11 269, 603
1:11f. 501
1:12 494, 781, 1184
1:15 215
1:16 1107
1:17 576, 643, 773
1:18 514, 515, 977, 1041 bis, 1091, 1121, 1122, 132, 1184, 1188
1:19 817, 966, 1060, 1128
1:20 261, 3 4, 350, 418, 463, 464, 514, 541, 817, 820, 852, 932, 1060
1:21 287, 459, 575, 679, 779, 872, 87 889, 942, 1191
1:22 349, 517, 534, 567, 582, 636, 705, 774, 820, 982, 998
1:23 515, 611, 713, 881
1:24 541
1:25 459, 975
2:1 255, 263, 408 bis, 575, 760, 762, 791
2:2 231, 366, 370, 419, 540, 542, 810, 915, 990, 1062, 1088
2:3 253, 263, 760, 772, 774
2:4 517 bis, 627, 773, 795, 866, 1043, 1045
2:5 695, 1186
2:6 255, 559, 587, 652, 669, 729, 1106, 1109, 1165
2:7 530, 762, 1106
2:8 366, 860, 971, 986
2:9 . 408, 642, 7 4, 840, 969, 975
2:10 258, 477, 484, 1122
2:11 593
2:12 561, 747, 800, 816
2:13 313, 476, 513, 828, 868, 882, 990, 1060, 1088
2:14 1112
2:15 636
2:15, 22 299
2:16 231, 297, 298, 834, 1112, 1126
2:17 255
2:18 475, 1159
2:20 392, 406, 892 bis, 1111
2:21 559
2:22 510, 574, 996, 1029
2:23 593
3:1 587, 697, 708, 868, 1185
3:2 408, 609, 652, 762, 895
3:3 255, 697
3:4 231, 577, 620, 686 bis, 709, 883
3:5 255, 491, 624, 652, 773, 883
3:6 271, 525 bis, 586, 636, 651, 760, 791, 883
3:7 213, 602, 735, 848, 883, 916, 1176
3:8 504, 835, 1192
3:9 598, 834, 853, 1035
3:10 418, 423, 771, 881
3:11 418, 428, 516, 520, 586, 590, 645, 658, 679, 889, 1076, 1148, 1153, 1186
3:12 260, 355, 533, 562, 575, 581, 606, 683, 722
3:13 575
3:14 235, 677, 682, 885, 1076, 1148, 1183
3:15 221,309,315,393,772 881, 1058, 1086, 1110, 1119, 1126
3:16 538, 561, 575, 578, 968, 1025, 1213
3:17 372, 460, 597, 697, 837, 842, 1097

Matt.
4:1 635, 820, 880, 990
4:2 349, 860, 1112
4:3 329,993
4:3, 6 781
4:4. 604, 649, 889
4:5 756
4:6 221, 548, 625
4:7 311, 319, 874, 883, 895
4:8 311, 419
4:9 705
4:10 391
4:11 540, 838, 847, 883
4:13 219, 273, 593, 613, 759
4:15 469, 500, 646
4:16 437
4:17 576
4:18 269, 615, 656, 1190
4:19 419, 480, 517, 645, 949
4:20 770
4:21 263, 501, 586, 620, 747, 770, 780
4:23 477, 499, 562, 617, 655
4:23-25 428
4:24 412, 799
4:25 28, 788
5:1 307, 561, 593, 597, 756, 1132
5:2 885
5:3 417, 523, 762
5:3-10 757
5:3-11 945
5:3-12 443
5:4 764, 872
5:6 474, 508
5:8 395, 523, 871
5:9 485
5:11 234, 392, 473, 505, 551
5:12 621,855
5:13 269, 534, 590, 739, 751, 768, 1019, 1024
5:14 505, 642
5:15 221, 263, 428, 491, 633, 635, 757, 766, 1183
5:16 640, 710, 782
5:17 231, 427, 428, 789, 833, 834, 853, 857, 858, 932, 990, 1062, 1080, 1088, 1187, 1188
5:18 186, 405, 406, 561, 677, 751, 933
5:19 660, 669, 698, 712, 959 bis
5:20 516, 666, 667, 677, 854, 933
5:21 212, 342, 349, 504 bis, 538, 541, 658, 844, 850, 889, 957, 1035, 1042, 1157, 1162
5:22 219, 502, 535, 537, 541, 677, 744, 772, 1107, 1148
5:22, 28 866
Matt.
5:22, 28, 32 1186
5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44 1153
5:23 849
5:24 428, 470, 529, 621, 640, 657, 690, 882, 949
5:25 330, 375, 488, 573, 729 890, 975, 976
5:26 255, 976
5:27 889
5:28 474, 508, 773, 842, 1003 1060, 1075 bis
5:29 502, 539, 575, 681, 779, 534, 992, 1009, 1018
5:29 f. 687
5:30 779
5:31 850
5:32 348, 517, 646, 764 bis, 773
5:33 224, 333, 889
5:34 475, 588, 1060, 1094
5:34 f. 594
5:34-36 1189
5:34, 39 1084
5:35 633
5:36 853, 1214
5:37 279, 516, 618, 660, 947, 1150 bis
5:38 573
5:39 727, 746, 747
5:39-43 1181
5:40 437, 529, 538, 683, 802
5:41 183,562
5:42 311, 809, 855, 943
5:43 330, 547, 646, 889, 943
5:44 630, 889, 041, 943, 947
5:45 392, 757, 764, 799, 801, 1200
5:46 735, 1019
5:46f. 1181
5:47 687, 850, 1019 bis
5:48 429, 678, 889
6:1 244, 394, 542, 626, 818, 820, 858, 991, 1003, 1075 bis, 1080, 1088, 1148, 1148-9, 1173
6:2 349,429, 577, 633, 687, 853, 866 bis, 969, 972, 986; 1154
6:3 652, 662, 856, 943, 1131, 1170, 1202
6:4 471, 653, 764, 986
6:5 552, 828, 874 bis, 942, 963, 968, 986, 1157
6:6 204, 777, 835, 855, 947, 950, 1186
6:7 184, 589, 591, 969, 1035
6:8 482, 720, 726, 857, 881, 895, 978, 1061, 1075, 1091
6:9 459, 464, 779
6:9-11 855
6:9-13 422, 852

Matt.
6:10 334, 350, 396, 600, 818, 1181
6:11 159, 779
6:12 538, 677 842, 963, 967
6:13 518, 575, 593, 652, 653, 853, 932
6:14 f. 1186
6:15 1185
6:16 395, 427, 8:4, 1040, 1102
6:16, 18 1121
6:17 683, 779, 811, 1102, 1126
6:18 589, 891, 1102, 1115
6:19 231 405,853,875
6:19 f. 286, 687, 1186
6:20 792
6:21 523
6:22 284, 768, 1018
6:22, 23 849
6:23 740, 9 7, 1027, 1186
6:24 251, 573, 675, 748, 749, 751, 890, 1052, 1188, 1191
6:25 539, 564, 738, 853, 917, 935, 1028, 1044, 1176
6:25, 31 1031
6:26 561, 581, 105, 1183, 1185
6:27 515, 561, 733, 8 1, 1115, 1128
6:28 341, 606. 19, 799, 1185
6:29 502, 515, 807, 1164, 1185
6:30 532, 1107, 1115
6:31 738, 934, 9 5, 1028, 1044
6:32 404, 419, 705, 771
6:33 542
6:34 411, 509, 547, 594, 765, 853, 1202
7:1 853, 890, 947, 983
7:2 534, 590, 718, 721
7:3 471, 685 bis, 738, 782
7:4 34, 286, 329, 430, 596, 931
7:5 582, 659, 1088
7:6 203, 538, 763, 853, 875, 988, 1185, 1200
7:7 357, 1023
7:7, 8 1213
7:8 773, 866
7:9 439, 82, 917, 1177
7:10 231, 1023, 1188
7:11 40, 1053, 1062, 1103, 1129
7:12 427, 704, 732, 733, 959, 1180
7:13 800
7:13 f. 1200
7:14 730, 739
7:15 272, 477, 548, 589, 727, 729, 800, 966
7:16 392, 66, 576, 1172
7:17 221
Matt.
7:19 402
7:20 425, 1148 bis, 1190
7:21 752 ter, 1107
7:22 367, 524, 525, 708, 917, 1157, 1175, 1213
7:23 559, 575, 1028, 1035, 1107, 1165
7:24 468, 479, 602, 727, 772, 905, 957, 1105 bis, 1107
7:25 361, 366, 606, 905, 1100, 1157
7:26 727, 752, 772, 957, 1105, 1107
7:27 1100
7:28 350, 532, 835, 883, 970, 1043
7:28 f. 966, 1207
7:29 394
8:1 597, 683, 1132
8:2 391, 1018, 1019, 1214
8:3 183, 391, 684, 770, 1028, 1216
8:4 330, 338, 430, 595, 683, 849, 854, 932, 949
8:5, 8 258
8:8 329, 635, 653, 657, 658 bis, 681, 819, 992, 1076
8:9 391, 817, 1180 bis, 1182
8:10 710, 844
8:11 334, 357, 408, 819
8:12 278, 298, 803
8:13 818, 968
8:15 367
8:16 392, 533, 653, 773
8:18 491, 646
8:19 282, 292, 674, 675, 796, 969
8:20 737, 757 bis, 800
8:21 748, 1152
8:22 690, 858
8:23 525, 560, 585, 683
8:24 679, 883
8:25 828, 879, 941
8:26 738, 813
8:27 292, 507, 543, 741, 917, 1001, 1176
8:28 597, 634, 708, 1171
8:29 348, 621, 729, 1136
8:30 499
8:31 948, 1009
8:32 339, 570, 607
8:34 528, 609, 628, 771, 995, 1046
9:1 691, 692, 770
9:2 315, 603
9:4 244, 395, 739 bis, 916, 1176
9:5 186, 617, 737, 916, 917, 1176, 1177, 1190
9:6 119, 319, 434, 443, 562, 907, 1203

Matt.
9:8 409, 710
9: 9 314, 602, 800
9:9 ft 215
9:10 316 bis, 529, 1043
9:11 244, 916, 1176
9:13 261, 844, 1163, 1164, 1166
9:14 402
9:15 300, 497, 559, 722, 733, 978
9:16 914, 278, 604
9:17 251, 292, 342, 352, 745, 880, 1025, 1148, 1220
9:18 433, 842, 1109, 1132
9:20 212, 1115
9:21 1019
9:22 264, 433, 462, 517, 575
9:24 512
9:25 300, 508
9:26 708 bis
9:27 463, 474
9:29 609
9:30 368, 430, 932, 949, 996, 1213
9:31 708
9:35 477, 655, 773
9:36 211, 212, 364 bis, 619, 968
9:37 1153
9:38 995
10:1 500, 809, 990, 1089, 1090
10:2 657, 767
10:4 760, 859, 1114
10:5 495, 500
10:6 358, 800, 881
10:8 488, 799
10:9 810
10:9 f. 852 bis
10:10 395
10:11 1185
10:13 874, 948, 1019
10:13 bis 849
10:14 437, 517, 642, 720, 813, 959
10:15 214, 257,,587, 663, 666
10:16 648, 653
10:18 1180, 1185
10:19 738 bis, 739, 972, 1045
10:20 401
10:21 403
10:22 357, 437, 584, 698, 702, 871, 889, 891, 1110
10:23 748 bis, 776, 976
10:24 632
10:25 393, 537, 740, 992
10:26 334, 472, 473, 485, 575, 577, 726, 816, 853, 960, 1001, 1158, 1164, 1200
10:26, 28 472
10:27 603, 705
Matt.
10:28 352, 472 bis, 473, 577 bis, 1046, 1213
10:28, 31 1170
10:29 355, 356, 510, 515, 603, 637, 638, 751
10:31 473, 519, 853
10:32 108, 436, 475, 524, 541, 588, 957, 959, 961
10:32 f 956
10:33 727, 951, 957, 959, 968
10:33, 38 956
10:34 603
10:35 284, 581, 607
10:37 633, 1108
10:37, 39, 40, 41 1108
10:37 f 956
10:38 956, 962, 1158
10:39 859, 1108, 1109, 1111, 1112
10:40 859, 1108, 1115
10:41 356, 389, 525, 595
10:41 f 593, 649
10:42 484, 653, 1108, 1202
11:1 683, 1102, 1121
11:3 748, 934, 1107, 1116
11:4 104, 258, 726
11:5 652, 816
11:7 765, 820, 1088
11:7-9 1166
11:8 354, 589, 653, 1088
11:9 1150
11:10 698, 703, 960, 1193
11:11 516, 587, 668
11:12 548, 816
11:13 367
11:14 1026
11:16 186, 477, 748
11:19 204
11:20 279, 670, 1078
11:21 260, 302, 023, 1011, 1015, 1193
11:22 646
11:23 505, 643, 653, 792 his, 975
11:25 337, 419, 523, 682, 696, 709, 965, 1097
11:26 461, 465, 769
11:27 682, 742, 752, 842, 878, 1024, 1164
11:28 235, 328, 625, 682, 924, 1023, 1193
11:28 f 873 bis
11:29 200, 523, 537, 687, 1182
11:30 262
12:1 696
12:1, 12 262
12:2 392, 523, 587, 1159

Matt.		Matt.	
12:3	726, 844	13:12	727, 957, 1156
12:4	491, 611, 714, 776, 1016, 1025, 10:32, 1084-5, 1119, 1130, 1188	13:13	233, 315, 993
		13:14	94, 531 bis, 539, 1004 bis, 1110, 1127
12:5	1035	13:15	201,-204, 367, 533, 844, 988, 1173
12:7	231, 904, 923, 1015		
12:9	683	13:17	339,367
12:10	511, 51'2, 916, 1024, 1176	13:18	501
12:12	292, 740, 999	13:19	315, 744, 773, 1105
12:13	401, 656, 746	13:21.	623
12:14	119, 994	13:23	695 bis, 1149
12:16	541,993	13:24	835
12:18	474, 842	13:25	244, 550, 571, 762, 1070, 1073
12:19	752		
12:20	365, 1212	13:26	348, 762, 799
12:21	889	13:27	418, 917, 1157, 1176
12:23	292, 697, 917	13:28	418, 430, 878, 915, 924, 935; 1175
12:24	590, 1036		
12:25	319, 403, 413, 817, 1105, 1106, 1116	13:29	319, 534, 637, 638, 1157, 1164, 1174
12:26	602, 750, 842, 376, 1008	13:30	479, 482, 626, 639, 645, 673, 974, 1075
12:26 f	452, 317		
12:26, 28	847	13:31	656, 715, 836, 1126
12:27	1003	13:31 f	713
12:28	425, 429, 842, 1003, 1190 bis	13:32	194, 343, 371 his, 1000, 1205
12:29	742, 757, 1018	13:33	503, 1110, 1126
12:30	607, 611, 1172	13:34	517, 648
12:30, 32	956	13:35	791, 1106
12:31	494, 500, 655, 779, 873 bis	13:33	233, 394, 698
12:32	594, 607, 1165, 1179	13:39	233, 768
12:34	830,924	13:40	969
12:35	408, 757, 776	13:41	598
12:36	416, 439, 459, 718	13:44	562, 580, 837, 863
12.38	515, 579, 742, 923	13:44, 48	715
12:39	955, 411	13:45 f	847
12:40	429	13:46	837, 844, 897, 900, 1110, 1126
12:41	453, 525, 501, 593, 828		
12:42	268	13:48	561, 837
12:43	413, 560, 582	13:49	550, 578, 648, 775
12:44	300, 548, 1041	13:51	310, 1150, 1175
12:45	516, 611, 749	13:52	399, 475, 521, 539, 559, 656, 727, 1206
12:50	679, 957		
13:1	314, 367, 615, 813	13:54	1091
13:2	602, 079, 1.126	13:55	757, 917, 1157
13:3	512, 652, 757, 764, 1088	13:56	625
13:4	107, 4 0, 564, 606, 695, 765, 1073 ter	14:1 f.	760
		14:2	694, 840, 842
13:4 f.	747	14:3	508, 585, 840
13:5	1159, 1171	14:5	481, 485, 817, 1129
13:5 f.	391, 1071, 1091	14:6	648
13:5-3	746, 749	14:7	611, 877, 963, 1028, 1031, 1039, 1047
13:6	794		
13:8	838, 833	14:8	233, 360, 434, 604; 866
13:9	956	14:9	1129
13:11	707	14:13	520, 550, 609

Matt.	
14:14	568
14:15	546, 613, 842
14:17	265
14:19	350, 367, 561, 1136
14:20	392, 1109
14:21	419, 648, 674
14:22	477, 857, 891, 975, 976 bis, 1048, 1081
14:23	224, 656, 657
14:24	469, 644, 775
14:25	523
14:25 f	603
14:26	580
14:28	601
14:29	601
14:31	508,739
14:33	546
14:34	219
14:35	546, 827
14:36	732, 956, 958, 993
15:2	564, 811, 972
15:2, 3	739
15:3	477
15:4	531
15:5	485, 789, 874, 875
15:6	845
15:9	482
15:11	559, 1166, 1172, 1187
15:14	488, 849
15:16	488, 546
15:17	773, 1035
15:18	561
15:19	408,427
15:20	1058, 1082
15:22	261, 463, 464
15:23	341, 484, 645, 1135
15:25	541
15:26	757
15:27	519, 577, 1116
15:28	463, 464, 1193
15:29	615
15:30	212, 615, 749, 1127
15:32	266, 275, 460, 602, 623, 726, 737
15:33	710, 990, 1089
15:34	740, 1176
15:35	491, 561, 602
15:36	311
15:37	219, 502
16:1	1182
16:2	213, 460
16:2 f.	147
16:3	1062 bis
16:5	812
16:6	472, 949, 1047, 1183
16:7	1028 bis
16:8	1028
16:9	506, 1045 bis
16:11	1047, 1160, 1164
16:12	1029, 1035, 1047, 1060, 1160
16:13	781 bis, 1103
16:14	695, 747, 749 bis, 1153
16:14 f	695
16:16	235, 678, 768, 781
16:17	255, 419, 842
16:18	174, 255, 408, 457, 510, 562, 604, 682, 780, 791, 875, 889, 1028, 1029, 1185, 1201
16:19	231, 265, 361, 907
16:20	679, 983, 993 bis, 1046, 1049
16:21	311, 579, 587, 1035, 1082
16:22	260, 272, 396, 541, 809, 875, 942, 1157, 1175
16:23	174, 498, 562
16:24	690, 742, 878, 890
16:25	425
16:26	485, 501, 935, 1023, 1129
16:27	576, 745, 882
16:28	489, 743, 794, 955, 957, 962, 1116, 1123
17:1	224, 787, 788
17:3	405, 562
17:4	425, 490, 538, 661, 750, 1009 bis, 1039
17:5	367, 396, 697, 776, 837
17:6	409
17:8	657
17:9	596, 597
17:10	487
17:11	870
17:12	484, 588 bis, 815, 842
17:14	513, 1132
17:15	802
17:16	334, 350, 368, 817
17:17	300, 548, 643, 917, 1101, 1176
17:19	224, 487, 739
17:20	268, 300, 308, 328, 548, 849, 889
17:22	594, 870, 1132
17:22 f	681
17:24	580
17:25	551, 748, 860, 1102, 1120
17:26	513, 1132, 1148
17:26 f	1190 bis
17:27	425, 573, 593, 657, 687, 792
18:1	668, 916, 1176
18:2	216
18:3	551

Matt.	
18:4	244, 281
18:5	525, 710
18:6	317, 594, 620, 992
18:7	537, 577, 580
18:8	406, 537, 593, 658, 661 bis, 687, 1084, 1188
18:9	276, 496
18:10	995, 996
18:12	541 is, 870, 1019
18:12 ff	213
18:13	1019, 1043, 1058
18:14	993
18:15	339, 348, 428, 505, 562, 645, 687, 842, 846, 949, 1019 bis, 1020
18:16	604, 649, 846
18:17	231, 539, 757, 846, 1019, 1027
18:18	361, 375, 733, 907
18: 19	715, 716, 1010
18:20	593, 56, 685, 776
18:21	281, 333, 56, 548, 674, 889, 917, 934, 1176
18:22	673 bis
18:23	611, 837
18:23 f.	109
18:24	233, 283, 674
18:25	514, 73 , 1048, 1068, 1132, 1172
18:26	538, 568, 570, 949
18:26 f	605
18:27	509
18:28	538, 883, 1025
18:30	309, 834, 885, 976
18:31	689, 690
18:32	464, 708
18:33	886, 19, 968, 1181
18:34	773
18:35	746 bis
19:1	517, 763
19:2	774
19:3	609, 916 bis, 1176
19:4	574
19:5	458, 595, 819
19:6	314, 845, 1165
19:8	626
19:9	646, 649, 747, 1028
19:10	545, 1008
19:11	706, 720, 752, 1163
19:12	233, 312, 367, 727, 1190, 1214
19:14	710, 11061 bis, 1094
19:16	675, 735
19:17	653 661, 738, 768
19:18f	766
19:20	1419, 476, 478

Matt.	
19:21	949, 1023, 1038, 1083
19:22	1110, 1127
19:24	192, 666
19:26	1096
19:27	309 bis
19:28	314, 565, 601, 1216
19:29	673 bis
19:30	280, 669
20:1	548, 638, 658, 728, 809
20:2	470, 510, 562, 599, 611, 769
20:3	586, 620
20:3, 6	320
20:4	190
20:6	470, 738
20:8	643, 1126 bis, 1203
20:9	673
20:10	766, 876, 1028, 1029
20:12	530, 658, 842
20:13	472, 510, 881
20:18	768
20:17	224
20:18	533, 794
20:19	349, 522, 595, 1072
20:20	482
20:20, 22	805
20:21	597, 750
20:22	291, 343
20:23	685, 721, 765, 793, 1153, 1187
20:24	619
20:25	1100
20:24	619
20:26 f .	874
20:28	175, 567, 573, 1088
20:29	561
20:30	463, 464, 491, 615
20:32	994
20:33	1213
21:1	267, 834, 971
21:2	644
21:3	742, 874, 943
21:4	1123
21:5	536, 560, 633
21:6	968, 1126
21:7	409, 477
21:8	279, 318, 404, 660, 690, 774, 779, 838
21:9	525, 670
21:10 f .	697
21:11	219
21:15	1122
21:16	649, 845
21:19	594, 603, 674, 943, 1024-5
21:21	767, 849, 1018, 1026
21:22	959
21:23	653, 740, 1188

Matt.

21:24 482, 740
21:25 300,613
21:26 443, 481
21:27 1185
21:28 949
21:29 1157
21:31 291, 737
21:32 334, 996, 1060, 1066, 1090
21:33 308, 340, 367, 399 bis, 575, 617, 727, 1214
21:35 696 23:20f
21:36 516, 667
21:37 473, 485, 819, 873
21:38 330, 697
21:39 1213
21:40 484, 880
21:41 119, 355, 727, 873, 960, 989, 1201, 1214
21:42 254, 410, 458, 587, 615, 655, 704, 718
21:43 873
21:45 787, 1029, 1035, 1041
21:46 334, 481, 965
22:1 409, 860
22:2 408, 957
22:3 885, 919
22:4 788
22:5 399, 691, 692, 695
22:7 834, 835
22:8 1153
22:10 424
22:11 485, 818, 1138 bis, 1139 bis
211 f 1172
22:12 1138
22:13 486, 828
22:15 148, 994
22:16 392, 550, 619
22:17 269, 1058, 1158, 1177
22.23 891, 1081
22.25 348
22:27 488, 668
22:28 833
22:30 392
22:34 840
22:36 660,740
22:37 774 bis
22:38 411, 661, 669
22:39 232, 530
22:40 317
22:42 760
22:43 480
22:44 310, 314
23:2 738, 786, 837, 866
23:3 733, 866
23:4 560, 1184, 1186

Matt.

23:5 542, 1075
23:12 957
23:14 892, 1116
23:15 278, 299, 652, 763, 1202
23:16 424, 475
23:16, 18 720
23:17 1177
23:17, 19 737
23:18 1146
23:20f 859
23:21 f 317
23:23 261, 309, 310, 337, 347, 845, 886, 919, 944, 1080, 1084, 1092
23:24 205, 606
23:25 642, 765
23:26 517, 640, 641, 642, 765
23:27 203, 260, 506, 530, 548
23:27, 28 1102
23:28 505, 633, 1153
23:30 312, 340, 394, 922, 1015
23:31 538
23:32 948, 1198, 1220
23:33 476, 926, 934
23:34 266,-333, 356, 515, 599
23:35 213, 255, 645, 715, 789
23:37 120, 204, 267, 486, 531, 689, 718, 917
23:39 548
24:2 565, 601, 828, 960, 1001, 1158, 1164
24:3 224 bis, 787
24:4 430, 933; 995
24:5 604
24:6 430, 500, 889, 932, 949, 996
24:9 353, 593, 889
24:12 357, 660, 858, 966
24:13 698
24:15 320, 434
24:17 231, 307, 328, 330, 548, 599, 856
24:18 453, 548, 586, 645, 856
24:20 495, 522, 523
24:21 207, 244, 731, 793, 1175
24:22 732, 772, 1016, 1163
24:24 990
24:26 409
24:27 792
24:28 871, 969
24:30 334, 336 bis, 357, 603, 611, 819, 871, 801
24:31 611, 775, 873
24:32 232, 341, 640
21:32-31 443
24:33 525, 604, 792, 972
24:35 757

Matt.

24:36 776
24:38 621, 639, 717, 974
24:39 975
24:40 675
24:40 f 750, 869
24:41 154, 231, 233, 675
24:42 292, 522, 740 bis
24:43 349, 708 740, 870, 922, 1014, 1015
24:44 718
24:45 768, 777, 783, 792, 845, 916, 1065, 1176
24:46 891
24:47 604
24:49 bis 849
24:50 715, 716, 718 bis
25:1 727, 1127
25:2, 4, 9 272
25:3 611
25:5 349, 367, 838, 883
25:4 611
25:6 495, 522, 595, 775, 793, 897
25:8 318, 879
25:9 244, 334, 689 818, 929, 933, 934, 995,1127, 1 59,1161, 1174
25:10 272, 763
25:11 1200
25:14 969, 1203
25:14 ff 1153
25:14-18 969
25:15 282, 696
25:16 746, 813
25:17 747
25:18 1118, 1125
25:19 562
25:20 835, 910, 1111, 1118
25:20, 24 1125
25:21 337, 601
25:21, 23 299, 604
25:24 718, 909, 910, 1034, 1111, 1116, 1118
25:24, 26 548
25:25 1045
25:27 886, 919, 922, 1014, 1015
25:29, 32 873
25:32 559
25:33 408, 1153
25:34 504, 516, 777, 793, 1106
25:35 340, 347, 1087, 1200
25:35-39 915
25:36 234
25:37 334, 339, 357, 819, 1123
25:38 917, 1123, 1176
25:39 234, 1123
25:40 733
25:40, 45 963

Matt.

25:41 777, 792, 1096
25:42 f 1157
25:43 312, 1157
25:45 1157, 1159
25:46 272, 1153
26:2 595, 612, 869, 870, 1072, 1090
26:4 263, 693, 511, 993
26:5 1202
26:6 263
26:7 512
26:8 739
26:9 510, 886
26:10 484, 842
26:12 603, 1075
26:13 842, 873, 969
26:14 1016
26:15 951, 1023, 1183 bis
26:16 674
26:18 234, 292, 491, 625, 744, 870
26:17 400, 935, 989
26:20 316
26:22 675, 743, 746
26:22, 25 917
26:23 525, 559, 585, 698, 707 bis
26:24 707, 886, 887, 920, 1014, 1015, 1160, 1169
26:25 859, 915, 1028, 1114, 1168
26:25, 64 842
26:26,25 768
26:27 519
26:28 213, 352, 567, 595, 618, 1106, 1116, 1118
26:31 523
26:32 490, 563, 558, 1039, 1074, 1092
26:33 1008, 1026
26:34 873, 1091
26:35 208, 628, 849, 875, 1026 bis
26:36 976
26:38 617, 643, 856
26:39 469, 653, 737, 1187
26:42 1012, 1019, 1020, 1160 bis
26:43 906
26:44 597
26:45 807, 882, 890, 948, 1183
26:46 312, 428, 430, 799 bis
26:47 774, 1127
26:50 602 bis, 696, 725, 917
26:51 496, 8051, 810, 1205
26:52 524, 534, 859, 1191
26:53 276, 312, 666, 681, 1214
26:54 851, 934
26:55 602, 813, 884
26:56 705
26:57 694

Matt.
26:58 883
26:59 505, 986
26:60 883, 1129
26:61; 581, 697
26:62, 562, 73S, 1126
26:63 475, 607, 781, 865, 883, 993, 1045
26:64 678, 679, 842, 915
26:65 212, 802, 842
26.66 504 bis, 658
26:67 212, 561, 694
26:69 313, 337, 674, 1182
26:70 517, 1136
26:71 547, 697
26:73 28, 103, 653, 1182
26:74 1028, 1035
26:75 910, 1028, 1091, 1113
27:1 653, 990, 1089 bis
27:3 609, 817, 858, 859, 860, 1112
27:4 109, 290, 339, 626, 736, 859, 860, 874, 942, bis, 1113, 1121, 1128
27:5 409, 807, 860
27:7 510, 537, 599 27:62
27:8 643, 848, 962, 1202
27:9 1201
27:10 967
27:11 678 bis, 768, 769, 915
27:12 473, 484, 1073
27:13 512, 741, 1177
27:14 473, 738, 751
27:15 606, 608, 884, 888
27:17 737, 1177
27:18 583, 841, 888, 898, 1029
27:19, 396,707,842 28:10
27:20 805, 835, 993
27:21 515, 577, 737
27:22 279, 845, 1149, 1190 484
27:2 516, 576 bis, 639, 644 ter,
27:25 678, 770, 874, 810, 942 1202
27:27 562, 593
27:28 483
27:29 465, 474, 598
27:30 593, 884
27:31 483 bis, 840
27:32 528, 993
27:33 411, 714, 881, 1105
27:34 317, 611, 1087
27:35 690, 811
27:36 604
27:37, 47, 54 697
27:38 675, 750, 792
27:39 473
27:40 308, 465, 581, 781, 892, 1107, 1116
Matt.
27:41 891
27:42 307, 419, 746
27:43 1028, 1029
27:44 409, 473, 480, 482, 487, 1106
27:45 602, 643, 772
27:46 29, 95, 215, 219, 261, 412, 463, 705, 739, 842
27:47 235, 1136
27:48 1136
27:49 . 374, 430, 877, 931, 991, 1045, 1118, 1128
27:51 297, 300, 580, 643 bis
27:52 1213
27:54 258, 780, 781
27:55 548, 727
27:55, 62 957
27:56 263, 501
27:57 208, 263, 475 bis, 487, 697, 800
27:58 697, 1078
27:60 542, 681, 715
27:61 405, 505, 639, 747, 1104 653, 728, 765
27:63 707 n., 816, 870, 1035
27:64 280, 669, 775, 794
27:65 949
27:66 611
28:1 517 bis, 519, 522, 622, 646, 672, 775, 841,
28:2 840-1
28:3 197
28:6 430, 845, 931, 949
28:7 842, 889
28:10 949,993
28:11 233
28:14 871, 1019
28:17 694
28:15 614
28:18 772, 842
28:19 475, 525, 592, 649, 684
28:19f 1128

Mark

1:1 781, 793, 795
1:2 606, 621, 956, 960
1:3 1106
1:4 496, 595, 782, 891, 892, 1127
1:5 592, 791, 1127
1:6 118, 204, 485
1:7 231, 722, 961, 1052, 1126
1:8 524
1:9 497, 525, 592
1:10 517 bis, 561, 577, 597
1:11 532, 768, 837
1:12 880

Mark
1:13 255, 611
1:14 1074
1:15 119, 453, 536, 540, 601
1:16 188
1:17 481, 656, 996, 1023
1:18 528
1:19 659
1:21 262, 559, 880
1:22 1127, 1140
1:23 589, 784 3:17
1:24 118, 263, 395, 488, 738, 762, 916
1:27 334, 540, 1181
1:29 255, 611
1:31 860 3:26
1:32 341, 348, 1214 bis
1:33 774
1:34 193, 315, 319, 367, 546, 1034, 1216
1:36 606, 766
1:37 1028 3:32
1:38 299, 424, 477, 595
1:39 118, 593
1:40 474, 849 ter, 1214
1:42 183, 559
1:44 118, 430, 619, 932, 949
1:45 300, 604, 1186
2:1 119, p25, 559, 581, 586, 593, 1120
2:2 119, 625
2:3 392, 1097
2:4 604, 969
2:5 866
2:7 118, 221, 697, 705, 1025, 1129
2:9 737, 885, 1215
2:10 119, 434, 907, 999, 1203
2:11 428, 855
2:12, 16 1028
2:13 119, 596
2:15 31 , 393, 1043, 1190
2:16 730, 917, 1029, 1035
2:17 990
2:18 786, 787, 1186
2:19 528, 587, 718, 733, 879 bis, 978 bis
2:20 118
2:21 212, 214, 1025
2:22 373
2:23 523, 763, 1043
2:24 523, 738, 1045, 1159
2:25 679
2:26 603, 628, 714
2:27 584
2:28 439
3:1 656, 789, 902, 1123
3:2 1024, 1045
Mark
3:3 775
3:5 368, 813
3:6 994, 1214
3:7 596, 611, 624, 838, 1183 bis
3:8 28, 620, 733, 898, 1123
3:10 562
3:11 118, 404, 884, 922, 958, 973
3:14 611, 1088
3:16 434, 441, 459, 488
411, 434, 713
3:20 627, 792
3:21 614 bis, 842, 845
3:22 210, 778, 1106
3:24 817, 879
602
3:27 1019
3:28 479, 732, 733, 1036
3:29 504 ter
3:30 589
3:31 991, 1115
404
3:34 521, 524, 617
4:1 525, 615, 625, 670
4:3 431
4:4 107, 339, 1073, 1153, 1183
4:4 ff 1152
4:5 747, 749
4:7 915
4:8 589, 592
4:8, 20 232
4:9 720, 956
4:10 244, 341, 482, 550, 653, 765
4:12 233, 315, 1173
4:13 876
4:17 300, 880, 1131
4:21 789, 917, 1028 bis
4:21, 24,-26, 30 883
4:22 653, 764, 960, 999, 1020, 1185, 1187
4:23 956, 1009, 1087
4:24 392, 471, 718
4:25 392, 720, 956, 957, 1158
4:26 603, 928, 968, 974
4:26 f. 987
4:27 470, 1213
4:28 160, 183, 273, 275, 276, 549, 687
4:29 309, 800, 972, 1214
4:30 407, 678, 736
4:31 516, 782, 1104, 1129
4:32 343, 371, 635
4:33 710
4:33 f. 884
4:34 224
4:36 549
4:37 231, 561, 800, 868, 1000

Mark
4:38 427, 602, 623, 679, 879, 965, 1034
4:39 330, 360, 428, 908, 950
4:41 405, 468, 699, 1001, 1182
5:3 223, 1165
5:4 231, 533, 581, 636, 828, 909, 966, 1070 bis, 1071 bis, 1079, 1081, 1091
5:5 244, 582, 793
5:6 300
5:7 279, 475, 483, 670
5:9 656
5:11 624 bis
5:13 283, 5S0, 607, 674, 884, 968
5:14 1043
5:15 868, 900, 910, 1099, 1117 bis, 1136
5:16 1032
5:18 1117
5:19 624, 733, 901, 1045,1177
5:20 733
5:22 625
5:23 297, 299, 324, 546, 800, 933, 943, 986, 994
5:24 774, 838
5 25 779, 892, 1115
5:25, 27 1105
5:25-27 1136
5:26 615, 635, 1110-11
5:27 619
5:28 208, 1018, 1025, 1027
5:29 232, 524, 1041 bis, 1216
5:30 508, 599, 1042, 1110, 1118, 1123, 1136
5:32 838, 883, 1088, 1136
5:33 542, 726, 858, 897, 1118
5:34 264, 462, 596
5:35 502, 845
5:37 528
5:39 1166
5:40 1119
5:41 29, 104, 465, 684, 714, 866, 881, 1119, 1215
5:42 497, 531, 1190
5:43 308, 1079, 1085, 1214
6:1 880
6:2 262, 705, 710 bis, 735, 771
6:3 255, 263, 697, 768, 785
6:4 269
6:5 368, 682, 751, 1011, 1013 bis, 1169
6:5,13 212
6:6 797
6:7 284, 673
6:8 438, 441, 657, 944, 950, 993, 1042, 1046

Mark
6:8 f. 1047 bis
6:9 413, 438, 633
6:10 969
6:11 257, 517, 647
6:12 993
6:13 483
6:14 694, 1111
6:16 698, 719
6:17 964
6:19 539, 542, 800, 1202
6:20 1103, 1123
6:21 408, 523, 786
6:22 482, 956
6:22-25 805
6:23 275, 502, 643, 655, 729, 775, 959, 1028, 1032, 1040, 1047
6:24 934
6:24 f. 805, 934
6:25 431, 611, 933, 943, 993, 1139, 1214
6:27 1084
6:29 310, 347
6:30 733
6:31 224, 367, 488, 653, 1087
6:33 530
6:34 482, 1140
6:36 279, 640, 670, 737, 1044, 1045
6:37 201, 309, 580, 678, 876, 934
6:3, 8 916, 949
6:39 460, 487, 604, 673, 1084
6:39 f. 284
6:40 460, 487, 673 bis, 1210
6:41 613
6:45 259, 975, 976
6:46 542, 684
6:47 550, 775, 884
6:48 400, 477, 528, 640, 1073
6:49 1029
6:52 604, 806
6:53 214, 623
6:55 234, 477, 604, 617 bis, 884, 953, 1029, 1049
6:56 208, 318, 733, 806 bis, 922, 957, 958, 969, 973, 984, 1025.
7:1 562
7:2 234, 399, 416, 705
7:3 806
7:3 f 439
7:4 256, 791, 807, 1087, 1218
7:5 790
7:6 367, 546
7:9 1198
7:10 793
7:11 233, 270, 433,1599, 1023, 1203
7:12 484, 1162

Mark

7:13 715, 716
7:15 642
7:18 233, 438, 548
7:18, 21, 23 300
7:19 118, 413, 438 bis, 1130, 1203
7:20 707
7:22 402
7:23 548
7:24 156, 334, 350, 368, 1094, 1162
7:25 560, 683, 722, 1205
7:26 155, 487, 884, 993
7:28 633, 634, 647
7:30 1123
7:31 491, 596, 775
7:32 210, 770
7:33 231
7:34 27, 29, 215, 714
7:35 349, 549, 835, 838. 885; 1213
7:36 278, 279, 488, 546, 663, 680, 733, 967
7:37 171, 297, 546
8:1 407, 696, 708, 737, 1131
8:2 460, 726
8:3 266, 275, 337, 1215
8:4 508,1028
8:6 561, 983
8:7 339, 1046-7
8:11 529, 614
8:12 94, 1004, 1024 bis
8:14 190, 841, 1060
8:15 471, 541, 577, 949
8:17 360, 409, 656, 789, 902
8:19 535
8:22 259, 807
8:23 508 bis, 916, 1027
8:24 423, 1041 bis
8:25 170, 368
.8:28 747, 1028
8:28 f. 1036
8:29 861, 1186
8:31 350, 579, 1035
8:34 727, 956
8:34 f. 956
8:35 193, 956, 957, 959, 961
8:36 472, 485, 689
8:37 109, 573, 935, 1214
8:38 472, 473, 485, 523
9:1 742, 957, 962, 1041, 1116, 1123
9:2 428
9:3 375, 723, 890, 903
9:4 268, 529
9:5 750
9:6 473, 738, 1028, 1031, 1044 657, 809 1025, 1065

Mark

9:10 1058, 1065
9:11 944, 730, 917
9:12 149, 219, 224, 316, 342, 602, 993
9:12 f. 1152
9:13 732
9:14 620
9:15 407, 597
9:17 624
9:18 184, 318, 850, 969
9:19 264, 464
9:20 436, 603 bis, 883, 1139
9:21 300, 740, 741, 974 bis
9:22 312, 472, 948
9:22 f. 340, 1214
9.23 118, 491, 766
9:25 465, 769, 1173
9:26 412, 968, 1091
9:28 221, 244, 514, 730, 917, 1060
9:30 348, 983, 994, 1055, 1156, 1214
9:31 815, 870
9:33 f. 118
9:34 334, 529, 668, 811, 818
9:35 775, 874, 961
9:36 800
9:37 710, 771, 954, 1163, 1187
9:38 964, 1123
9:39 726, 1164
9:40 630
9:41 484, 795; 930, 1033, 1034
9:42 663, 997, 1011
9:43 218, 1019
9:43, 45 661
9:43-47 849
9.45 231, 850
9:47 849, 1084
9:48 318
9:49 269, 534
9:50 145, 269 ter, 534, 767
10:1 801, 904, 968
10:2 794, 916
10:7 574
10:9 314
10:10 503
10:11 747, 1028
10:12 747
10:13 392, 538
10:16 318
10:17 418 bis, 474, 675
10:18 176, 276, 298, 479, 480, 656, 661, 916, 1176 bis
10:20 507, 842
10:21 302, 476, 541, 834, 1193
10:22 888
10:23 741

Mark

10:24 302
10:2, 780
10:2€ 1182
10:27 542, 1096
10:28 309
10:29 427, 726, 955, 961
10:30 611, 673, 727, 1020
10:32 376, 541, 888
10:33 533, 539, 882
10:34 333, 356
10:35 405, 501, 933, 994
10:35, 38 805
10:36 430, 994
10:37 750, 993, 1065
10:38 426, 478, 482, 485, 879
10:38 f 715, 717
10:39 312, 356, 1214
10:40 721, 1058, 1065, 1076
10:42 510
10:43 961
10:45 573, 632, 815
10:46 1204
10:47 760
10:51 933
11:1 259, 624, 971
11:2 505, 1165
11:3 738, 874, 943
11:5 1121
11:6 309
11:8 198, 593
11:9 620, 786
11:10 279
11:13 877, 1024 bis, 1027, 1043, 1045, 1190
11:14 854, 913, 939 bis, 940, 943, 1170, 1173, 1215
11:15 787
11:16 315, 431, 993, 1216
11:18 786, 838, 995
11:19 392, 922, 958, 973 bis
11:20 362
11:21 473
11:22 500
11:23 720, 880, 1048 bis
11:24 732, 1023, 1029,
11:25 150, 188, 351, 742, 958, 972
11:28 292, 740, 915, 916, 999
11:2c 1177
11:31 613
11:32 295, 443, 551, 887, 1029, 1034, 1109, 1203
12:1 190, 308, 409
12:2 519, 614
12:4 149, 551
12:5 213, 394, 694, 696, 1213
12:6 334

Mark

12:7 430, 768, 789, 931
12:8 339
12:10 718
12:11 234, 254, 410, 655, 704
12:12 858, 1060, 1078, 1183
12:13 233, 786
12:14 792, 850, 928, 934 bis, 1158, 1170, 1177
12:17 597
12:18 1046, 1082, 1171
12:19 309, 348
12:20 669
12:23 497, 587
12:24 700
12:26 199, 253, 395, 603, 1032 bis
12:28 410, 516, 613, 669, 740, 1042, 1123
12:30 774
12:30, 33 774
12:31 667, 688
12:32 1187
12:33 789, 890, 1058, 1081
12:34 297, 546, 551
12:37 660, 774, 775
12:38 441, 589, 1106
12:38 f 1199
12:38-40 458
12:40 233, 413, 1106, 1130
12:41 639, 844, 883, 884, 1032
12:41-44 838
12:42 411, 674, 713
12:43 700
12:44 833
13:1 413, 741
13:2 638, 930, 960, 962, 1174, 1175
13:3 224, 593, 644
13:4, 7 972
13:5 751, 995, 996
13:9 593, 603
13:10 535
13:11 233, 709, 738, 768
13:12 794
13:13 859, 889
13:14 320, 429
13:15 308, 599
13:16 453, 525, 536, 547, 548, 586, 593, 645
13:19 547, 710, 715 bis, 722, 731
13:20 424, 584, 752, 818, 1015
13:21 1170
13:22 891, 1075
13:24-27 873
13:25 353, 375, 782, 889, 1116
13:27 599, 775
13:28 232, 341, 350, 827
13:29 601

Mark
13:30 873, 975
13:31 873
13:33 1177
13:34 993, 1203
13:35 185, 471, 495, 1188
13:36 987
13:37 720
14:1 408, 590
14:2 988
14:3 253, 339, 342, 499, 512, 607, 1127, 1131
14:4 739, 916, 1176
14:5 341, 368, 511, 538, 541, 642, 666, 674
14:6 484, 564
14:7 299, 473, 879
14:8 551, 845, 1120
14:9 593, 969
14:10 675, 983
14:10 f. 309
14:11 1036
14:12 522, 980, 989
14:13 233, 356, 499, 573, 873
14:14 14 bis, 442, 737, 955, 960, 969, 989, 1045, 1049, 1177
14:15 185, 260, 538
14:19 105, 282, 450, 460, 555, 568, 606, 675
14:20 231, 525, 560
14:21 432, 1016, 1169
14:24 618, 629, 632
14:25 213, 708, 854, 930
14:27 538
14:28 355, 681, 765, 871, 1070, 1074, 1083
14:29 1008, 1026 bis, 1203
14:30 522 bis, 550, 873, 1091
14:31 529, 819, 850, 875, 1019, 1026
14:32 976
14:34 856
14:35 603, 883, 993
14:36 26, 20, 186, 461, 465, 561, 737
14:37 426, 1103
14:38 933, 994, 1153, 1170
14:40 319, 339, 1183, 1213
14:41 391, 392, 470, 487, 577, 800, 842, 866
14:43 312, 931
14:43 526, 786
14:44 679, 905
14:45 603
14:46 339, 684, 1213
14:47 292, 564, 684, 742, 805, 810, 828, 1110
Mark
14:48 526
14:49 550, 625, 1187, 1203
14:51 485, 529
14:54 314, 548, 625, 643, 807
14:55 367, 607, 883
14:58 1042
14:60 550, 648, 738, 775, 792, 917, 1158
14:61 695, 917
14:63 212
14:64 1036
14:65 391, 530, 617
14:67 118, 313
14:68 620, 1185, 1189
14:70 612
14:71 317, 371
14:72 509 bis, 550, 800, 861 bis, 885, 1091, 1109, 1127
15:1 787, 802, 812
15:3 367, 511, 884
15:4 292, 917
15:5 473, 484
15:6 291, 608, 710, 884, 922, 1154
15:6-10 905
15:7 255, 339, 366, 727, 841
15:9 1205
15:10 366, 841, 898, 1029
15:11 255
15:12 484, 718, 720
15:16 232, 411, 505, 643, 712
15:17 318
15:18 465
15:20 203, 483 bis, 542
15:21 183, 791
15:22 259, 411, 714
15:23 311, 695, 885
15:24 737, 916, 1044, 1176
15:25 793, 1180, 1183
15:29 231, 1193
15:30 307, 802, 861, 1113
15:32 308, 856
15:33 793 f., 794
15:34 29, 205, 261, 714
15:35 320
15:36 430, 742, 931
15:38 300 bis, 548, 550
15:39 597, 649, 652, 697
15:40 297, 300, 501, 780
15:41 529
15:42 965, 1139
15:44 430, 845, 916, 965, 1024, 1043, 1045, 1177
15:45 579, 760
15:46 542
15:47 501, 1043 bis

Mark
16:1 501
16:2 523, 602, 672
16:3 596, 597
16:4 1035, 1041, 1190
16:5 408, 485
16:6 817, 842
16:9 578, 672, 905
16:10 ff 708
16:12 293, 749, 792
16:18 208, 473, 1026
16:19 561, 1074
16:20 891, 1127

Luke
1:1 367, 841, 965, 1154
1:1-4 107, 121, 418, 432 bis, 1208
1:2 308, 347, 687, 1214
1:3 221, 244, 279, 392, 463, 464, 570, 771, 1039 bis, 1084, 1085
1:4 719
1:5 292, 395, 743, 760
1:6. 505, 641
1:7 523, 587, 906, 963
1:8 148, 505, 640, 658, 979, 1072
1:9 231, 509, 1060, 1065, 1113
1:10 888
1:12 418, 560, 602
1:13 480, 964
1:14 356, 357, 541, 871, 1078
1:14 f. 889
1:15 270, 505, 642, 871, 933
1:16 f. 889
1:16, 17 679
1:17 255, 477, 562, 683
1:18 739
1:20 208, 353, 594, 714, 717, 721, 728, 889, 960, 963, 975, 1173
1:21 260 bis, 532, 979, 1073, 1092
1:22 582, 680, 888, 1029
1:23 658
1:24 351, 617, 1217
1:25 224, 566, 721, 792
1:27 364
1:28. 611
1:29 741, 938, 1031, 1044, 1045
1:30 614, 647
1:31 480, 1202
1.33 602
1:34 1159
1:35 409, 560, 764, 1181
1:36 256, 267, 272, 275, 701, 790
1:37 752
1:38 940
1:39 255, 652, 708

Luke
1:40 255
1:41 505
1:42 417, 660
1:42-45 422, 1199
1:43 235, 398, 699, 992, 998
1:45 615, 689
1:46-55 942, 422
1:46-56 1199
1:47 532, 605, 1212
1:48 355, 547, 560
1:50 594
1:51 590, 793
1:51-53 837
1:53 510
1:54 508, 1001, 1086
1:56 535, 562, 628
1:57 1039, 1052, 1061, 1076
1:58 530, 610, 611
1:59 480, 523-, 605, 885
1:60 391 bis, 1164, 1187
1:61 234, 726
1:62 683, 739, 766, 884, 890, 938, 940, 1021, 1025, 1031 bis, 1044, 1046
1:63 457
1:64 297, 550, 885, 1127, 1201, 1213
1:66 409, 736, 739
1:67-79 422
1:68-79 1199
1:70 107, 762, 783
1:71 649
1:72 509, 1001, 1086
1:73 475, 479, 485, 718
1:74 540, 1039, 1076
1:75 470, 527
1:76 560, 678, 694, 1149, 1185
1:76, 78 f 1001
1:76 f., 79 990
1:79 231 bis, 341, 349, 371, 1056
1:80. 497
2:1 185, 417, 561, 708, 809, 1076, 1086
2:2 82, 510, 657, 669, 701, 704, 790, 793
2:3 417, 746
2:4 417, 578, 728 bis, 729, 966, 1039, 1071
2:5 216, 364, 801, 807, 809, 1080, 1214
2:6 1061, 1076
2:7 541, 1210
2:8 376, 477, 479
2:9 542
2:10 538

Luke
2:11 350
2:12 701
2:13 272, 404, 407, 412, 655, 656
2:14 242, 792 bis
2:15 393, 714, 1149
2:16 759, 760, 861, 1109, 1113
2:18 532, 619, 838
2:19 828, 884
2:20 429, 716, 717
2:21 457,.480, 621, 858, 978, 1039, 1075, 1076, 1091
2:22 491, 561, 609, 1088
2:22, 24 990
2:24 204, 1088
2:25 395, 602, 770
2:26 362, 816, 858,977 bis, 1030, 103o, 1047, 1080, 1084, 1085, 1091
2:27 47, 490, 501, 619, 858, 979, 1039, 1065, 1073; 1081, 1109
2:28 473, 593
2:29-32 1199
2:32 210
2.33 405, 412, 605
2.35 687, 986
2:36 723
2:37 232, 495, 518, 559, 576, 680 bis
2:38 523, 541, 574, 686
2:39 766, 800, 841
2:41 224, 270, 523, 608, 884
2:42 497
2:44 269, 469, 479, 496, 1036, 1060
2:46 491
2:47 883
2:48 402, 879
2:49 502, 86, 739, 767, 884, 916, 1034, 1176
2:50 680 bis
2:51 828, 884
3:1 189, 255, 510, 523, 788, 793
3:2 255 bis, 501, 603
3:5 458, 595, 652
3:6 772
3:8 853
3:9 870
3:10 850, 916, 934, 1176
3:12 243, 996
3.13 187, 667
3:14 409, 532, 541, 582, 626, 853, 1173
3:15 939, 940, 988, 996, 1031 1044, 1045, 1177
3:16 355, 520, 521, 722, 828
3:17 260, 503
Luke
3:18 474, 749 bis, 1181
3:19 258, 512, 619, 717, 719
3:20 605 bis
3:21 371, 771, 1073
3:22 795, 837 bis
3:23 1102
3:23-38 236, 761
3:24 215, 263
3.25 f 215
3:27 214, 236
3:29 215, 236
3:32 214
3:33 255
3.35 236
3:36 236
3:37 184
4:1 396, 880, 1185
4:3 781, 1009 bis
4:6 701, 771
4.7 234, 540
4:9 834
4:10 582, 762, 1068
4:13 505, 576, 771, 791, 974
4:14 607
4:15 1127
4:16 219, 299, 358, 523, 537, 881, 909
4:17 29, 103
4:18 425, 641, 901
4:20 757, 773
4:22 418, 496, 532, 651, 697, 838
4:23 402, 864, 1035, 1103, 1207
4:25 253, 255, 410, 523, 602, 604
4:26 . 219, 263, 399, 1016
4:26 f. 1187,1203
4:27 214, 603
4:28 1127
4:29 365, 603, 905, 990, 1000, 1089
4:30 550, 565, 581, 648, 775, 791, 905
4:34 391 bis, 488, 539, 738, 1193
4:35 230-1, 472, 482, 484, 648, 860, 1172
4:36 735, 1001
4:37 261
4:38 619
4:40 800
4:41 404, 1035, 1041, 1103
4:42 643, 1061 bis, 1078, 1089, 1094 1171
4.43 474 748, 776
5:1 375, 615
5:1, 12 393

Luke
5:1, 12, 17 1183
5:2 1 559
5:3 597, 733
5:4 431, 860, 891, 1102, 1121
5:5 339, 582, 604, 774, 1186
5:6 212, 318, 885, 1219 bis
5:7 529, 616, 745, 748, 769, 1039, 1068
5:9 433, 628, 717
5:10 353, 504, 528, 765, 889
5:12 334, 792, 817, 849
5:14 442, 537
5:17 323, 393, 788, 888, 906
5:18 396
5:19 494, 506, 550, 561, 636, 652, 740 bis, 1029, 1044, 1202
5:20 342, 1216
5:20, 23 315
5:21 703
5:23 896
5:24 434, 907, 1203
5:25 642
5:26 845
5:27 263, 612
5:29 263
5:30 611
5:32 844
5:33 478
5:34 978, 1085
5:36 560, 1025, 1027, 1182
5:37 356
5:38 157, 373, 486, 1097
6:1 168, 393, 533, 560, 1043
6:2 235, 425
6:3 300, 726, 971
6:3 f. 1045
6:4 435, 714, 1032, 1039, 1084
6:6 393, 684, 748
6:7 1103
6:8 680, 800
6:11 327, 854, 885, 938, 940 bis, 1021
6:12 500, 582, 1040, 1049, 1058, 1085
6:13 477, 577
6:13-17 428
6:14 480
6:16 501, 767
6:17 28, 273, 579, 613
6:17 f. 714
6:20 593, 681, 683, 770, 910
6:21 333, 356
6:22 641, 834
6:23 208, 523, 855
6:24 1107, 1187
6:24 f. 1193
6:25 333, 356, 459, 466, 1107, 1193
6:26 208
6:27 473
6:27 f. 428
6:28 473 bis
6:29 518, 746
6:30 855, 890, 1214
6:32 1019, 1026
6:32 f. 740
6:33 687, 850, 1019
6:34 . 576, 720, 721, 1010
6:35 223, 476
6:37 930, 1164, 1182
6:37 f. 948
6:38 184, 213, 718, 828, 1136
6:39 917 ter, 1157, 1175
6:40 1105
6:41 692
6:42 312, 597 bis, 659, 686, 932, 980, 1138, 1139, 1214
6:45 676, 762, 763
6:47 436
6:48 212, 214, 232, 256, 365, 530, 551, 779, 909, 1071, 1081, 1091, 1105, 1136
6:48 f. 712
6:49 212, 648, 785, 1105, 1114
7:1 841, 965 bis, 971
7:2 546
7:3 582, 995
7:4 724, 872, 884, 961, 996
7:5 367
7:6 518, 807
7:7 1023
7:8 767, 856, 865
7:9 290, 474
7:11 . 523, 530, 547, 660, 774
7:12 232, 536, 537, 680, 1116, 1183
7:16 842
7:17 586
7:18 194, 258
7:19 . 742, 1108, 1116, 1118
7:19 f. 748
7:21 818
7:24 1080
7:24 f. 857
7:25 364, 816
7:27 872, 960
7:28 234, 504
7:30 535, 594
7:32 778, 792, 1107
7:33 519, 1189
7:35 837

Luke
7:36 742
7:37 586, 1035
7:38 525, 533 bis, 645, 799
7:38, 44 262
7:39 292, 727, 736, 741 bis, 887, 923, 1012, 1014, 1048, 1049, 1177
7:40 742, 1087
7:41 201, 668, 749, 750, 920
7:42 393, 515, 737
7:42 f. 608
7:43 659, 1034, 1048
7:43, 47 720
7:44 701
7:45 581, 653, 717, 978, 1102, 1121
7:47 647, 720, 722, 774, 777, 962, 966
7:49 703, 724, 735, 961
8:1 587, 608
8:1, 22 680
8:3 214, 215, 599, 749
8:4 313, 505, 583
8: 5 107, 478, 695, 990, 1072, 1073, 1153
8:5f 749
8:5 ff 1152
8:6-8 350, 749
8:7 216, 341, 644
8:8 284, 777
8:9 736, 938, 1031
8:10 993
8:11 704
8:12 233
8:13 625, 793
8:14 1164
8:14 f. 704
8:15 176, 600, 1182, 1201
8:16 318, 634
8:17 726, 64, 1001, 1158, 1164
8:18 957, 962, 1170
8:19 530
8:20 349, 881
8:21 700
8:22 675, 680
8:23 834, 838, 884, 885
8:24 787, 879, 1200
8:25 541, 697, 917, 1176
8:26 573, 638, 639, 728
8:27 527, 528, 809, 841
8:28 234, 463, 464, 519
8:29 212, 262, 318, 392, 527, 581, 827, 905
8:29 f. 543
8:30 404
8:31 252, 404
Luke
8:33 607
8:34 339
8:35 339
8:36 1043, 1045
8:37 1186
8:38 203, 342, 1214
8.39 608, 733
8:40 107, 587, 891, 1073
8:41 697
8:42 232, 680, 827
8:43 367, 1105, 111
8:45 828
8:46 234, 742, 910, 1035, 1041, 1042, 1103, 1109, 1118, 1123
8:47 718, 721, 726 bis, 966, 1045 bis, 1032
8:48 264, 462
8:49 742, 827, 867, 890, 895
8:50 549
8:51 752
8:52 475, 809, 853, 1166
8:53 341, 827, 838
8:54 264, 465, 769
8:55 1049, 1085
8:56 1109
9:1 427
9:3 571, 944, 1092, 1189
9:3-5 1047
9:5 437, 733
9:6 299, 608
9:7 233, 792, 1071, 1109
9:7 f. 743, 750, 1049
9:8 636, 747
9:9 710
9:9, 13 1186
9:10 691, 733
9:11 367
9:12 800
9:13 201, 666, 751, 762, 1016, 1017, 1025, 1172
9:14 482, 487, 968
9:15 771
9:16 561
9:18 371, 375, 891
9:18, 20 1036
9:18 f. 1035
9:19 695, 1047
9:22 579, 762
9:23 681, 688, 690, 811
9:24 641, 688, 689, 698
9:25 816, 1023, 1129
9:27 473, 743
9:28 107, 434, 460, 968
9:29 163, 748, 1073
9:30 957

Luke
9:31 343, 884
9:32 529, 533, 582, 628, 766
9:33 1720, 726, 750, 931, 1030, 1048
9:33, 41 299
9:34 431, 885
9:35 507, 818
9:36 337, 364, 657, 680, 720, 776, 834, 897 bis
9:37 393, 529, 774
9:38 232, 541
9:39 231, 296
9:40 993
9:41 264, 299, 463, 464, 623
9:42 212, 818
9:43 537, 716, 717
9:43-45 883
9:45 509, 812, 998,1212
9:46 424, 491, 585, 739, 766, 890, 93S, 940, 1021, 1031, 1044, 1046, 1176
9:47 614
9:48 668, 698, 954
9:49 611, 838, 864, 885, 892, 964, 1030, 1041, 1048
9:50 607, 720, 956, 962, 1158
9:51 349, 426, 951, 1002, 1042, 1068, 1183
9:52 621, 967, 987, 990, 1089, 1091
9:54 561, 858, 878, 935, 1046, 1080
9:55 731, 740 bis
9:56 748
9:57 969
9:58 969, 1044, 1045
9:59 1039, 1084
9:60 582, 1201
9:61 536, 593
9:62 1097
10:1 284, 299, 571, 655, 673 bis, 749, 884, 969
10:3 644
10:4 608, 853, 1172
10:5 537
10:6 334, 357, 394, 561, 819, 874, 948, 1025
10:6, 8, 10 849
10:7 408, 561, 615, 709, 757
10:8 959, 1115
10:8, 10 437
10:11 401, 539, 699
10:15 643, 678
10:16 418
10:17 543, 1181
10:18 843, 864, 883, 910, 1041, 1012, 1114, 1116, 1123 bis

Luke
10:19 875, 889, 590, 1061, 1076, 1165, 1175
10:20 965, 1035, 1173 bis
10:21 464, 524, 709, 764, 788
10:22 845, 959
10:24 339, 678, 843
10:25 743, 796
10:26 423, 917, 1176
10:27 765
10:28 949
10:29 234, 547, 1182
10:29, 36 646, 765
10:30 521, 524, 542, 634, 1113
10:31 165
10:31 f. 565, 572, 613
10:34 508, 691, 817, 1220
10:34 f. 219
10:35 107, 243, 291, 602, 681, 688, 729, 959 bis, 964, 1039
10:36 501, 561, 585, 593, 908
10:37 611
10:38 633, 743
10:39 289, 613, 696
10:40 529, 560, 565, 573, 618, 627, 816, 1087, 1090
10:40 f. 620
10:41 816
10:42 518, 559, 562, 728, 810, 819
11:1 371, 375, 429, 742 bis, 891, 952, 1036, 1042, 1181
11:2-4 852
11:3 159, 487, 766, 855, 1214
11:4 315, 335, 541, 744, 773, 853, 880, 963, 1216
11:5 185, 738, 875, 930, 934
11:6 720, 726, 960, 965, 996
11:7 300, 340, 362, 593, 853, 947, 1170
11:8 244, 518, 733 bis, 1012, 1026, 1027, 1070, 1071, 1148 bis, 1149
11:9 f. 357, 1213
11:9, 10 f 1213
11:11 436, 490, 573, 738
11:11 f. 439
11:13 548, 599, 1045, 1204
11:14 1119
11:15 515
11:15 f. 749
11:17 750
11:18 750, 891, 1081
11:21 690, 779
11:22 231, 366, 580, 904, 971
11:24 969
11:26 775

Luke

11:27 219
11:28 1151
11:29 500
11:30 1190
11:32 963
11:33 231, 764
11:34 284, 971
11:35 995, 1045, 1169
11:38 32, 621, 808, 965, 1035
11:39 399, 505, 642, 643, 786
11:40 547, 642
11:42 315, 477, 499, 500, 800, 919, 1171, 1193
11:44 642
11:45 473
11:46 484
11:47 1153
11:48 529, 1153 bis, 1190
11:49 1181, 1202
11:50 213, 796
11:51 789
11:52 265
11:54 474
12:1 31, 577, 587, 623, 696, 714, 722, 727, 802, 818, 952, 953, 1091, 1192
12:2 627, 818 bis, 1158
12:3 696, 722, 724, 818, 952, 962
12:4 72, 577, 704, 752, 935, 1046, 1087, 1213
12:5 232, 560, 818, 858, 950, 979, 1046, 1074, 1092
12:6 751, 818, 917, 1157, 1182
12:7 818 bis, 1186
12:8 108, 93, 459, 475, 524, 541, 588, 684, 955, 956, 957 bis, 959
12:8 f. 1114
12:8, 10 439
12:9 642, 812, 818, 819
12:10 436, 459, 473, 594, 718, 818, 957
12:11 334, 561, 739, 787, 1170
12:12 523, 709, 726, 776
12:13 742 bis
12:14 480
12:15 472, 476, 543, 598, 772, 802, 807, 933, 949, 979, 994, 1073, 1183 bis
12:16 349
12:18 699
12:19 594, 902
12:20 264, 392, 406, 463, 464, 523, 541, 816, 820
12:21 689
12:23 411, 516, 654
12:24 606, 1035, 1183

Luke

12:26 669, 670, 1012, 1024, 1160 bis
12:28 184, 352, 1212
12:29 609
12:30 419, 705
12:31 1187
12:32 231, 261, 465
12:33 215, 504, 1100, 1109, 1137, 1172
12:34 969
12:35 313, 314, 328, 330, 360, 375, 890, 908
12:36 597, 1044, 1045, 1110, 1132
12:38 158, 523, 794, 1018, 1025, 1182
12:39 471, 740, 922, 1014
12:40 718
12:41 1180
12:42 604
12:43 891
12:44 604, 866
12:46 718
12:47 479, 485, 626, 559, 1112, 1114
12:47 f 653
12:48 436, 477, 479, 485, 659, 718,720
12:49 302, 739, 917, 1176, 1193
12:50 302, 729
12:51 1187, 1188
12:52 361, 375, 907
12:52 f 605
12:54, 57 1180
12:57 109, 686
12:58 559, 909, 967, 988, 1062, 1079, 1081, 1147
12:59 775, 976
13:1 290, 317, 611, 613, 686
13:2 616 bis, 661, 801, 1029, 1175
13:3 849
13:4 253, 283, 616 bis, 724
13:6 906, 1115, 1117
13:6 f. 1128
13:7 739 bis, 879, 977, 1115
13:8 528, 620, 976
13:9 208, 394, 594, 874, 924, 942, 1018, 1023, 1025, 1203
13:10 1110
13:11 627, 1119
13:12 264, 518
13:13 367, 770
13:13, 17 885
13:14 920, 965
13:15 746
13:16 283, 460, 518, 887, 919
13:17 542, 605

Luke
13:19 458, 595, 690, 791
13:19, 21 715
13:21 656
13:23 916, 1024
13:24 434
13:25 188, 319, 800, 978, 1102
13:25, 26 324
13:27 559, 773
13:28 188, 324, 339, 348, 876, 972, 1218
13:29 254
13:32 653, 1202
13:33 393, 652, 1198, 1202
13:34 204, 219, 267, 348, 635, 689, 718
13:35 972 bis, 976
14:1 613, 811
14:2, 16 743
14:3 787
14:6 574
14:7 360, 477, 800, 811, 883, 1032, 1202
14:8 907
14:8f 988
14:9 910
14:10 186, 308, 328, 338, 561, 910, 984, 988
14:11 1108
14:12 988
14:13 (21) 192
14:14 574
14:15 356
14:16 262
14:17 186, 656
14:18 109, 360, 375, 480, 550, 653, 1041, 1108, 1122
14:18f 1110
14:18, 19 809
14:18-20 842
14:19 818
14:19 f 748, 902
14:21 427, 787
14:23 789
14:24 473, 506
14:25 774
14:26 688, 789, 1012
14:27 1159
14:28 1024, 1045
14:29 1173
14:30 770, 1102
14:31 281, 531, 589, 748, 1045
14:32 546
14:33 515, 720, 744, 1158
14:34 269, 889, 934
14:35 535
15:2 529, 697
15:4 976
15:4, 7 213
15:4, 8 738
15:6 562 563, 786 805
15:6, 9 1035
15:7 661, 1188
15:8 738, 917
15:9 787, 805
15:11 743
15:13 771, 1163
15:14 253, 410, 608, 680
15:15 675, 817
15:16 208, 716, 883 885
15:17 510, 532, 741 828
15:18 594, 874
15:19 658, 1076, 1080
15:19, 21 1061
15:20 1110
15:21 845
15:22 483, 649
15:24 701, 904, 906
15:25 507, 792
15:26 407, 411, 736, 890, 938 bis, 940, 1031
15:27 881, 893
15:28 885
15:29 470, 477, 879
15:30 697
15:31 685
15:32 834, 842, 887
16:1 529, 652, 697, 703, 966, 1140
16:2 312, 736, 916, 1164, 1176, 1214
16:3 480, 483, 559, 600, 1060, 1078, 1102
16:3 f. 935
16:4 308, 518, 827, 842, 893
16:5 201
16:6 499
16:8 496, 633, 651, 667, 779
16:9 254 510, 598
16:10 658, 660 782 bis
16:11 1009
16:11, 31 1012
16:12 288 bis
16:13 251, 508, 748
16:14 472, 705,778
16:15 1108
16:16 221, 645, 975
16:17 186, 921
16:18 579 bis, 910 bis
16:19 485, 810, 883
16:20 361, 364, 366, 905, 910
16:21 1186
16:22 1085
16:23 408, 502, 586

Luke
16:24 495, 775
16:25 341, 696
16:26 548, 561, 800, 896
16:26, 28 bis 986
16:27 1046
16:27 f 1046
16:28 986
16:29 268
16:30 791
16:31 819, 871, 1210
17:1 393, 720, 721, 996, 1002, 1040, 1059, 1060, 1068, 1094, 1171
17:2 212, 479, 485, 560, 661 992, 997
17:3 477, 542, 689, 802, 1202
17.4 505, 769
17:5 310, 948
17:6 887, 921, 1015, 1022
17:7 338
17:8 340, 738, 869, 976, 1045, 1215, 1218
17:9 f. 349
17:10 920
17:11 550, 560, 562, 565, 581, 648, 791, 1012
17:12 367
17:14 1042
17:15 611
17:17 917, 1157
17:21 505, 641
17:22 224
17:23 392
17:24 652, 792, 1202
17:25 579
17:27 717, 884, 975
17:28 968
17:29 791
17:29 f 522, 718
17:30 208, 968
17:31 308, 440, 442, 708, 724, 957, 959
17:32 506
17:33 193, 957
17:34 f 748, 749
17:35 602, 889
17:37 969
18:1 626, 997, 1003, 1049, 1060, 1075
18:2 743
18:4 688, 1012, 1026, 1027
18:5 201, 244, 966, 1039, 1148 bis, 1149
18:6 496, 651
18:7 495, 930, 934, 1158
18:7 f. 802
18:8 589, 916, 1176
Luke
18:9 342, 540, 605, 778, 1107
18:10 748, 990, 1080, 1087-8, 1088
18:11 502, 697, 700, 965, 1035, 1159, 1188
18:12 505, 646, 769, 880
18:13 231, 561, 756, 858
18:14 661, 703, 708
18:18 675
18:22 541
18:25 192, 1058
18:29 234
18:28 310
18:29 641, 726
18:30 284, 673
18:31 539
18:32 1190
18:33 762
18:34 751
18:35 743
18:36 890, 938, 1022, 1031 bis, 1042, 1044
18:37 1035
18:38 463, 464
18:39 532, 664, 800
18:41 924, 935
19:1 472, 476, 563, 800
19:2 162, 457, 679, 723
19:3 423, 488, 580, 738
19:4 186, 201, 472, 476, 494 bis, 547, 652, 709, 983, 1202, 1205
19:5 328, 861, 1127
19:5 f. 1109, 1127
19:7 614
19:8 199, 275, 502, 742, 870, 880
19:8f. 1008
19:9 963
19:10 411, 764, 1109
19:11 551, 640, 1071, 1126, 1127
19:12 272
19:13 690, 976, 978
19:14 879, 886, 919
19:15 107, 308, 737, 841, 1044, 1048, 1049, 1214
19:16-20 749
19:17 299, 330, 375, 890, 950
19:20 361, 375, 776, 906 bis
19:21 997
19:23 922, 1014, 1023, 1129
19:29 154 bis, 232, 259, 267, 458, 780
19:30 644
19:31 850
19:35 212, 799
19:36 318

Luke

19:37 154, 412, 619, 623, 624 bis, 719
19:40 325, 333 bis, 356,361,801, 873, 907, 1008, 1010, 1217
19:41 834
19:42 483, 523, 793, 835, 842,1023, 1203
19:43 617, 873, 907, 1183
19:46 480,
19:47 470, 487, 550, 888
19:48 190, 317, 340, 766, 771, 1127, 1217
20:1 523
20:2 1177, 1188
20:3 1180
20:4 1177
20:6 163, 891, 903, 1030, 1046, 1081
20:7 1036, 1038, 1171
20:9 308, 470
20:10 324, 519, 522, 872, 984
20:11 748
20:11 f . 551, 1078
20:12 94, 822
20:14 497
20:15 876
20:16 939 bis, 940
20:17 718
20:19 626, 1183
20:20 481, 508, 787, 990, 1036, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1089.
20:22 1158
20:24 393
20:25 425, 767, 1154
20:26 508, 573
20:27 458, 1094, 1171
20:28 849
20:34 150, 1213 bis
20:35 509, 598, 782
20:35f 1189
20:36 879
20:37 253,1034
20:40 1162
20:42 199, 686
20:47 564
21:2 743
21:5 153, 187
21:6 416, 439, 459, 565, 601, 960
21:8 932-3, 996
21:11 219, 1201
21:12 622
21:12, 17 641
21:14 334, 818, 1094, 1171
21:15 573
21:16 599
21:17 375, 636, 878, 889

Luke

21:18 597
21:19 681, 683, 871
21:20 1041
21:22 1061, 1076, 1088
21:23 216
21:24 534, 889, 974
21:25 262, 419, 794 bis, 795
21:26 566
21:27 876
21:33 873
21:34 186, 272, 400, 542, 550, 657, 708, 996, 1213 bis
21:36 476
21:37 154 bis, 232, 267, 458,470
22:1 416, 498
22:2 427, 766, 985
22:2-4 1031
22:4 766, 1031, 1046
22:5 350
22:6 517, 1061, 1068, 1076
22:6, 35 639
22:7 887
22:10 333,356
22:11 955, 969, 1045, 1205
22:12 185, 260
22:15 531 bis, 621, 978, 1075
22:16 976
22:18 577
22:19 685
22:20 213, 1060, 1074
22:22 1152, 1153
22:23 427, 430, 739, 766, 890, 938, 1031 bis
22:23f 1046
22:23, 24 739
22:24 766, 938, 1031
22:25 510
22:26 1214
22:26f 1140
22:27 737
22:28 1108
22:29 581
22:30 232, 1216
22:32 300, 1139
22:33 659
22:34 548, 908, 976 bis, 977 bis, 1036, 1094, 1171
22:35 219, 750
22:37 401, 611, 766, 818
22:38 411
22:40 603
22:41 469, 559
22:42 193, 339, 1023, 1203, 1214
22:44 231, 339
22:45 580
22:47 477

Luke

22:48 311, 533
22:49 374, 456, 502, 590, 620, 876, 878, 916, 934, 935, 1024 bis, 1109, 1118, 1215
22:50 156, 292, 675, 742
22:52 611
22:53 704
22:54 559
22:55 617, 644
22:56 697
22:58 612, 653, 678
22:59 550, 697, 743, 746
22:61 483, 509, 873, 1091
22:63 628
22:6.5 1130
22:66 1179
22:67 1020
22:70 678, 695, 915
22:71 519, 649
23:1 404, 412
23:2 339, 1039, 1041 bis, 1094, 1123
23:4 786
23:5 413, 548, 1126, 1203
23:6 916
23:7 561
23:8 597, 884
23:11 483, 628
23:12 226, 1289, 405, 625, 686, 690, 888, 1103, 1121
23:14 219, 511, 560, 720, 750, 966, 1141
23:15 534, 542, 794, 820, 903, 1186
23:18 170, 348, 530, 760
23:19 323, 375, 860
23:21 695
23:23 805
23:26 517, 645
23:28 475, 1173
23:29 219
23:30 338
23:31 195, 587, 588, 929, 934
23:32 749
23:33 696, 792, 794
23:35, 37 1009
23:38 159, 604
23:39 409
23:41 720
23:44 1183
23:45 775
23:47 700
23:49 366, 560, 778
23:50 176
23:51 434, 529
23:53 316, 375, 906, 1165
23:54 493, 885

Luke

23:55 726, 729, 1032, 1043
24:1 274, 495, 522, 672, 718, 841
24:2 575
24:3 225
24:4 267
24:5 611
24:6 1032
24:7 649, 1049
24:10 214, 501, 767
24:11 404, 540
24:13 263, 424, 469
24:14 529, 625, 883
24:14, 25, 31 680
24:16 518,765, 1061, 1171
24:17 572, 625, 703, 735, 835, 1202
24:18 172, 235, 549, 656, 657, 1183
24:19 399, 419, 651, 735, 740 bis
24:19 f. 1046
24:20 731, 732, 985, 1045, 1177
24:21 216, 244, 392, 424, 628, 679, 701, 771, 884, 978, 1029, 1035, 1148 bis, 1185, 1186
24:22 550, 657, 1181, 1186
24:23 489, 1028, 1038, 1039
24:24 968
24:25 658, 659, 716, 1061, 1077
24:26 887, 919
24:27 367, 566
24:28 297, 298
24:29 625, 765, 792, 1065, 1088
24:30 1039
24:31 575, 682, 1213
24:32 367, 888, 974, 1212
24:34 334, 842
24:35 534, 587, 726
24:38 587, 739
24:39 203, 260, 1011
24:41 580, 743
24:42 159
24:45 315, 1036, 1212
24:46 858, 1080 bis, 1081
24:47 413, 491, 535, 946, 1126, 1203
24:50 643, 683, 1205
24:51 561, 581, 1072

John

1:1 135, 579, 623, 625, 758, 761, 767, 792, 794, 795, 883
1:1-18 915
1-2 628, 761
1.9, 7 700
1:2-8 918

John
1:3 751
1:4 243, 768, 801
1:5 1183
1:6 416, 434, 460, 534, 615, 707
1:7 583, 703, 707, 723, 850
1:7 f 915
1:7, 22 619
1:8 505, 707, 708, 1187
1:9 777, 891, 1118
1:9, 41 762
1:10 834
1:11 502, 691 ter, 767, 834, 1157
1:11 f. 563
1:12 339, 732, 778, 834, 1076, 1107, 1217
1:13 408, 534
1:14 275, 276, 394, 407, 413, 505, 767, 794, 818, 829 ter, 1204
1:15 280, 434, 438, 473, 484, 516, 640, 662, 670, 801, 887, 895, 896, 1111
1:15 ff. 964, 1034
1:16 407, 505, 574, 829, 1181
1:17 1200
1:18 133 n., 364, 536, 559, 586, 593, 614, 656, 707, 708, 829, 893, 896, 906
1:19 704, 905, 915
1:19 ff. 897
1:20 1205
1:20 f. 918
1:21 233, 768
1:21 f. 1157
1:24 905
1:25 1012, 1135, 1160 bis, 1165
1:26 505, 550, 644, 720
1:27 503, 658 bis, 961, 992, 996
1:28 970
1:29 391, 1193
1:29-42 868
1: 30 234, 629, 632, 677
1:31 904
1:32 408, 440, 602, 792, 893, 897
1:32, 34, 41 896
1:33 440, 677, 707, 708, 724
1:34 677, 893, 896
1:35 366
1:37 1042
1:38 411, 416, 433, 465, 1044, 1123
1:39 299, 470, 714, 813, 871, 875, 949, 1044
1:40 519, 614 bis, 762, 779, 785

John
1:41 416, 433, 549, 657, 691 bis, 692, 714, 762 bis, 770, 795, 881, 893, 897
1:41 (42) 215
1:42 255, 376, 411, 678, 835
1:44 578, 598
1:45 578, 720, 782
1:46 428, 598, 743, 875, 949
1:47 1100
1:48 621, 634, 635 bis, 683, 765, 858, 978, 1075
1:49 769, 781, 1126
1:50 277, 396, 476, 634, 871, 1028, 1029, 1123
1:51 364, 423
2:1 762
2:2 428
2:2, 12 405
2:4 539, 736
2:5 243, 729
2:5-8 855
2:6 571, 906
2:7 510
2:9 474, 506, 507, 841
2:9, 23 1184
2:10 218, 277, 643, 678
2:11 216, 701-2, 704, 771, 781
2:12 470, 680, 681, 686
2:14 265, 427
2:15 427
2:16 855, 950
2:17 500, 903, 1029
2:18 311, 433, 964, 1034
2:19 586, 856, 948, 1023
2:20 283, 365, 367, 523, 527, 833, 1183
2:21 399, 498, 707, 708
2:22 715 bis
2:23 523, 760, 1184
2:24 226, 287, 476, 686, 688, 689, 765, 885, 966, 1071, 1186
2:24f. 584
2:25 1029, 1043, 1176
3:1 395, 434, 460, 599, 782, 1185
3:2 611 bis, 793
3:3 ff 857
3:3, 5 751
3:5 795
3:6 1200
3:7 852 bis
3:8 299, 342, 548 bis, 800, 1177
3:10 678, 768, 1175
3:11 407
3:12 654, 1009, 1012, 1160

John
3:13 600, 859, 1183
3:14 968
3:16 135, 437, 753, 758, 762, 770, 1000 bis
3:17 1166
3:18 897, 898, 963, 1028, 1159, 1169
3:19 426, 663, 666, 699, 789, 964, 1028, 1033, 1183, 1184
3:19 f. 1191
3:21 364, 795
3:22 405, 438, 884
3:23 392
3:24 905
3:25 433, 515, 598, 610
3:26 539
3:27 857, 907, 1019, 1162
3:28 707
3:29 94, 531 bis, 550
3:30 218, 707, 708
3:31 243, 598
3:32 901 bis
3:33 859, 1034
3:34 597, 1163
3:35 585, 649
3:36 540, 879
4:1 438, 666, 684, 841, 1034, 1049
4:1-3 434
4:2 1129, 1148, 1149, 1154
4:2, 12 680
4:4 393, 582, 887, 919
4:5 505, 547, 596, 646, 715
4:6 367, 428, 549, 599, 604, 778, 909 bis, 1116, 1146
4:7 598
4:7 ff 434
4:7, 9 343
4:8 905
4:9 204, 371, 482, 530, 678
4:10 418, 656, 678, 762, 922 bis, 1014, 1015, 1146, 1069, 1105, 1110
4:11 394, 656 bis, 762, 777, 778, 1105, 1106, 1166, 1179, 1182, 1185, 1189
4:12 667
4:13 599
4:14 519, 520, 716, 813, 889, 1212
4:15 201, 985, 1088
4:16 299
4:16, 35 856
4:17 699
4:18 657, 702, 720, 790, 823, 843
4:20 426, 842-3, 1183
4:20, 24 919
4:21 1159
4:21, 23 971

John
4:22 233, 429, 677, 678, 713, 1159
4:23 234, 400, 476, 540, 566, 710, 1186
4:25 215, 707, 708
4:26 778
4:27 424, 604, 611, 756, 791, 1154, 1188
4:28 433
4:29 751, 917, 949, 1167, 1175
4:31 587, 645, 884
4:33 292, 743, 917, 1168
4:33, 35 1168
4:34 685, 992, 1078
4:35 422, 62G, 678, 870, 1180
4:36 299, 659
4:37 786
4:39 1123
4:39, 53 709
4:40 762
4:41 1179
4:42 686
4:43 762
4:44 691, 1191
4:45 1128
4:46 970
4:47 368, 597, 884
4:49 977, 1091
4:50 715 bis, 841
4:51 1212
4:52 206, 470, 546, 665, 834
4:53 566, 680, 721
5:1 782
5:2 104, 169, 524, 604, 760
5:3 427
5:4 291, 585, 710, 719, 1149
5:5 892, 1115
5:6 428, 879, 1139
5:7 879, 960, 978, 1001, 1068
5:8 681, 855 bis, 890, 950
5:9 681, 838, 855
5:11 258, 274, 480, 481, 656, 695, 707, 769, 855
5:11, 15 275
5:12 778, 1114
5:13 841
5:14 234, 890
5:15 836, 859, 928, 1035, 1112, 1114
5:17 681
5:18 884. 1060, 1166
5:19 190, 707, 708, 1018 bis, 1094, 1181
5:20 188, 311, 985
5:21 969
5:23 1137
5:24 593, 897, 898
5:24, 38 453

John
5:25 135, 234, 333, 356 bis, 781, 859
5:25, 28 333
5:26 1181
5:27 781, 802
5:28 890
5:29 500, 859
5:30 685, 828, 890, 1162
5:31 890, 1010, 1018
5:31, 34 677
5:32 479, 746, 764
5:33 897
5:33, 36 ff. 896
5:34 110, 866
5:35 334, 625, 656, 1212
5:36 220, 265, 274 bis, 402, 516, 667, 686, 789, 894, 1204
5:37 893, 896
5:37 f. 1179, 1189
5:38 678, 703, 708
5:39 329 bis, 678, 707, 941
5:39 f. 1183
5:40 878
5:41 110
5:42 499, 500
5:43 707, 762
5:44 437, 442, 776, 857, 1128, 1135
5:44f. 678
5:45 779, 853, 890, 895
5:46 540, 1014
5:46 f. 1012
5:47 1009, 1012, 1160
6:1 444, 503
6:2 368, 404, 604, 1218
6:2, 5 774
6:5 1035
6:6 891, 1029, 1043
6:7 745, 921, 998
6:9 407, 674, 704, 713, 736, 762
6:10 486
6:11 732, 762, 967, 1181
6:12 618, 751
6:12, 16 974
6:13 . 598, 762, 777
6:14 444, 718, 768
6:15 287, 480, 657
6:16 602, 841, 904
6:16-21 904
6:17 361, 366 bis, 904, 1214
6:18 367, 1179, 1215
6:19 263, 469, 603, 904
6:20 890, 947
6:21 603, 857, 886, 919
6:22 437, 444, 776, 887, 1034
6:22-24 1029

John
6:23 232
6:24 887, 1029, 1049
6:25 896
6:27 471, 595
6:28 850, 880, 889, 923, 934
6:29 567, 706, 708, 720, 721, 850
6:29, 39, 40 400
6:30 850
6:31 375, 903 bis
6:32 1187
6:34 300
6:35 349, 850
6:35, 37, 44, 45 235, 889
6:36 1182
6:37 409, 682
6:37, 39 653, 713, 773
6:38 895, 1166, 1187 bis
6:39 437, 439, 684, 718, 753, 769, 775, 992
6:40 520, 522, 586, 708, 762
6:41 444, 561, 853, 859, 1201
6:42 697, 698
6:43 610, 853
6:44 520, 523, 586
6:45 504, 516, 859 bis, 1097 bis
6:45 f. 614
6:46 1034
6:47 653
6:48 677
6:49 1183
6:50 599, 768
6:51 234, 768, 872, 1185 bis
6:52 811
6:52, 60 444
6:54 586
6:57 584 bis
6:58 968
6:61 587
6:62 470, 487, 550, 1023, 1203
6:63 768, 1206
6:64 374, 515, 550, 597, 792, 878, 1118 bis, 1159, 1214
6:65 234
6:66 444, 597
6:67 878, 917, 923, 1175
6:68 790, 791, 876, 924, 934
6:69 423, 652, 763, 895, 1035
6:70 779
6:71 501, 884
7:1 444, 885
7:2 399
7:3 308, 328, 984, 1180
7:4 752, 1009, 1038, 1100
7:4, 10 764
7:5 1185
7:6 770 bis, 777

John
7:9 833
7:10 429, 444
7:11 707 bis
7:13 491, 500
7:13, 17 619
7:14 444, 838, 885
7:15 1172
7:16 496
7:17 292, 551, 741, 757, 878, 1019, 1045, 1177, 1188
7:18 698, 762
7:19 1175
7:22 243, 434, 1166, 1187, 1202
7:23 275, 418, 541, 656, 774, 965, 1175
7:24 478
7:25 27, 444, 698, 703
7:26 135, 845, 1168
7:26, 35, 47, 51 f. 917
7:27 f 1183
7:30 231, 905, 1183
7:31 716, 720, 1175
7:32 444, 1123
7:33 659
7:34 969
7:34, 36 232, 233
7:35 495, 501, 581, 1001, 1205
7:37 234, 444, 1019
7:38 333, 355, 356, 437, 459, 1130
7:39 368, 433, 795, 859 bis
7:40 599 bis
7:41 1190
7:41 f 578
7:42 970
7:44 857
7:45 444
7:47 1175
7:48 599
7:49 404, 407
7:51 308, 1168, 1214
7:52 866, 949
8:3,9 1216
8:7 1102, 1121
8:9 282, 294, 606
8:12 768
8:14 208, 866, 870, 1010, 1018, 1026, 1045
8:16. 208, 424
8:16,54 1019
8:19 922, 1015
8:20 586, 905, 1165
8:20, 37 1159
8:21 870
8:23 547 bis, 548, 765
8:24 356

John
8:25 244, 294, 419, 470, 487, 546, 550, 729, 730 bis, 738, 917
8:26 698, 1186
8:27 473, 1029
8:28 698, 837
8:28, 32 871
8:29 537, 549, 611, 659, 845
8:30 1132
8:31 234, 453, 1117
8:32 872
8:33 872, 896
8:38 614
8:39 921, 1015-16, 1022
8:42 579, 708, 881, 1014
8:44 224, 551, 683, 768, 1219
8:49 690
8:51 850, 1019
8:52 473, 507
8:53 441, 728
8:54 1034
8:55 505, 530, 1026
8:56 993, 1212
8:57 310, 337, 1183
8:58 394, 880, 977, 1091
8:59 350, 581, 807, 817, 1136
9:1 784
9:2 998
9:3 404
9:4 976, 1081, 1159
9:5 684 972
9:6 420, 503, 681, 779
9:7 253, 592, 714, 855
9:7, 11 253
9:8 768, 866, 887, 1115, 1139
9:9 1028
9:10 339, 419, 420, 503, 681, 1213
9:11 420,779
9:11, 25 708
9:12 234, 707
9:14 368, 718, 1213
9:15 681
9:16 710
9:16, 40 779
9:17 964
9:17, 26, 30 420
9:17, 32 1213
9:18 291, 841, 975, 1029
9:19 f 768
9:21 733
9:22 366, 480, 811, 816, 905, 993
9:24 597, 697, 700
9:25 866, 892, 1045, 1115
9:27 878
9:28 268, 473, 707 bis
9:30 433, 1190

John
9:30, 32, 35 1029
9:31 698
9:32 597
9:33 920, 1014, 1016
9:34 656, 678, 768, 774
9:35 841
9:36 960, 999, 1182
9:40 611
9:41 1013, 1014
10:1 300, 708
10:3 608
10:3, 9, 12 428
10:4 358, 404, 801
10:5 355, 356, 4188, 889
10:6 708, 736
10:7 501 768
10:8 507, 622
10:10 1025
10:11 398, 418, 429,650, 762 ter, 776, 788, 8657 1206
10:11 14 762
10:11 15 632
10:12 434, 764, 955, 1138, 1163,
10:13 509
10:15 ff 870
10:17 965
10:18 420, 579, 845
10:22. 408, 760
10:27 762
10:28 333, 356, 752, 875, 1164,
10:301 402, 677
10:2? 740, 845, 880 bis
10:2, 480
10.34 1028
10:35 434, 480, 708, 1182
10:36 425, 437, 442, 781, 952;1028
10:37 1012, 1020, 1060, 1170
10:37 f 1160
10:38 425, 850, 983, 1026
10:39 409, 885
10:40 487, 659, 833, 970
11:1 256, 578
11:2 859, 1114
11:3, 6, 12, 14 etc 1191
11:4 632
11:6 470, 706, 718, 1152, 1153
11:7 931, 1205
11:8 885
11:9 587, 800, 1019
11:10 587
11:11 895
11:11-113 905
11:12 1009
11:13 498, 905, 1029
11:14 1210 bis
11:16 580
John
11:17 966, 800
11:18 283, 424, 469, 575, 760
11:19 619, 620, 905
11:20 521, 791,
11:21 420, 841
11:21, 32 313, 922, 1015
11:22 676, 684, 733
11:23 420
11:24 669
11:25 356, 768
11:26 f . 915
11:27 391, 781, 891, 1028 1034, 1150
11:28 861, 881
11:30 841, 905 bis
11:31 596
11:32 420 bis, 681, 706, 722, 779, 1015
11:35 391, 834
11:36 302, 339, 741, 884
11:37 698, 857, 920, 985, 993
11:38 341, 559, 560, 593, 596, 604
11:39 657
11:39, 44 856
11:40 1030
11:41 541, 841, 856
11:42 477, 617
11:43 328, 1193
11:44 193, 197, 361, 366, 486, 905, 910, 1117
11:47 880 bis, 923, 934
11:48 681
11:49 675, 742
11:50 631 bis, 993, 1034
11:51 688, 1029, 1034
11:51, 53 709
11:52 581, 593, 1162
11:54 205, 640
11:55 517, 621
11:56 1217
11:56 f. 905
11:57 134, 234, 308, 905, 986, 993
12:1 110, 424, 598, 621, 622, 702, 762, 970, 1191
12:2 627
12:3 510, 598, 859
12:4 111, 1118
12:7 932
12:9 656, 777
12:9, 12 762, 774
12:10 811, 993, 994, 1180
12:13 243, 528, 595, 838
12:15 264, 462
12:16 487, 550, 605, 653, 765, 905
12:16, 33 1029
12:17 892

John

12:18 909, 1035, 1042, 1103
12:19 843, 941
12:19, 21 243
12:20 27
12:21 923
12:22 405
12:23 895, 992
12:24 1019
12:25 317
12:26 870, 969, 1019
12:27 598, 843, 895, 1187
12.28. 462, 845,
12:29 908, 1047, 1081
12:30 584
12:32 190, 597, 889, 1018
12:33 740 bis
12::34 697, 704, 735
12:35 f 976
12:36 133, 807, 974
12:37 1129
12:39 699
12:42 1155, 1188 bis
12:43 301, 633, 1150, 1154
12:44 1135
12:46 753
12:47 234
12:48 698
12:49 698
13:1 498, 691, 843
13:1 ff. 435
13:1-5 435
13:2 309; 799
13:3 562
13:4 188, 314, 597
13:5 716, 757,
13:6 418, 420, 880, 915, 1175
13:8 915, 933
13:9 1162, 1172, 1173
13:10 234
13:12 841, 1045
13:13 270, 416, 458 bis, 466, 1028
13:14 399, 845
13:15 633
13:16 516
13:17 850, 890, 1019, 1022
13:18 560, 845, 1203
13:19 765, 978, 983, 1075
13:20 190, 956 bis, 1018
13:21 675, 1136
13:22 739
13:24 703, 724, 1045
13:25 602,707
13:26 707, 708
13:27 488, 664, 880
13:28 626, 739
13:29 235, 442 595, 706, 720
13:31 843, 847
13:33 548
13:34 845, 993
13:36f 857
13:37 879
14:1 329, 941
14:2 424, 1015, 1025
14:2f. 869
14:3 353, 690, 846
14:3 f. 299
14:4 731
14:6 429, 583, 769
14:7 923, 1181
14:8 393
14:9 419, 528, 879
14:11 287, 395, 856, 1016, 1025, 1202
14:13 243, 727, 729, 850
14:13 f 956
14:15 1019
14:16 613, 747, 1023
14:17 233, 614, 857
14:17, 26 709 bis
14:19 395, 963
14:21 635, 688, 707, 708 bis, 769
14:22 739, 916, 965, 1001, 1034
14:23 802
14:24 685
14:26 418, 482, 483, 509, 634, 708 bis, 709, 795
14:27 315, 777
14:28 234, 817, 923, 1015
14:29 1091
14:31 308
15:1 777
15:2 243, 437
15:2, 5 437
15:3 584
15:4 586, 587
15:5 437, 442, 1165
15:6 392, 820 bis, 828, 836, 837 bis, 847, 850, 1020, 1204
15:7 850
15:8 324, 699, 837, 843, 984, 992, 1078
15:9 856, 968
15:10 779
15:11 784, 1204
15:11, 17 699
15:12 393, 699, 992, 993
15:13 272, 401, 429, 699, 992
15:14 681
15:15 480, 769, 845
15:16 309, 327, 729, 993, 1214
15:18 280, 670, 1008

John
15:19 559, 508, 921, 1013, 1014
15:20 509, 716, 1009
19:13
15:22 921, 1013, 1169
15:21 484
15:22, 24 336, 339, 887, 922, 921, 1013 bis
15:24 1014, 1015, 1016, 1147
15:25 1033, 1203
15:26 561, 708, 795, 970
15:27 879, 1185
16:2 859, 998, 1114, 1186
16:3 834,845
16:4 1049
16:7 1019 bis
16:8 566, 1126
16:8-11 964
16:12 857
16:13 698, 708, 709, 1109
16:17 393, 515, 599, 698
16:17 f . 703, 719
16:18 738
16:19 .610 659, 699, 857, 1029
16:20 458 bis, 595, 871
16:20, 22 871
16:22 424 bis
16:21 405, 529, 537, 707 bis
16:23, 26 709
16:23 190, 482 bis, 708, 1018
16:24 325, 360, 375, 848, 907
16:27 598
16:26 618
16:28 598
16:30 579, 589, 699
16:31 1175
16:32 657
16:33 135, 677
17:1 801
17:1, 5, 11 462
17:2 193, 309, 348, 409, 411, 437, 500, 713, 718, 876, 963, 984
17:3 203, 699, 718, 776 985, 992 bis, 1079
17:4 234,.418, 677, 682, 843
17:5 418, 461, 678, 682, 716, 765, 891, 978 bis, 1074, 1075
17:6 337, 598, 894, 895
17:7 337 bis, 820
17:7 f. 1172, 1173
17:8 234, 337, 423
17:9 566, 567, 618, 619, 720, 721
17:10 685, 770, 898
17:11 463, 948
17:11 f. 716
17:12 599, 1188
17:13 902
17:14, 16 598
17:15 598 bis
17:17 768
17:19 360, 908
17:18 439
17:19, 23 983
17:21, 24 264
17:21 234, 395, 249
17:21, 24, 25 462
17:22 898
17:23 360, 593, 677, 908, 1049, 1116
17:24 653, 713, 933, 969, 1048
17:25 264 bis, 419, 461, 464, 843, 1182
17:26 478 bis, 482
18:1 213, 275, 627, 680
18:2, 5 859
18:3 548, 1127
18:5 888
18:6 521
18:8 1028
18:10 457, 762
18:11 459, 683, 850, 934, 1161, 1174
18:13 255
18:14 529,1035,1058,1084
18:16 746, 747 bis, 775, 777
18:17 708
18:18 909 bis, 910, 1116
18:20 589
18:21 726
18:22 1116
18:23 1009 bis
18:24 841
18:25 1136
18:26 575, 706, 720
18:28 1183
18:28 1183
18:29 500
18:30 1015, 1016
18:32 531, 740, 1029, 1043
18:34 288, 688
18:35 1172
18:36 922, 993, 1015
18:37 233; 599, 915, 917, 1165, 1175, 1192
18:38 411, 736
18:39 430, 541, 876, 878, 924, 935, 980, 992
18:40 1172, 1173
19:1 801
19:2 408, 483, 521, 883
19:3 311, 465, 769, 884, 1214
19:6 1190, 1200
19:7 480
19:11 887, 906 bis, 921, 923 1014, 1015, 1016
19:12 542, 573 885

John
19:13 104, 367
19:14 501, 793
19:17 104, 539
19:18 300, 775
19:19 362, 375, 603
19:20 28, 104, 205, 524
19:21 707 bis
19:22 358, 801, 895
19:23 212, 408, 1184
19:24 619, 690, 811, 928, 931, 943
19:25 235, 255, 501, 614, 767, 904
19:26 525
19:27 502, 586, 691
19:28 425, 898
19:29 214, 254
19:31 365, 392, 1212
19:32 530, 746, 747, 775
19:32 f . 1212
19:33 546, 602, 909, 910, 963, 1041, 1042, 1118
19:35 707, 1118
19:36 260, 704
19:37 293, 594, 706, 720, 721, 772, 871
19:38 578
19:39 495, 1127
19:40 533, 1076
19:41 316, 762, 905
20:1 522, 672, 762, 868, 1097
20:2 392, 566, 845, 1202
20:2, 3, 4 747
20:3 775
20:3 f. 746, 838
20:4 278, 401, 549, 656, 662, 669
20:5-7 868
20:7 593, 603, 648
20:8 868
20:9 1165
20:11 525, 624 bis
20:12 589, 624, 653, 868, 906, 1202
20:13 868
20:14 133, 868
20:14-18 443
20:15 683, 1009
20:15-18 869
20:16 416, 462, 465, 714
20:16, 18 259
20:17 561, 853, 870
20:18 438, 1028, 1212
20:19 522, 653, 708, 722, 779
20:19, 26 593
20:20 1128
20:21 429
20:22 207
20:21 190, 315, 1019, 1216
20:25 258, 259
20:27 882, 1201
20:28 261, 461, 462, 466 bis, 779
20:29 859, 895, 1028
20:30 362, 655, 1181
20:31 540 bis
21:1 603
21:2 405, 501, 767
21:3 353, 627, 882, 923, 990, 1062
21:4 593
21:5 155, 623, 917, 1168
21:6 408, 580, 593, 652
21:7 716, 810
21:8 268, 469, 499, 520, 521, 533, 543, 575, 802
21:9 841
21:10 519, 577, 716, 843, 845
21:11 672, 1129
21:12 437, 885, 949, 1128
21:13 1205
21:14 702, 843
21:15 187, 516, 659, 667
21:15 ff 501
21:15-17 255, 1201
21:17 1028
21:18 314 bis, 802, 884, 969 bis, 971, 1159
21:19 531, 740, 876, 891, 1029, 1043, 1110
21:20 724
21:21 395, 411, 697, 705, 736 bis, 1202
21:22 395, 736, 978
21:22 f. 976
21:23 593, 703, 870
21:24 137, 406, 416, 785
21:25 234, 369, 729, 877 bis, 891, 1030, 1040, 1082 bis, 1162, 1205, 1210

Acts
1:1 280, 419, 440, 463, 663, 669, 716, 954, 1152, 1179, 1193, 1203
1:1-5 121
1:2 717, 841
1:3 147, 581, 820, 1039, 1074
1:4 442, 475, 507,,519, 578, 618, 688, 715, 717, 1029, 1047
1:5 110, 389, 418, 420, 533, 612, 656, 702, 771, 1158, 1205
1:6 316 bis, 523, 695, 916, 1151
1:7 497
1:8 418, 787
1:10 267
1:10 f. 904

Acts

1:11 398, 701, 718, 771
1:12 154, 232, 267, 269, 458, 469, 640, 778, 780
1:13 xii, 501, 629, 760
1:14 623
1:15 283, 434, 602
1:16 399, 651, 859
1:17 509
1:18 472, 510, 599, 775, 834, 1151, 1217
1:19 28, 219
1:20 272, 939, 1116, 1214
1:21 721
1:22 413, 639, 717, 974, 1126
1:23 214
1:23, 26 215
1:24 678, 706, 861
1:25 561, 692
1:26 215, 562
2:2 261, 376, 966, 969, 1105, 1140
2:4 748
2:5 593
2:6 1042
2:7 224
2:9 186
2:9 f. 427, 788
2:11 770, 1123
2:12 692, 747, 883, 938, 1031
2:13 749, 903, 1127
2:14 1107
2:15 793, 1158
2:17 393, 531, 577
2:17, 21 1042
2:18 747, 1148
2:20 561, 1091 bis
2:21 720, 744
2:22 399, 534, 579, 698, 716
2:23 317, 339, 698, 1113
2:24 122, 1058
2:25 234 bis, 367, 594
2:26 224, 604
2:27 591, 593, 792
2:27, 31 502
2:28 510
2:29 234, 587, 612, 881, 1119, 1130, 1182
2:30 479, 531, 877, 1205
2:31 593
2:32 701, 714
2:33 448, 498, 526, 543, 652, 781, 1179
2:34 652
2:36 772
2:37 350, 1179
2:38 389, 592, 595, 780, 781, 782, 795
2:39 541, 593, 733
2:40 666, 813
2:41 283, 1151
2:42 542
2:43 541
2:45 581, 722, 884, 922, 958, 967
2:46 508, 519, 608 bis, 609, 1179
2:47 318, 891, 892, 1115, 1116
3:1 602
3:1-10 905
3:2 318, 392, 480, 884, 891, 990, 1088
3:2f 429
3:3 313, 559, 877, 884
3:5 538, 828, 1036, 1127
3:6 698
3:7 210, 508
3:8 423, 1116 bis, 1136
3:9 1103
3:10 262, 626, 885, 887 bis, 1111, 1117, 1179
3:11 269, 407, 604, 655
3:12 334, 423, 818, 1065, 1068, 1078, 1140
3:13 649, 707, 1151
3:14 399, 651, 785, 818
3:15 714
3:16 517, 639, 644
3:17 609, 1128
3:18 409, 858, 877, 1036, 1080
3:19 649, 1075
3:19 f. 986, 1049
3:21 716, 1151
3:22 733, 1151
3:23 148, 189, 598, 727, 959
3:24 732
3:25 625, 716
3:26 538, 549, 800, 891 bis, 991, 1072, 1073 bis, 1116, 1128
4:2 587, 966, 1071
4:3 538
4:5 f 1047
4:6 214.
4:7 648, 655, 678, 740
4:9 500, 703, 780
4:10 656, 698, 705, 715
4:10, 16 656
4:11 698, 703, 769
4:12 635 bis, 749, 751, 778, 1107
4:13 127, 415, 691, 812, 887, 1035, 1197
4:14 1087, 1179
4:15 1202
4:16 656, 665 n., 880, 1152
4:17 531, 538, 1094
4:18 546, 550, 607

Acts

4:19 516, 666, 1045
4:20 312, 677, 1094, 1164, 1171 bis, 1173, 1174, 1214
4:21 766, 905, 966, 1031, 1046, 1128
4:22 268, 498, 602, 666, 905, 1214
4:23 733
4:24 419
4:25 739
4:27 905
4:29. 224, 560, 765, 772
4:30 1072, 1073
4:31 905
4:32 688, 691, 751
4:33 311
4:34 587, 884, 891, 892, 1115, 1116
4:35 190, 312, 318, 615, 922, 958, 967, 1214
4:36 487, 530, 579 bis, 714
4:37 891, 1116
5:1 215, 256 bis, 457
5:2 256, 319, 517, 627, 810, 1116
5:3 1001, 1089, 1090
5:4 541, 965, 1166
5:4, 9 739
5:5 833, 1116
5: 7 460, 581 bis
5:8 308, 510, 710, 810
5:9 529, 601, 965, 1084
5 : 12 269 bis
5:13 529
5:14 435, 453, 1106
5:15 194, 214, 928, 984, 1091
5:16 404, 412, 617
5:17 261, 1107, 1108
5:19 408, 581, 791
5:20 497, 706
5:21 635, 1086
5:22 800
5:23 601, 603, 621
5:24 405, 736 bis, 789, 938, 940, 1021, 1044
5:25 233, 881
5:26 531, 995
5:28 224, 253, 510, 531 bis, 697, 760, 878, 895
5.29 405, 747
5:30 317, 603, 1127
5:31 480, 526, 1088
5:34 653
5:35 605
5:36 172, 233, 411, 540, 542, 581, 743, 1038, 1113
5:36, 37 732
5:37 835
5:38 547, 1018, 1019
5:38 f. 963
5:39 995, 1009, 1096
5:41 632, 884, 1151
5:42 1102, 1109, 1121
6:1 104, 626, 782
6: 2 348
6:3 816, 989, 1149
6:5 173, 235, 275, 276
6:9 788
6:11 594, 634, 801, 897, 1042, 1113
6:13 1102
6:14 701
7:1 546, 800, 916
7:2 215, 419, 464, 1091
7:3, 7 957
7:4 561, 566, 721, 979, 1074
7:5 1036, 1131, 1138, 1139
7:6 889
7:7 203, 959
7:8 522, 760
7:9 308
7:10 339, 480, 481, 640, 1100
7:12 262, 536, 1042, 1103
7:13 537, 587
7:14 589 bis
7:16 367, 510, 561, 716
7:17 716, 968, 974
7:18 639, 748, 975
7:19 477, 703, 1002, 1068, 1090 bis
7:20 537, 671, 718
7:21 339, 401, 482, 680, 811
7:22 772
7:23 207, 392
7:24 805, 1204
7:25 315, 885, 1036, 1049
7:26 . 313, 522, 739, 861, 885
7:27 367
7:28 206, 718
7:29 589
7:30 760
7:31 474
7:34 187, 430, 932, 1110, 1147
7:35 253, 268, 649, 698, 778, 860, 863, 897, 1113
7:35, 36, 37, 38, 40 698
7:36 794
7:37 778
7:39 537
7:40 436, 459, 541, 697, 701, 703, 960
7:41 367 bis, 532
7:42 409, 463, 800, 1087

Acts
7:43 244, 355, 517, 550, 642, 647
7:44 268
7:45 367, 409, 582, 716
7:48 424
7:49 735, 740
7.51 300, 523, 542, 573
7:52 502
7:53 482, 596, 728
7:56 1123, 1213
7:57 339,789
7:58 256, 811
7:60 834, 853
8:1 581,782,787
8:2 802
8:3 174, 419, 473
8:4, 25 695, 696
8:5 684
8:9 316, 743 bis, 888, 1038, 1121
8:10 704, 769
8:10, 18 1113
8:11 523, 527, 533, 906, 909, 966, 1060, 1070, 1071
8:12 1179
8:14f. 728
8.15 367, 995
8:16 375, 560, 906, 1103, 1121
8:17 318 bis
8:19 706
8:20 327, 939 bis, 940
8:21 541, 640
8:22 430, 576, 1024, 1027
8:23 458, 536, 593, 865, 1041, 1123 bis
8:24 630, 706, 720, 1217
8:25 474, 1151
8:26 328, 602, 608, 698, 703, 792, 1205
8:27 374, 877 bis, 991, 1118, 1128
8:28 562
8:30 244, 571, 916, 1148 bis, 1176, 1201
8:31 194, 628, 890, 938, 1010, 1021, 1022 bis, 1214
8:32 715, 968
8:34 748
8:35 367
8:36 602, 743, 974, 1094, 1171
8:38 f. 578, 597
8:39 349, 479
8:40 218, 593, 643, 975, 979, 1060, 1074, 1092
9:1 216, 507
9:2 190, 482, 497, 1018, 1041
9:3 538, 1072
9:4 506, 7042
9:4, 7 762
9:6 313, 729, 731, 739, 1044, 1045, 1176, 1215
9:6, 34 310
9:7 213, 449, 472, 506, 529
9:8 1213
9:9 1138, 1172
9:11 310
9:11, 17 762
9:12 864, 986, 1114, 1116
9:13 484, 733
9:15 496, 704 1179
9:17 716, 721
9:18 559
9:20 698, 885, 1034
9:21 699, 769, 860, 905, 1107, 1108, 1123
9:22 213, 891, 1127, 1220
9:24 820
9:26 1128
9:27 244, 367, 1035, 1047
9:31 524, 607, 787
9:32 1043 1085
9:32, 37,43 1043
9:34 866
9:35 269
9:36 714, 716
9:38 256, 505, 538, 568, 640
9:39 311, 529, 542, 732, 810
9:42 607
10:1 258
10:2 772
10:3 471, 864
10:5 609
10:6 615
10:7 272, 892
10:9 538, 793
10:10 623
10:11 315, 603, 1213
10:14 752, 1173
10:15 396, 1202, 1205
10:17 579, 602, 890, 910, 938, 940, 1021, 1031
10:18 1043, 1045, 1105, 1107
10:18, 32 1108
10:20 571
10:21 735
10:22 561, 614, 1179
10:92 f 833
10:23 809
10:25 98, 393; 996, 1002, 1040, 1043, 1059, 1060, 1065, 1068
10:26 686
10:28 314, 665, 967, 1032, 1036
10:28, 38 1045
10:29 212, 739, 1043, 1044, 1113
10:30 471, 645, 793

Acts

10:31 233
10:32 399, 792, 794, 1105
10:33 861 bis, 990, 1080, 1088, 1113, 1121
10:35 1108
10:36 438, 718, 723
10:37 413, 458, 607
10:38 219, 533, 1032
10:39 339, 1113
10:40 537, 794
10:40 f. 1095
10:41 612, 752, 960, 979, 1074, 1162, 1163
10:41 f 833
10:42 419, 1035
10:43 1036
10:44 891
10:45 578, 782, 897, 1181
10:47 231, 728, 960, 1061, 1094, 1171
10:48 1084
11:1 608
11:1, 20 1181
11:2 599, 766, 885
11:4 1102, 1126
11:5 315, 498, 639
11:6 787, 838
11:7 1042
11:11 188
11:13 1032, 1041, 1049
11:14 402, 405
11:15 566
11:17 658, 736, 968, 1008, 1181
11:18 1190
11:19 605, 657, 696
11:21 1107
11:22 643
11:23 530
11:25 990
11:26 160, 192, 298, 659, 774, 833, 1043
11:28 253, 410, 603, 728, 877 bis, 891, 1036, 1082
11:29 367
11:30 714, 861, 862, 1113
12:1 578, 608
12:2 533, 534
12:3 411, 434, 551
12:5 629
12:6 408, 620, 621, 878
12:7 310, 328, 559, 597
12:8 314, 807, 811, 855, 950
12:9 855, 1153
12:10 477, 550. 728, 762, 777, 794, 1107, 1213
12:11 339, 772
12:12 255.
12:13 990
12:14 231, 319, 358, 580, 621, 908, 1036, 1039, 1040, 1081
12:15 695, 1036, 1084, 1186
12:16 551, 1102, 1212
12:18 224, 411, 484, 736, 739, 916, 1131, 1177
12:20 235, 906
12:21 522, 603
12:25 235, 431, 835, 859 bis, 862 ter, 1099
13:1 608, 1107 bis
13:2 566, 816, 1149 bis
13:3 682
13:3,5 862
13:4 440, 686
13:5 214, 258, 269, 480, 828, 885
13:6 639
13:7 574
13:8 279, 433
13:9 734, 761
13:10 264, 330, 463, 464 ter, 791, 795, 874, 917, 942, 1157, 1162, 1193
13:11 639, 800
13:12 218
13:13 620, 766
13:13 f 836
13:15 234
13:16 1107
13:17 611
13:18 165 bis, 219, 528
13:20 523, 527
13:22 458, 482, 501, 780, 1114, 1136
13:24 94, 621
13:25 720, 736, 738, 916, 996, 1036
13:26 497
13:27 608, 858
13:28 1085, 1086, 1129
13:31 429, 602, 728
13:32 423, 474, 483, 1035, 1107
13:33 861, 1113
13:34 392
13:36 560
13:36 f. 1153
13:37 706
13:39 566, 720, 721
13:40 409, 430, 933, 996
13:41 597, 849, 1019
13:42 313, 314, 594, 645
13:44 990
13:45 261
13:46 810, 965

Acts
13:47 221, 482
13:49 582
13:50 578, 788 bis
13:51 197
14:1 197, 502, 710, 789, 1000
14:3 649, 833
14:4 695
14:5 424, 625, 789, 1052
14:6 257
14:8 257, 521, 523, 1096
14:9 1042 bis, 1065, 1066, 1076
14:10 423, 549, 656, 659, 789, 838
14:11 28,104
14:11-13 428
14:12 258
14:13 621, 1107
14:14 212
14:15 483, 736 bis, 738, 789, 1036
14:16 521
14:17 204, 210, 300, 1129, 1154
14:18 606, 800, 1061, 1094, 1102
14:19 319, 489, 859, 908, 1030, 1039, 1040, 1081, 1216
14:21 475
14:21 f. 892
14:22 524, 562, 892, 1035, 1036, 1047, 1113
14:23 905
14:26 905
14:27 611
14:28 994, 1205
15:1 530, 780
15:11 760
15:2 515, 788, 1084, 1205
15:3 787
15:3, 30 696, 1191
15:4 788, 818
15:4, 20 789
15:6 788
15:7 475, 1035, 1041
15:8 861
15:8, 9 1113
15:9 219, 282, 580, 645, 750, 861
15:10 1089
15:11 487, 531, 718
15:12 834
15:13 834, 857, 1074
15:14 968, 1045
15:15 529
15:16 1219
15:17 653, 713, 723, 986
15:19 613
15:20 518, 788,1068, 1078, 1080, 1082
15:22 173, 214, 628, 808, 1039, 1127
15:22 f. 413, 439, 655
15:22, 25 1084
15:23 582, 649, 696, 787, 944, 1093, 1205
15:24 897
15:24-26 432
15:25 1039
15:27 686, 891, 991, 1128-9
15:28 186, 187, 518, 646, 1059, 1061, 1078, 1085, 1187
15:29 212, 299, 318, 330, 360, 364, 808, 908, 962, 1121, 1160, 1169
15:32 349, 686 ter
15:35 477, 655
15:36 546, 714, 1149
15:37 565
15:37 f. 857, 884, 1081
15:38 576
15:39 1000, 1091
15:41 788
16:1 f. 863
16:2 566
16:3 394, 428, 801, 887, 1029, 1035
16:4 311, 476, 562, 788, 1214
16:5 524 bis
16:6 788, 862 bis, 863, 1110, 1113
16:7 781, 1156
16:71. 863
16:9 561, 581
16:10 1034
16:11 139, 244, 257, 367, 652, 1202
16:12 263, 412, 497, 728, 729 bis, 954
16:13 792, 1039
16:14 408, 1036
16:15 537, 1009
16:16 728, 810, 1043, 1128
16:16 f. 442
16:18 578, 884
16:21 1039, 1084
16:22 212, 609, 618, 628, 883
16:23 861, 863
16:24 278, 710
16:25 507, 608
16:26 262 bis, 367, 1213
16:27 431, 909, 1040, 1081, 1213
16:28 299, 484, 688
16:30 580, 924
16:31 402
16:33 515, 576 bis, 771
16:34 170, 453, 530, 1122
16:36 336, 993, 1219
16:37 339, 530, 653, 659, 686 1120, 1187, 1190, 1213
16:39 578

Acts

17:1 1126
17:2 408, 537, 576
17:3 442, 1034 bis, 1035
17:4 924, 669, 1163
17:5 165, 885
17:6 572, 1035, 1137, 1172
17:6, 8 258
17:7 639
17:9 763
17:10 313, 728, 760
17:10, 15 314
17:11 487, 890
17:12 1151
17:13 760
17:14 643
17:15 279, 313, 316 bis, 339, 488, 669, 760, 968, 974
17:16 169, 224, 40S, 613, 760, 885, 1041, 1123, 1131, 1204
17:16-34 121
17:18 201, 529, 695, 787, 788, 890, 938, 940, 1021, 1025, 1031, 1044, 1082, 1085
17:19 187, 701, 785, 879
17:20 559, 736, 742, 878
17:21 749, 7.51, 773, 1087
17:29 187, 399, 464, 665
17:23 362, 561
17:25 518
17:26 772, 863, 1113
17:27 244, 327, 508, 939, 1021, 1027, 1030, 1044, 1045, 1086, 1129 bis, 1138 his, 1139, 1140, 1148, 1149, 1190 ter
17:28 195, 422, 608, 694, 1200, 1215
17:29 920
17:30 487, 629, 1084, 1152
17:31 550, 589, 590, 716, 860, 963
17:32 333
17:34 187
18:2 236, 459, 487,,530, 909, 910 bis, 1040, 1047, 1049, 1071, 1116
18:3 367, 471, 486, 1039, 1215
18:4 885
18:5 529, 628, 808, 1036
18:6 810, 1202
18:7 263, 529
18:8 453, 884
18:9 583, 792, 890, 1173 bis
18:10 477, 1002, 1090
18:11 672, 833
18:12 269, 296, 510
18:13 616
18:14 368, 877, 1014, 1015 bis, 1153, 1.193
18:15 110, 608, 686 bis, 766, 1038
18:17 256, 508, 539
18:18 342, 1127
18:20 1131
18:22 1136
18:23 788, 891, 892, 1113, 1136
18:24 172, 189 bis
18:25 485, 524, 619, 816
18:26 665
18:27 818, 1036
18:28 311, 529, 582, 1036
19:1 189, 233, 260
19:1 f. 1047
19:2 207, 234, 861, 916, 1024, 1045, 1113, 1179, 1186
19:3 739, 1179
19:4 399, 416, 993
19:7 283 n., 773
19:8 431, 811
19:9 473, 891
19:11 253, 1138, 1139
19:11, 23 f. 1205
19:12 189, 192
19:13 475, 484, 617, 759, 762, 791
19:14 236, 255, 742
19:15 736, 762, 777, 791
19:16 252, 559, 560, 607, 745 bis
19:17 418
19:19 674, 828
19:21 310, 476, 688, 787, 1074
19:22 586, 593, 800
19:23 224
10:24 224, 810
19.25 620, 710
19:26 295, 494, 643, 697, 701, 1035, 1166, 1187
19:27 219, 253, 257, 410, 518, 750, 1162 bis
19:28 395
19:28, 34 1202
19:29 510
19:30 423, 885
19:31 258, 537
19:32 301, 425, 641, 665, 692, 747, 898, 1029, 1176
19:33 515
19:34 436, 439, 1130, 1200
19:35 68, 253, 260, 653, 726, 892, 1041, 1123, 1159, 1190
19:36 212, 375 bis, 881, 909, 1119 bis, 1121, 1130
19:37 253 bis, 257, 410
19:38 541
19:38 f. 1153
19:39 545, 618, 1000, 1154
19:40 229, 511, 547, 815-16, 820
20:1 1074

Acts
20:3 497, 1002, 1060, 1068, 1076
20:3, 7 877
20:4 173, 205,235 ter, 236, 501, 528, 529, 639, 813
20:5 471
20:5, 23 475
20:6 657
20:7 313, 529, 653, 672, 792
20:8 969
20:9 235, 579, 580, 835, 891
20:11 1179
20:12 1163
20:13 235, 1140
20:14 199
20:15 199, 214, 221, 505, 573, 638, 653, 748, 1202
20:16 470, 472, 613, 905, 986, 1021, 1030, 1058, 1085
20:18 299, 312, 334, 561, 566, 717, 721, 773, 793, 1032
20:20 1094
20:20, 27 1061, 1102, 1171, 1174, 1205
20:22 374, 523, 765, 878, 1118, 1172, 1213
20:23 262, 646
20:24 480, 499, 811, 967, 987, 990, 1089
20:26 515, 576, 765, 1035
20:27 807, 1089
20:28 480, 510, 559, 810, 1032
20:30 687, 689
20:31 419, 1035, 1041
20:33 282, 474, 508
20:34 441
20:35 573, 663, 666, 679, 708, 1034
20:37 515
20:38 488, 659, 670, 716, 905
21:1 183, 235, 260, 263, 522, 547, 653, 836, 1038, 1202
21:2 f. 891
21:3 290, 486, 54S, 817, 883, 1115
21:4 1046
21:5 548, 643
21:6 691
21:7 205, 582
21:8 339, 614
21:11 289, 690
21:12 1065, 1066, 1068, 1085, 1088
21:13 593, 657, 1077, 1121, 1162, 1181
21:14 862, 863, 1214
21:16 393, 502, 515, 519, 599, 614, 719, 721, 891, 955, 989, 1202
21:18 561
21:18, 26 313, 314
21:19 746
21:20 741
21:21 482, 521, 524, 773, 950, 1034, 1046, 1082, 1084
21:22 310, 337, 356
21:23 541, 1127
21:24 201, 324, 342, 412, 720, 809, 816, 984
21:25 476, 483
21:26 313, 314, 522
21:27 339, 1213, 1220
21:28 300, 526, 769, 783, 844, 894, 897, 901, 1107
21:29 323, 362, 375, 883, 905, 906
21:30 774, 1179
21:31 213, 256, 774, 879, 1033, 1132, 1202
21:32 835, 1126, 1127
21:33 251, 375, 736, 884, 938, 1031, 1044 bis
21:34 692, 747, 884
21:35 392, 1043, 1058
21:36 404, 407, 412, 655, 1104
21:37 915, 916, 1175
21:38 769, 917, 1157, 1176
21:39 1151, 1163, 1205
21:40 104, 770
22:1 507
22:2 28 bis, 29, 104, 542, 653, 1029
22:3 495, 497, 615, 1105
22.4, 22 639
22:5 299, 374, 548, 877, 1118, 1128
22:6 536, 539, 560, 617, 620, 792, 1085
22:7 506, 1042
22:8, 13 235
22:9 449, 472, 506
22:10 716 bis, 1084
22:11 580, 1159
22:14 763, 1033
22:15 720, 773
22:16 329, 332, 808 bis, 1110
22:17 1039, 1085, 1132
22:18 784
22:19 608
22:20 213, 1220
22:21 469, 593
22:22 393, 886, 920, 1014
22:23 799
22:24 308, 718, 726, 861, 863, 1084
22:25 258, 533, 916, 1181

Acts

22:29 1029, 1033, 1034
22:30 615, 766, 815, 820, 1046
23:3 314, 340, 616, 678, 1201, 1216
23:4 473
23:5 234, 422, 473, 484, 874, 1041, 1200
23:6 511, 791
23:7 787
23:8 745, 1094, 1189
23:9 582, 1023, 1203
23:10 564, 995, 1214
23:11 221, 593
23:12 802, 1040, 1046, 1048
23:13 666, 802
23:14 473, 531, 689
23: 15 490, 546, 659, 978, 1061, 1068, 1075, 1077, 1082, 1141
23:17 231
23:17, 18, 19 1087
23:18 696, 1151
23:19 736, 738
23:20 547, 968, 1002, 1066, 1068, 1141
23:21 474, 517, 579, 976
23:22 235, 442, 1047, 1113
23:22, 25, 30 1113
23:23 168, 232, 742, 793, 1047
23:23 f. 442
23:24 1179, 1204
23:26 944, 1093
23:27 339, 431, 433, 778, 1035, 1099
23:27 f . 243
23:29 511
23:30 330, 594, 603, 846, 877, 908, 1040, 1049, 1082, 1130
23:31 1151
23:34 578, 740, 1035
23:35 434, 861, 863
24:1 607
24:2 236
24:3 300, 530
24:5 782, 1135
24:6 288, 438, 724
24:6, 8 1181
24:9 319, 705, 1084
24:10 597, 619, 811, 892, 1041, 1103, 1115, 1123
24:11 666, 714, 717, 877, 978, 1111, 1118
24:11, 17 374, 991, 1128
24:12 f. 1165, 1189
24:13 511 bis, 720
24:14 699, 703
24:15 . 877, 1039, 1076, 1082, 1179
24:15, 20 686, 700, 705
24:17 535, 581, 594, 877, 1118
24:18 578, 612, 1123
24:19 235, 886, 920, 1014, 1021, 1022
24:20 439
24:21 348, 363, 701, 702 bis, 716
24:22 235, 580, 619, 665, 1128 ter
24:22-25 810
24:23 540, 828, 861, 863, 1171
24:24 692
24:25 470, 487, 547, 551, 800, 1109
24:25 f. 1126
24:26 284, 529, 546, 637, 638, 665, 884, 1139 bis
24:27 221, 265, 267 bis, 1123
25:1 f. 836
25:3 995, 1046
25:4 586, 593, 1036, 1038
25:5 234, 534
25:5, 8, 11 742
25:5, 22 233
25:6 666
25:7 153, 477, 619, 655
25:8 1028
25:9 265, 603, 878
25:10 277, 362, 375, 482, 484, 603, 665, 881, 895, 1116
25:11 472, 511, 720, 765, 809, 881, 893, 896, 1059, 1066, 1078
25:12 429, 816
25:13 412, 580, 812, 861, 862, 863, 877, 979, 1113, 1128
25:14 197, 234, 542, 608
25:14f. 1048
25:14-16 1048
25:15 787
25:15f. 429
25:16 792, 939, 970, 977, 1030, 1035, 1048, 1091
25:17 603
25:18 619, 718 bis, 719
25:20 472, 890, 940, 1021, 1031, 1045
25:21 580, 976, 1039
25:22 394, 886, 919, 923
25:23 254, 405, 424, 608
25:24 233, 404, 412, 530, 1036, 1047, 1085, 1173
25:25 908, 1036, 1040
25:26 742, 743, 760, 875, 879, 996 bis, 1030, 1045
25:27 1039
26:1 367, 885
26:2 690, 811, 895

Acts
26:3 439, 490, 608, 1130
26:4 319, 773, 782, 792, 1215
26:4, 6 1107, 1152
26:5 280 bis, 670
26:7 463, 465, 522, 550, 718, 763, 877, 1082, 1213
26:8 430, 614, 1024
26:9 231, 688, 1038, 1039, 1049 1085 bis
26:10 714, 1113
26:10-14 432
26:11 885
26:12 714, 780
26:13 550, 633, 775, 864
26:14 28, 104, 506, 1042
26:16 427, 700, 720, 724, 819, 871, 1078
26:16-18 432
26:17 559, 713
26:18 566, 1088
26:19 272, 537, 962
26:20 585, 1047, 1135, 1179
26:21 183
26:22 520, 640 bis, 720, 1138, 1139, 1179
26:23 372 bis, 656, 1024, 1097
26:24 418, 420, 656, 661, 683, 774, 789
26:25 233, 812
26:26 219, 323, 750, 903, 1094, 1162 bis, 1165
26:27 538, 915
26:28 192, 653, 880, 1079, 1081, 1084
26:29 291, 566, 646, 653, 660, 710, 732, 854, 886, 919, 923, 938, 1021, 1025, 1162, 1182
26:30 314, 529, 786, 789
26:32 886, 887, 906, 909, 920, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1080, 1081
27:1 256, 311, 459, 743, 1002, 1060, 1068
27:11 342
27:2 210, 223, 469
27:3 532, 861, 1084
27:3, 17 476
27:4 1039
27:4 f. 469
27: 4, 7 634
27:5 212, 257, 263, 476, 563, 608, 787
27:6 235, 585
27:7 477
27:8 186, 214, 538, 568, 613, 640
27:9 261, 884, 909, 1071, 1081
27:10 162, 438, 877, 1036 bis, 1047, 1082
27:12 244, 60S, 792, 1021, 1024, 1027, 1030, 1044, 1045
27:12, 39 1214
27:13 235, 634, 665, 909, 1060
27:13, 17 799
27:14 166, 606, 702, 799, 834, 1163
27:14, 20 1205
27:15 312, 572, 1214
27:16 211, 263, 477, 618, 634, 834
27:17 235, 314, 633, 995
27:17, 26, 29 802
27:18 885
27:19 212, 886
27:20 224, 618, 765, 1061, 1076, 1179 bis, 1205
27:21 464, 886, 920, 1014, 1151, 1152
27:22 475, 517, 1204
27:23 497, 724, 758
27:24 1058
27:25 487, 718, 758
27:27 184, 284, 550, 581, 648, 775, 1036
27:27, 33 672
27:28 231, 800
27:29 244, 266, 886, 919, 995, 1173
27:30 256, 476, 966, 1141
27:33 219, 244, 282, 471, 751, 877, 1102, 1121, 1173
27:34 451, 517, 570, 623
27:35 367
27:36 508, 519
27:37 773
27:38 508, 810, 818
27:39 940, 1021, 1031
27:40 157, 265, 309, 638, 653, 1140
27:41 145, 232, 256, 264, 580, 885
27:42 432, 828, 987
27:43 212, 313, 518, 797, 800, 835
27:44 601, 604, 696
28:2 339, 1205
28:3 256
28:4 317, 365, 597 bis, 697
28:6 210, 233, 318, 1036
28:7 516, 617, 620
28:8 162, 257
28:11 199, 235, 613
28:11-15 836
28:13 189, 200, 298, 550, 657
28:14 1113
28:15 528
28:16 167, 258
28:17 789, 1107, 1108, 1132, 1138, 1139
25:19 1140 bis

Acts
28:20 316, 485, 562, 613, 815, 816
28:21 428, 752, 1139, 1164
28:22 1151
28:23 548, 792, 892, 1116
28:26 333, 356
28:27 204, 819, 988
28:30 774, 833

Romans
1:1 263, 496, 793
1:1-7 432
1:2 772
1:5 407, 500, 678
1:6 504, 516
1:7 396, 504, 576
1:8 583, 629, 1152
1:9 589, 1032
1:10 603, 1024, 1027, 1030, 1090, 1145, 1147, 1149
1:11 983, 991, 1060, 1071
1:12 244, 682, 700, 705, 1059
1:13 242, 547, 968, 1031, 1181, 1182, 1183
1:14 537, 764, 1179
1:15 221, 486, 608, 654, 687, 766
1:16 472, 773, 1152
1:17 499, 514, 599, 781
1:18 139, 606
1:19 654, 763, 964
1:20 272, 606, 654, 763, 787, 1002, 1038, 1072, 1090, 1182, 1201
1:21 1188
1:21, 32 1129
1:22 319, 457, 489, 891, 1038, 1084
1:23 1212
1:24 585, 996, 1002, 1067, 1076, 1087
1:25 396, 561, 585, 616
1:25, 32 960
1:26 496, 561, 585, 651, 1179
1:27 350
1:28 968, 1041, 1086, 1087, 1138
1:28-30 1155
1:29 510, 533, 794, 1201 bis
1:29-31 427
1:30 232, 629, 794, 1201
1:30 f. 1201
1:31 372, 1097, 1201
1:32 710, 1166
2:1 402, 463, 464, 721, 748, 978, 1107, 1193
2:3 402, 459, 464, 678 bis, 699
2:3 f 1177
2:4 654, 763, 880, 1035
2:5 497
2:6 714
2:6 ff 441
2:7 500, 1200
2:8 100, 599
2:9 549, 757, 1179
2:10 1106
2:12 589
2:13 424, 757, 796
2:14 537, 704, 778, 796, 972
2:15 311, 645, 728
2:16 590, 718, 721, 763, 971, 1097 bis
2:17 341, 678, 796
2:18 764
2:19 489, 801, 1038, 1082
2:21-23 915
2:23 712, 796
2:25 796, 1019
2:26 481, 683, 819, 1019
2:27 583 bis, 778, 782, 1022, 1129
2:28 590, 764, 962
2:28 f. 766
3:1 395, 408, 763, 1198
3:1, 9 739
3:2 413, 485, 659 bis, 816, 1152
3:3 395, 739, 1190
3:4 193, 986
3:4, 6, 31 940, 1170
3:5 315, 761, 876, 1108, 1199
3:6 965 bis, 1022, 1025
3:7 678, 739, 1145
3:7 f 433
3:8 234, 319, 678, 763, 1028, 1033, 1036, 1039, 1047, 1049
3:9 391, 419, 423, 621, 812, 816, 1036
3:10 751, 1164
3:11 315, 764, 1106, 1216
3:12 187, 638, 643, 751
3:13 336, 343, 635, 1213
3:15 1062, 1080, 1220
3:18 500, 639
3:19 771
3:20 752, 962
3:21 523, 781
3:22 500, 567, 1184
3:23 476, 518, 814, 837, 847
3:24 175, 401, 779, 782
3:25 154, 401, 480, 584, 589, 595, 781, 784, 810
3:25 f. 567, 600, 624, 783
3:26 547, 599, 766, 781, 1071
3:27 498, 582, 740, 780

Rom.
3:30 301, 1025, 1027, 1154
3:31 307, 316 bis
4:1 1175
4:2 739, 1009
4:3 393
4:3 ff 458
4:4 523, 609, 757, 759
4:5 258, 274
4:6 394, 722
4:7 367, 720, 724
4:9 394, 1202
4:10 1198
4:11 498, 780, 781, 782
4:11 bis, 16, 18 1066
4:12 423, 521, 548
4:12, 16 423, 1095, 1162
4:13 400, 499, 796, 1059, 1078, 1188
4:14 599, 766, 1023
4:17 644, 717, 719, 1028
4:18 207, 224, 616
4:19 207, 215, 299, 674, 1114, 1146
4:20 334, 532, 594, 861
4:21 724, 816, 964, 1035, 1114
4:24 602
5:1 200, 583, 598, 823, 850, 857 889, 928, 931, 1192
5:2 224, 900 bis
5:3 394, 1187
5:3-5 1200
5:5 499, 500, 583, 896
5:6 567
5:6 f. 632
5:7 530, 652, 653, 763, 876
5:8 315, 594, 784, 964, 1034
5:9 518, 659
5:10 529
5:11 394, 1134 bis
5:12 348, 434, 438, 604, 684, 773 833, 963
5:13 342, 796
5:14 605, 833, 860
5:14, 16 348
5:15 774
5:15f 1159
5:15,19 660
5:16 860
5:18 394, 438, 458, 500, 773, 1190, 1202
5:19 394, 969, 1201
5:20 613, 722, 998
6:1 850, 876, 934
6:1, 15 1192
6:2 539, 728, 889, 960, 966
6:2, 15 940
6:3 784
6:3 f. 592
6:4 493, 496, 651, 850, 969
6:5 528
6:6 496, 699, 990, 1002, 1067 1088 bis, 1128
6:8 529, 872
6:9 1128
6:10 479, 541, 715
6:10 f. 539
6:11 481, 537, 588, 1038, 1181
6:11, 23 587
6:12 1090, 1097, 1192
6:13 689, 855, 950, 968, 1140
6:13, 16 316
6:14 793, 796, 889
6:14 f 635
6:14-8:32 207
6:15 850
6:16 720, 1150, 1154, 1188
6:17 461, 719, 721, 792
6:18 518
6:19 221, 537, 650, 856
6:20 313, 523
6:21 714, 721 bis, 722
7:1 602, 733 bis, 978
7:2 500, 529, 1019, 1.190
7:3 426, 515, 876, 996, 1002 bis, 1067, 1087, 1090
7:3, 25 1190
7:4 499, 539, 1071
7:5 312, 782
7:6 721, 1091, 1095, 1162 bis, 1164
7:7 768, 874, 915, 921, 940, 1014, 1016, 1192
7:7-25 402, 678
7:9 341, 1160
7:10 232, 398, 539, 680, 698, 782
7:12 1152
7:13 537, 550, 609, 940 n, 1102, 1121
7:14 158, 1152
7:15 1158
7:15, 19 1158
7:15 f., 20 698
7:16 319
7:17 677
7:18 234, 399, 416, 431, 705, 890, 1058, 1059
7:18 f. 1158
7:19 718
7:20 683
7:21 539, 778, 1035, 1041, 1190
7:22 529, 780
7:23 295, 530, 551, 748, 780, 796, 1109
7:24 461 bis, 497, 518, 706, 1203

Rom.

7:2.5 287, 537, 540, 687, 770, 780 bis
8.1 425, 1190
8:2 402, 780, 784, 788
8:3 372, 419, 459, 491, 618, 654, 763, 780, 784, 978, 1096
8:4 778
8:5 767
8:6 780 bis
8:7 962
8:8 540
8:9 234, 589, 698, 761, 780, 795, 1008, 1154, 1160
8:9 ff 1186
8:11 584, 1009
8:12 341 bis, 537, 996, 1067, 1076, 1087, 1095, 1162, 1192
8:14 533, 698, 732
8:15 29, 465, 595
8:16 529, 1035
8:17 395, .1023 bis
8:18 535, 626, 661, 777, 857, 877, 878, 1035, 1107, 1191
8:18-24 1191
8:20 224, 298, 349, 550, 1100, 1139
8:21 503, 770, 780, 964
8:22 639, 772
8:23 498, 503, 577, 687
8:24 448, 531, 533, 543, 742, 1105
8:26 529, 560, 565 bis, 573, 629, 722, 739, 766, 770, 967, 1046
8:27 609, 1046
8:28 477
8:29 480, 504, 528, 621, 841, 991, 1071
8:30 837, 841
8:31 630, 1192
8:31-35 1198
8:31-39 432
8:32 244, 291, 424, 509, 632, 724, 725, 773, 812, 960, 965, 1001, 1148 ter
8:33 504, 607, 652, 779, 1175
8:33 f. 916
8:34 652, 765, 781, 878, 1118, 1119, 1199
8:35 793, 1188
8:36 481, 501
8:37 629
8:38 895, 1118
8:38 f. 427, 432, 1189
8:39 499, 749, 779, 782
9:1 434, 444, 588, 886, 1035, 1132
9:3 367, 575, 812, 886, 919, 1038 bis, 1148
9:4 409, 427, 1182
9:4 f. 724, 954
9:5 486, 604, 608, 766, 795, 1108
9:6 698, 724, 732, 752, 1034
9:7 207
9:8 701, 1158
9:9 394
9:10 394
9:11 425, 434, 656, 782, 1173, 1188
9:12 218, 277, 394, 663
9:13 760, 967
9:14 876, 917, 934, 940
9:15 474
9:16 342, 519
9:17 686, 699 705 986
9:18 342
9:19 739, 812
9:19, 20 423
9:20 . 402, 464, 545, 678 bis, 1148, 1149, 1151
9:21 503, 695, 1062
9:22 496, 654, 763, 1129
9:22, 24 438
9:23f. 713
9:24 718
9:25 438, 1138, 1139 bis, 1156, 1163
9:26 1042
9:27 166, 474, 632
9:29 367
9:30 782, 1184
9:31 f. 965
10:1 685, 1151
10:2 500
10:3 781, 817, 818
10:5 1035
10:6 499, 606
10:8 394, 505, 649
10:9 1123
10:10 392, 820
10:12 514, 594, 687
10:14 506, 648, 706 bis, 720, 721 bis, 934 bis, 1106, 1158, 1200
10:14 f. 820
10:15 302, 395, 741, 917, 967 bis, 1032, 1193
10:16 752 bis, 753
10:18 425, 506, 652, 1148, 1151
10:18, 19 918, 1158, 1169, 1174, 1175
10:19 355, 657, 760, 1163, 1174
10:20 551, 820
11:1 810, 917, 1168, 1175, 1191
11:1, 11 940
11:2 529, 739, 1168
11:3 634

Rom.
11:4 254, 411, 739
11:6 1159
11:6, 22 1025
11:7 509
11:8 1031, 1076
11:10 262, 1061 bis
11:11 998 bis
11:12 218
11:13 440, 602, 1151
11:14 1017, 1024
11:15 411
11:15 f. 395
11:16 1023, 1181
11:17 402, 418, 678, 1201
11:18 1158, 1204
11:20 532, 1199
11:21 609, 1012 bis, 1160
11:22 441, 524, 965 bis
11:23 418, 524
11:24 524, 525, 559, 561, 616
11:25 550, 791
11:26 324, 559, 779
11:27 615, 704, 782
11:30 532
11:31 532, 685
11:32 627, 773
11:33 302, 395, 461, 463, 741, 795 1032, 1200
11:33-36 432
11:36 567, 583, 595, 759, 773
12:1 444, 583, 1205
12:1 f. 443
12:2 530, 609, 891
12:3 562, 583, 616, 629, 633, 1003, 1072, 1090, 1201
12:4 967
12:5 244, 282, 294, 450, 460, 487, 568, 606, 673, 675, 692, 766, 774
12:6 439, 442, 581, 946, 1134, 1135
12:6-8 433
12:7, 9 758
12:8 561, 609
12:9 396, 1133
12:9-13 439
12:9 f., 16 f. 946
12:10-13 523 bis, 1133
12:11 1172
12:12 524
12:14 439, 1133
12:15 440, 944, 946, 1092, 1106, 1201
12:16 440 bis, 594, 614
12:17 440, 573
12:15 486, 598, 611; 766
12:20 342 bis, 454, 1019
12:21 534, 763, 881
13:1 444, 579, 1108
13:2 807
13:3 201, 204
13:3 f. 763
13:4 1019
13:5 1084, 1162, 118
13:6 705 bis, 941
13:7 758, 1202
13:8 748, 897, 898, 1066, 1078, 1173
13:9 288, 688, 748, 758, 766, 874
13:11 298, 640, 666, 705, 1059, 1076, 1134, 1140, 1181
13:12 901
13:13 261, 792, 850, 1140
14:2 695 bis, 1060
14:3 810
14:4 402; 539, 541, 678, 694
14:4, 10 423, 738
14:5 290, 616, 692, 695
14:6 539
14:7. 539
201, 1010, 1019, 1027, 1179, 1189
14:9 699, 834
14:10 678, 694
14:11 1034
14:13 1059, 1078 1094
14:14 588, 743
14:15 317, 708
14:17 419, 784
14:19 325, 767, 1176
14:20 553, 1152, 1153
14:21 268, 706, 721, 858, 978, 1059, 1066
14:22 706, 721 bis, 1175
14:23 897, 898, 1019
15:1 372, 1096
15:2 746
15:3 1191
15:4 563, 685
15:5 326, 692, 1214
15:5, 13 939, 940
15:7 809, 1181
15:8 499, 632, 909, 1040, 1049, 1060
15:14 686, 909
15:15 298, 553, 665, 846
15:16 474, 498, 587, 594
15:16, 19 681
15:17 486, 626
15:18 720, 1158, 1164
15:19 644, 645, 909
15:20 710, 748, 1162 bis

Rom.
15:21 720, 1159
15:22 470, 487, 762, 765, 774, 884, 996, 1061, 1067, 1089, 1094, 1171
15:23 152, 996, 1061, 1067, 1076
15:23-28 434
15:24 324, 974
15:25 891, 1129
15:26 367, 502, 528, 782
15:27 529, 1009
15:28 582
15:29 589
15:30 688
15:31 166, 783
15:32 529
15:33 396
16:1 315, 782
16:2 232, 505, 680, 687, 718, 721
16:4 633, 728
16:5 235
16:5 f. 728
16:6 488
16:7 172, 337, 622, 728
16:8 172
16:9 236
16:10 172, 255, 759, 783
16:11 258, 259, 274
16:13 682
16:14 172, 173, 235, 255 bis
16:15 173, 773
16:17 616, 758, 778, 783, 800, 954
16:18 771
16:19 487, 605, 813, 919
16:20 611
16:21 173, 504
16:23 235, 236 bis
16:25 230, 527, 609
16:25f 1117
16:25-27 439
16:26 772
16:27 437, 438, 776

1 Corinthians

1:1 459,760
1:2 235
1:4 765
1:5 772
1:6 500
1:8 792
1:9 583, 782
1:10 203, 360, 419, 983, 1046, 1186
1:11 265, 267, 502, 1035
1:12 255, 401, 497, 699, 1153
1:13 916, 1175
1:14 235, 953
1:15 744
1:16 173, 255, 488
1:17 418, 987 bis, 1162, 1163
1:18 500, 503, 537, 780, 827, 828
1:18, 30 539
1:19 356, 1218
1:20 757, 764
1:21 f. 965
1:22 962
1:23 174, 1186
1:23 f. 539
1:24 686
1:25 654, 663, 667, 763, 962
1:25 ff. 1200 bis
1:26 962, 1163
1:26 ff. 1207
1:27 411, 757, 762
1:27 f. 409, 763
1:28 654, 1109
1:29 752, 986, 987 ter
1:31 949, 985, 1202
2:1, 3 677
2:1-4 85
2:2 1181
2:4 157, 566, 1206
2:5 566
2:6 1186
2:7 418, 586, 589, 621, 784, 1107, 1110, 1117
2:7f. 724
2:8 1015
2:11 f. 782
2:12 325, 983
2:13 504, 516, 654
2:14 159
2:15 159, 208
2:16 724
3:1 158 bis
3:2 484, 1201
3:3 158, 159, 267, 1186 bis
3: 4 743, 750
3:5 583
3:6 838
3:7 743, 1189
3:8 691, 786
3:11 616
3:12 427, 560, 983, 1178
3:13 590, 731, 732 bis, 1176
3:14 233
3:14 f. 1008
3:15 350, 582, 1008
3:17 412, 728, 729, 960
3:18 658, 1038
3.19 474

1 Cor.

3:21 497, 685, 949, 1000
3:22 793, 1189
3:23 1027
4:1 481, 710, 968
4:2 992, 993
4:3 458, 537, 670, 992, 1186
4:4 319, 627, 688
4:5 752, 757, 763
4:6 203, 260, 325, 342, 561, 587, 607, 622, 630, 675, 721, 749, 984, 987, 1202 bis
4:7 341, 1184
4:8 428, 529, 818, 841, 923 bis, 1004, 1148, 1149, 1199
4:9 480, 481, 769, 788
4:11 148, 191
4:12 1121
4:13 618
4:14 845, 1138, 1139
4:15 233, 283, 582, 1018, 1187
4:17 483, 712 bis, 724, 782, 960, 989
4.19 356, 871
4:20 1202
4:21 394, 456, 534, 589, 737
5:1 710, 727, 770, 803, 881
5:3 705, 1152
5:4 628
5:6 776
5:7 219, 349, 399
5:8 498, 931, 955, 999
5:9 757, 811, 1047, 1170
5:9 f 423
5:9, 11 317, 846
5:10 272, 887, 920, 947, 963, 965, 1014, 1026, 1162, 1163
5:11 232, 1047, 1060, 1185
5:12 547, 736, 944, 1202
5:13 689
6:1 603, 811
6:2 233, 504, 516, 587, 652, 670
6:3 751, 1149, 1173 bis
6:4 423, 698, 941
6:5 232, 313, 409, 561, 648, 718, 726, 1001
6:6 460, 705
6:6 f. 610
6:6, 8 487
6:7 218, 293, 690, 808, 816
6:8 704, 705
6:9 947, 1160, 1164
6:10 1164, 1189
6:11 411, 654, 701, 704, 807, 809
6:12 1158
6:13 703, 704
6:14 582
6:15 860, 940
6:16 233
6:18 471, 640
6:19 497, 716
6:20 511, 1149 bis
7:1 619, 720, 721, 722
7:2 408
7:5 597, 751, 1010, 1023, 1025
7:6 609, 1199
7:7 545, 688, 691, 605, 923, 968, 1181
7:9 218, 1012
7:10 518, 794
7:12 232, 680
7:13 440, 442, 724, 956
7:14 587, 1026
7:15 429, 948
7:16 264, 462
7:17 1025
7:18 740
7:18 ff. 1198
7:19 394, 654, 751
7:20 716
7:21 430, 1023
7:22 795
7:23 429
7:25 1128, 1140
7:26 320, 545, 1059, 1205
7:27 432
7:28 536, 710, 846, 923, 1020, 1022, 1027
7:29 319, 487, 994
7:29 f. 1127, 1140
7:31 476, 477, 533
7:33 767
7:34 523, 993
7:35 287, 504, 537, 546, 547, 687, 689, 763, 1109
7:36 489, 629, 1204
7:37 440, 549, 656, 700
7:38 218, 299
7:39 291, 716, 720, 733, 897, 1076, 1080, 1082
7:39, 40 1019
8:1-4 435
8:2 1038
8:3 698, 845
8:4 424
8:5 793, 1025, 1026, 1181
8:6 440, 533, 724
8:7 500, 532, 743
8:9 537, 995
8:10 778, 1072
8:11 317

1 Cor.
8:13 268, 962, 1154
9:1 364, 587, 917, 1157
9:2 244, 537, 1012, 1148, 1160, 1187
9:3 537, 703, 704
9:4 1158
9:4 f. 1169, 1174
9:4, 5 918
9:5 477, 480
9:6 402, 1068, 1164, 1177
9:7 478, 532, 770, 1147
9:8 208, 917 bis, 1158, 1174, 1177
9:9 508, 541
9:9 f 223
9:10 224, 996, 1061, 1067, 1076
9:11 681, 1009, 1017, 1022
9:12 500, 681, 1187
9:12, 15 533
9:13 521, 542, 623
9:14 598
9:15 439, 587, 704, 845, 984, 996, 1058
9:16 270, 1012
9:17 485, 550, 816, 1100
9:18 477, 656, 759, 784, 984, 992, 1078
9:19 516, 540, 597, 660, 665, 775, 1129
9:19f. 539
9:19-21 1217
9:19, 20, 22 843
9:21 232, 349, 504, 516, 1216
9:22 742, 773, 1199
9:23 504, 843
9:25 148, 478, 707, 880, 1153
9:26 1127, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1154, 1159, 1163
9:26 f. 880
9:27 201, 244, 633, 988
10:1 419
10:9 808 bis
10:3 776
10:3 f. 883
10:4 201, 339, 418, 838
10:5 418
10:6 488, 500, 704
10:7-9 931, 1088
10:7-10 403, 1185
10:9 317, 635, 1218
10:10 189, 967
10:11 404, 626, 703, 707
10:12 320, 430, 933, 1000
10:13 598, 632, 996, 1060, 1067, 1076, 1087
10:14 471, 1154
10:16 429, 488, 718, 8S0 bis
10:17 509, 773, 774, 962
10:18 760, 783
10:19 233, 234, 743, 1035, 1036
10:20 886, 1214
10:21 509, 791, 1183
10:22 325, 516, 923
10:24 394, 1203
10:25 263
10:27 f. 1018
10:29 688 bis, 694, 739
10:30 402, 509, 530, 609, 632, 678, 720, 721
10:31 1189
10:33 479, 487, 504, 652, 660, 690
11:2 479, 482, 487, 506, 881, 895, 1035
11:3 769, 781
11:4 477, 606
11:5 342, 530 bis, 656, 687, 789
11:6 342, 371, 809, 948, 1012, 1059, 1218
11:8 793
11:9 565
11:9, 12 584
11:11 1187
11:12 565, 582, 773
11:13 541, 687, 689, 890, 1086
11:14 686
11:15 574
11:17 218 bis, 277, 663
11:18 . 174, 487, 550, 585, 803, 881, 893, 1042, 1103, 1152
11:20 234, 562
11:20 ff 1152
11:21 342, 695, 854, 880
11:22 918, 928, 934, 1072, 1090, 1169, 1174
11:23 190, 312, 561, 579, 838, 1214
11:23 f. 1049
11:24 234, 595, 685
11:25 612, 1074, 1181
11:25f 974
11:26 880, 975
11:27 504, 787, 1188
11:28 519
11:29 880, 1023, 1129
11:29 ff 1201
11:30 880
11:31 1015
11:33 1000
11:33 f. 562
11:34 521, 791, 974
12:2 407, 412, 563, 922, 974, 1033
12:3 116, 1034
12:6, 11 476, 773

1 Cor.

12:8 696, 770
12:8, 10 746, 749
12:9 f. 747 bis
12:9-11 758
12:10 166
12:11 530, 580, 653, 1199
12:12 419
12:13 485, 757, 1189
12:13, 28 793
12:15 550
12:15 f. 616, 1164
12:19 1015, 1023
12:22 663, 664, 777, 1107
12:23 668
12:26 1179
12:27 550, 597, 792
12:28 300, 488 bis, 574, 696, 1152
12:29 757, 774
12:31 311, 551, 777, 784
13:1 129, 358, 1105
13:1-3 758
13:2. 219, 316 bis, 609, 750, 751, 772 bis, 1090, 1163
13:3 201, 324, 484, 504, 764, 876, 984, 1216
13:4 148
13:4-7 1178
13:4, 8 758
13:7 476, 477, 774
13:8 357
13:10 766
13:11 900, 971
13:12 208, 564 bis, 582, 600, 625, 649, 792, 827
13:13 281, 405, 668, 758
14:1 993
14:5 548, 640, 1017, 1039, 1188
14:6 483, 1188, 1189
14:7 233, 357, 423, 581, 778, 1109, 1140, 1155, 1188, 1189 bis
14:7, 9 871
14:7, 9, 16 876
14:8 807
14:9 323, 353, 582, 889, 1110, 1115
14:10 392, 1021
14:11 272, 588
14:13 950, 955
14:15 533, 874
14:15, 19 261
14:16 460, 691, 759, 765, 965 bis, 1026, 1159
14:17 1152, 1153
14:19 233, 661, 792, 1188
14:20 524
14:21 207, 591, 748
14:22 458, 537
14:23 917, 1157
14:24 427
14:25 546
14:26 626
14:27 170, 279, 470, 487, 550, 571, 670, 791
14:28 166
14:29 775
14:31 606, 608
14:33 497
14:34 1220
14:35 792
14:37 845, 1038
14:38 948, 1011
14:39 765, 1059, 1061, 1094
15:1 f. 427, 724
15:1-2 954
15:2 425, 530, 640, 738, 1008, 1011, 1018, 1169, 1188, 1205
15:3 525, 550, 1034 bis, 1035
15:4 844, 894, 896, 1182
15:6 511, 548, 642, 666, 674, 848
15:7 f. 820
15:8 233, 244, 516, 669, 757, 969, 1025, 1154
15:9 279, 658, 669, 713, 779, 962
15:10 411, 654, 712, 713, 720, 791, 1166
15:11 707
15:12 658, 820, 1008, 1034 bis, 1085
15:13, 16 1008
15:13, 15-17 1012
15:14, 17, 19 1008
15:15 607, 1154
15:15 f . 817
15:18 783
15:19 204
15:21 395, 794
15:22 587, 827
15:22, 28 872
15:23 767
15:24 312, 851, 1214
15:26 870
15:27 244, 395, 658, 1034, 1106
15:28 357, 657, 809, 819 bis
15:29 630, 632, 963 bis, 965 bis, 1012, 1025, 1180
15:29, 51 876
15:30 470, 677
15:31 487, 685, 827, 1150
15:32 539, 869, 931
15:33 207, 422, 1200
15:34 626
15:35 740, 1022, 1184
15:36 264, 423, 463, 678

1 Cor.
15:37 374, 878, 892, 1021, 1106, 1119, 1187, 1213
15:39 687, 747, 749, 752 bis, 770, 1153, 1163, 1187
15:39, 41 747 bis, 748
15:40 748, 749 bis
15:41 794
15:42 392
15:42 ff 429, 866
15:43 f . 1178
15:44 234 bis
15:45 669
15:48 429, 710, 731 bis
15:49 200, 349, 678
15:50 405, 699, 1036
15:51 334, 423, 753, 819, 1212
15:52 392, 587
15:54 429, 778
15:54 f. 258
15:54-7 1200
15:57 461, 1106, 1116
16:1 594, 619
16:1 f. 197
16:2 243, 325, 343, 672
16:2 f. 729
16:3 408-9
16:4 992, 996, 1059, 1061, 1066, 1067, 1077
16:5 434, 869, 882
16:6 488, 490, 551, 722, 969, 1109, 1121, 1127, 1130
16:7 877
16:9 364, 800
16:10 795, 993
16:11 244, 853, 856, 933, 943
16:12 235, 423, 619
16:12, 19 488
16:15 173, 1034
16:16 233, 627
16:17 173, 205, 235, 288, 685
16:18 685
16:20 692
16:21 416, 496, 685
16:22 313, 939, 945, 1012, 1160 bis

2 Corinthians
1:1 774
1:3 396, 785, 945, 1133, 1182
1:4 716, 772 bis
1:6 393, 632, 685, 784, 787
1:7 504
1:8 518, 632, 765, 996, 1061, 1067, 1.213
1:9 325, 360, 498, 577, 687, 897, 900, 908, 983, 1186
1:10 212, 710
1:11 474
1:12 297, 659
1:13 476, 643, 828, 1187
1:15 662, 886, 919
1:17 547, 614, 765, 1150 bis, 1157, 1176, 1177, 1190
1:18 1034, 1202
1:19 236, 424
1:22 212
1:23 602, 678, 1033, 1034, 1035
1:24 510
2:1 401, 539 bis, 700, 1059, 1078
2:2 1014, 1182
2:3 686, 699, 705, 706, 720, 721, 887, 920
2:3, 4, 9 846
2:4 423, 583, 598
2:5 1008
2:6 411, 537, 782
2:7 208, 532, 1090
2:9 194, 699, 1045
2:10 720, 956
2:11 474, 1156
2:12 364, 513, 595, 1213
2:13 235, 490, 532, 536, 539, 688, 765, 900 bis, 901, 966, 1061, 1091, 1112, 1171
2:14 474, 498
2:14-7:16 407
2:15 537
2:16 626, 696
2:17 644, 881
3:1 307, 316 bis, 1175
3:2 560, 778, 828, 1201
3:2 f. 217
3:3 404, 658, 1034, 1085-6, 1120, 1163, 1166
3:5 423
3:6 367, 480, 1213
3:7 1204
3:8-10 1136
3:10 f. 1109
3:11 583
3:12 532
3:13 318, 394, 883, 1003, 1075, 1159, 1171, 1203
3:14 244, 729
3:15 602
3:15 f. 300
3:15, 16 971
3:16 207, 392, 617, 618
3:17 769
3:18 486, 503, 530, 789, 810, 820, 891, 967, 968, 1154

2 Cor.
4:1f. 1128
4:2 316, 338, 771, 810
4:3 234, 587
4:4 503, 779, 1094, 1171
4:5 584, 1187
4:6 764, 962
4:7 497, 514
4:8 596, 1138
4:8 f. 1201
4:8, 9 1139
4:13 1134
4:16 522, 681, 750, 766
4:17 297, 551, 654, 763
4:18 891, 1132
5:1 399, 418, 498, 762, 779, 882, 1019
5:2 f. 563 bis, 600
5:3 244, 563 bis, 1027
5:4 604, 722, 762, 963
5:5 498, 595
5:6 474, 560, 1135
5:6 ff 440
5:6, 8 217
5:8 625
5:10 582, 773
5:11 500, 877, 880, 909
5:12 316, 439, 626, 792
5:13 394, 539, 845, 1203
5:14 499, 699, 833, 1035
5:15 517, 539, 631, 773
5:17 654
5:18 774
5:19 683, 964, 1033
5:20 1140, 1141
6:1 440
6:2 440, 497, 507
6:3 440
6:3 f. 442
6:4 316, 454, 481
6:4 ff 591
6:4-7 442 bis
6:7 582, 777
6:9 440, 827
6:9 f. 442, 1136, 1140
6:10 523, 828
6:11 895
6:13 486, 487
6:14 330, 375 bis, 528 bis, 529, 625, 890, 1051
6:15 217
6:15f. 1184
6:16 216, 528
6:17 853
6:18 458, 595
7:1 576
7:5 415, 439 bis, 897, 900 bis, 1135
7:7 665, 1091
7:8 1027
7:8, 14 962, 1008
7:9 599, 834, 1166
7:11 427, 481, 523, 686, 700, 705, 741, 1038, 1059, 1078, 1215
7:12 225, 429, 641, 846, 1060, 1073, 1080, 1091
7:13 663, 1205
7:14 603, 632, 968
7:15 612
7:16 217,474
8:1 587
8:2 262, 607
8:3 434, 609, 616
8:5 1152, 1159
8:6 968, 1003, 1072, 1090
8:7 195, 598, 933, 994
8:8 763
8:9 708, 834 bis
8:10 221, 425, 523, 703, 1059, 1158, 1162
8:10 f. 1066
8:11 395, 600, 996, 1061, 1067, 1073 bis, 1076
8:12 957, 967
8:13 395
8:14 707, 986
8:15 218, 660, 763, 774, 1202
8:16 396, 585
8:17 657, 665
8:18 562, 582, 770, 1134 ter
8:18-21 433
8:19 f. 431, 439
8:20 431, 699, 1039, 1134, 1136
8:22 488 ter, 530, 659, 664, 1041, 1103, 1123 bis
8:23 395, 441, 504, 632
8:24 946
9:1 782, 1059, 1066
9:2 221, 261, 475, 548, 550
9:3 375, 983
9:3 f. 988
9:3, 4 988
9:4 1199
9:5 996, 1086, 1182
9:6 295, 604, 1202
9:7 394, 597, 1202
9:8 1201
9:9 272
9:10 799
9:11 f. 946, 1136
9:11, 13 439
9:12 323, 376, 435, 439, 536, 565, 881
9:13 781, 783
9:14 562, 605

2 Cor.
9:15 605
10:1 407, 424, 457, 474, 686, 688
10:1, 2 217
10:1-11:6 407
10:2 401, 407, 474, 481, 490 bis, 519, 743, 1035, 1038, 1059, 1060, 1083, 1123
10:3 407, 792 bis
10:4 537, 626
10:5 500, 593
10:7 407, 497
10:7, 11 699
10:8 407
10:8, 13 716
10:9 407, 597, 959, 969, 1025, 1040, 1091, 1095
10:10 233, 392, 434, 1206
10:11 291, 407, 678, 392, 710, 434,
10:12 315, 401, 529, 687, 1201
10:12, 18 316
10:13 407, 719, 1078
10:14 477, 561, 629, 1159
10:16 244, 297, 517, 547, 550, 629 bis, 647
10:18 315, 707
11:1 368, 486, 543, 886, 923 bis, 1004, 1186
11:1 f., 16 f., 23 1199
11:2 261, 349, 1088
11:3 782, 995
11:4 747, 748, 1151, 1186
11:5 297, 395, 519, 548, 550, 629
11:6 129, 395, 1202
11:8 219, 1165
11:9 750, 778
11:10 1034
11:15 1180
11:16 203, 234, 743, 853 bis, 933, 1023, 1025
11:19f 1199
11:20 606, 802
11:21 434, 964, 1033, 1199
11:22 1198
11:23 244, 293, 297, 450, 551, 555, 558, 629 bis, 1109
11:23 ff 442
11:23, 27 784
11:24 615, 635
11:25 212, 833, 897
11:25 f 793
11:26 501
11:27 258
11:28 244, 537, 547, 646
11:29 677 bis
11:30 475
11:32 255, 258, 498
12:1 1092, 1130, 1149
12:2 408, 622, 778, 793, 1035, 1041, 1103
12:2f. 1045
12:2, 4 349
12:3 710
12:4 212, 225 bis, 491, 881, 1139
12:6 519, 988
12:7 532, 536, 538, 629, 960, 985
12:9 488, 541 bis, 602, 664, 670, 879, 897, 923
12:9, 15 279
12:10 973
12:11 478, 920, 1003, 1014, 1160
12:12 408, 757, 772, 1151
12:13 218, 341, 479, 512, 1025, 1199, 1216
12:14 702, 1077
12:15 218 bis, 277, 596
12:16 392, 476, 856, 948
12:17 436, 474, 488, 718, 720, 744, 896, 893 bis
12:18 684, 770
12:19 297, 644, 696, 879
12:20 267, 408, 534, 539, 731 bis, 929, 995 ter, 1159, 1161, 1174
12:21 193, 475, 621, 716, 910, 995, 1117, 1173
13:1 478, 674, 702
13:2 674, 1035
13:4 598
13:5 751, 1011, 1025, 1045, 1169
13:7 394, 423, 656, 763, 886, 919, 1162, 1173
13:9 698, 703
13:10 699, 845
13:12 773 bis

Galatians

1:1 567, 582, 778, 795
1:2 773, 780
1:4 232, 618, 629, 778
1:5 408
1:6 748, 749, 879 bis, 965
1:6 f. 747 bis
1:7 764, 778, 785, 1011, 1107, 1169
1:8 313, 402, 406, 1010, 1026
1:8f. 616, 939
1:9 483, 968
1:10 922, 1015
1:11 474
1:12 582, 1189

Gal.
1.13 783, 885
1:14 298, 620, 633, 779
1:16 587 bis
1:18 561
1:19 224, 1025
1:20 538, 1034
1:22 376, 487, 530
1:22 f. 412, 888
1:23 659, 892, 1115, 1139, 1147
1:24 523
2:1 955, 283, 581
2:1, 2 636
2:2 542, 923, 988 ter, 995
2:4 613, 802, 984
2:5 367, 438
2:5 f. 434
2: 6 438, 731, 732 bis, 743, 751, 1115
2: 6-9 130
2:7 208, 485, 540, 546, 550, 816, 820
2:9 394, 1000, 1085, 1202, 1203
2:10 703, 714, 719, 723, 933, 960
2:11 608, 816, 1118
2:12 579, 978, 1075
2:13 334, 530, 533, 1000 bis, 1181
2:14 224, 626, 880, 1028, 1029
2:15 530, 598
2:16 752, 796, 1025, 1204
2:17 232, 916 bis, 940, 1176
2:18 316, 402, 480, 678
2:19 402, 539, 796
2:20 479, 632, 715, 779
2:21 1190
3:1 349, 473, 608, 621, 723, 792,1193
3:2 579, 1060
3:4 710
3:5 394
3:7 698
3:8 367
3:10 598, 631, 720, 744, 773, 1067, 1086, 1088, 1159
3:11 395
3:13 317, 631 ter
3:14 1049
3:15 423, 1155, 1188
3:16 342, 604, 712
3:17 580, 672, 699, 1003, 1072, 1090
3:18 583
3:19 221, 349, 411, 647, 736, 974, 975
3:21 777, 778, 940, 1015
3:20 423
3:21 777, 7778, 940, 1015
3:23 857, 878, 978, 1074, 1075
3:25 635
3:28 313, 419, 558
4:1 733, 751, 757
4:4 820
4:5 960, 987
4:6 26, 231, 465
4:6 f. 441
4:7 395
4:8 1172
4:9 879, 1111, 1199
4:10 613, 810
4:11 995, 1169
4:12 482
4:15 841, 921, 922, 1014, 1048
4:17 203, 325, 342, 984
4:18 186, 1162
4:19 713, 975
4:20 368, 784, 886, 919, 937, 1199
4:24 704, 729 bis, 760, 881
4:24 f. 750
4:24, 26 727
4:25 254, 398, 411, 530, 547, 759, 766
4:25 f. 760
4:26 398, 547
4:27 663, 892, 1138, 1139
4:30 942
5:2 399, 482, 484, 816
5:3 1062, 1076
5:4 518 bis, 562, 880, 960
5:6 583
5:7 1094, 1171
5:10 540, 727, 746, 957
5:11 1008
5:12 809, 819, 873, 923, 940, 1004
5:13 605, 692, 1202
5:14 288, 419, 688, 766, 773, 874
5:15 933, 996
5:16 834
5:17 698, 850, 957, 994, 998
5:19 404, 729
5:20 265, 267
5:20 f., 22 f. 794
5:21 290, 771, 1035
5:22 428, 1178
5:24 767
5:25 1009
5:26 541
6:1 439, 995, 1027, 1180
6:3 411, 743, 751, 1127, 1173
6:4 690
6:6 486, 773
6:5 692, 889
6:6 486, 773

Gal.
6:7 698
6:8 779
6:9 1023, 1102, 1121, 1129, 1170
6:10 658, 670, 762, 763, 968, 974
6:11 292, 533, 734, 741 ter, 846 bis, 917, 1045, 1177
6:12 148, 201, 325, 532, 698, 732, 880, 885, 985
6:14 401, 796, 854, 940, 1003, 1170
6.15 234, 743
6:17 295, 495

Ephesians
1:1 582, 1107
1:2 780, 991
1:3 396, 763, 781, 785
1:3-14 433
1:4 297, 644
1:5 226, 583
1:6 503, 716
1:7 262
1:8 716
1:10 226, 766, 809
1:12 778, 1071
1:13 396; 453, 533, 540
1:13f. 713
1:15 605, 766, 782, 783
1:16 813, 1102
1:16-18 1086
1:17 309 bis, 326 bis, 327 ter, 398, 933, 940, 983 bis, 994, 1214
1:18 411, 909, 1072, 1087
1:19 778
1:19 716
1:20 408, 440
1:21 413, 629, 647
1:22 632
1:22 729, 1206
1:23 805-6
2:1 789
2:2 497, 651
2:3 419, 497, 503, 530, 788
2:4 478 bis, 482, 584, 833
9:5 529
2:5, 8 533
2:7 262, 784
2:8 582, 704, 705, 1182
2:9 744
2:10 605, 681, 716, 776
2:11 774, 777, 783
2:19 398, 516, 658, 782
9.13 1115, 1139
2:14 480, 498, 769 bis
2:14-18 433
9:15 589, 769, 783
2:17 483, 547
2:18 745, 769
2 20 498, 560, 787, 1131
2:21 772
3:1 488, 505
3:1-13 435
3:2 424, 1045, 1148 bis
3:3 845
3:4, 13 783
3:5 523, 787
3:6 1089
3:6, 8 1078
3:8 278, 439, 474, 483, 516, 663, 670 bis, 773 bis
3:8, 16 262
3:10 654
3:11 f. 724
3:12 784
3:13 412, 728, 729, 784
3:14 435
3:14-19 433
3:15 772
3:16 309, 327, 593, 766
3:16 f. 1086
3:17 1087, 1090
3:17 (18) 212
3:18 787
3:19 401, 519
3:20 517, 548, 629, 647 bis
3:21 408, 660
4:1 478, 716, 783, 1201
4:2 440, 807
4:2 f. 946
4:6 567
4:7 746
4:8 392, 479
4:9 278, 298, 499, 665, 668, 735, 766
4:10 297, 550, 647, 806
4:11 424, 694, 1152
4:12 624
4:13 503, 773, 975 bis
4.15 712
4:16 589, 745
4:17 700, 1078
4:17 f. 405, 407, 412
4:18 412, 515, 523, 910, 1117
4:21 507, 545, 588, 1027, 1148
4:22 280 bis, 283, 662, 1038, 1089
4:25 746
4:26 605, 854, 949, 1023, 1173
4:28 892, 1116
4:29 626, 753, 994
4:32 594
5:3 541, 753, 1173

Eph.
5:4 714, 887, 920;1138
5:5 319, 330, 360, 406, 713, 753, 786, 890
5:8 497, 651
5:11 529
5:12 530
5:14 310, 328, 422, 948, 1199
5:15 1172
5:15-22 440
5:18 533, 854, 890
5:19 690
5:21 500
5:22 393, 757, 946
5:23 399, 416, 768, 781, 782, 794
5:24 394, 794
5:25 757
5:26 521, 784, 811
5:27 687, 1023
5:29 1147
5:30 260
5:31 560, 574, 623
5:32 677
5:33 330, 746, 766, 769, 933, 943, 994, 1187
6:1 757
6:2 793
6:3 299, 875, 984
6:4 757
6:5 757, 782
6:6 792
6: 8 355
6:9 315, 502
6:10 550, 816
6:11 502, 991, 1003, 1075
6:12 566, 651, 763
6:13 563 ter, 777
6:14 409
6:16 589, 605, 652
6:17 412, 712, 954
6:18 f. 618
6:19 1090
6:21 608, 785
6:22 699, 846

Philippians
1:1 394, 628, 763, 783
1:2 795
1:3 604, 772
1:5 783
1:6 478, 686, 705, 776, 889
1:6, 25 699
1:7 491, 504, 566, 632, 658, 787, 966, 1131
1:8 1032
1:9 663, 699
1:10 594, 991, 1071
1:11 483, 485, 510, 595, 694
1:12 608, 665, 766
1:13 262, 1091
1:14 279, 540, 784
1:15 235, 265, 743 bis, 750, 1153
1:15 1200
1:16 ff. 1153
1:17 538
1:18 218, 487, 530. 646, 703, 871, 889, 1186, 1187
1:19 787
1:20 787, 794
1:21 1065
1:21, 24, 29 1059
1:22 537, 698, 737, 810, 875, 1023, 1183
1:23 130, 278, 442, 488 bis, 532, 546, 628, 664, 858, 1072, 1076
1.23, 29 1066
1:25 613, 787, 828
1:26 588, 783, 784
1:27 439, 505, 529, 637, 766
1:28 412, 537, 729
1:29 487, 632, 777, 1162
1:30 414, 439, 530, 731, 1135 bis
2:1 130, 410, 744, 1019
2:2 992
2:3 519, 690, 692, 1123 bis
2:4 292, 746
2:5 699, 703
2:6 152, 407, 546, 1041, 1059, 1066
2:7 1114
2:8 523, 645, 1122
2:9 629 bis, 632
2:10 503
2:11 188, 795, 1034
2:12 564, 606, 634, 1162, 1173
2:13 560, 564, 632, 1059, 1182
2:15 488, 505, 550, 644, 713, 714, 775
2:16 550
2:17 787, 828
2:17 f. 627
2:18 207, 487, 535
2:20 960, 961, 996
2:21 767, 773
2:22 441, 1199
2:23 224, 620, 687, 974
2:21 895
2:25 172, 418, 502
2:26 888, 964, 1120
2:27 505, 601, 646
2:28 297, 298, 545, 665, 846
2:29 480, 481
2:30 148 bis, 503, 781,

Phil.
3:1 420, 487, 546, 550, 890, 1058, 1085, 1146, 1153
3:2 471, 769, 949, 1100, 1178, 1200
3:2 f. 1201
3:3 540, 769, 785, 1138, 1139
3:4 1129, 1154
3:5 523, 598, 657
3:6 261
3:7 396, 480, 481, 584, 698, 704, 1041
3:8 396, 481, 485, 504, 652, 764, 812, 983, 1036, 1109, 1145, 1148, 1151, 1186
3:9 588, 598, 685, 782, 783, 784
3:10 150 bis, 990, 1002, 1067, 1088, 1200
3:11 1017
3:12 605, 811, 812, 845, 901, 916, 1017, 1024, 1030
3:13 472, 489, 506, 509, 807, 1038, 1060, 1202
3:13 f. 765
3:14 146, 547, 608, 656, 782
3:15 395, 749, 931
3:16 329, 944, 1081, 1092, 1187
3:17 221
3 :18 473, 718
3:18 f. 413, 1107
3:20 714
3:21 496, 528, 906, 1061, 1066, 1067, 1076
4:2 235
4:3 612, 728
4:5 546, 763, 1202
4:7 477 499 629, 800, 1183
4:8 698, 724, 733, 765, 812, 1146
4:9 698, 724, 1182
4:10 348, 476, 487, 604, 963, 965, 1019 1059, 1066, 1147, 1212
4:11 677, 687, 721 bis, 835, 845, 1038, 1041, 1060, 1103, 1166
4:11, 17 965
4:12 117, 342, 371, 1181
4:13 478
4:14 1121, 1187
4:16 1183
4:17 594, 1166
4 :13 172
4:19 962, 586, 783
4:20 785
4:22 548, 599, 670

Colossians
1:2 185, 408
1:2, 6, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28 243
1:3 f. 1128
1:3, 4 860
1:4 783
1:5 498
1:6 881, 968
1:6, 9 717, 978
1:7 172, 255, 781
1:8 764, 779, 859
1:9 483, 435, 576, 600, 721, 784, 993, 1049, 1102
1:9 ff 772
1:9-23 433
1:10 1036, 1087
1:10-12 1200
1:13 212, 496, 497, 503, 818
1:15 233, 234, 772
1:15, 23 772
1:16 567, 583, 588, 654 bis, 762, 763, 8474, 894, 896
1:17 234, 534, 622; 679, 774, 896
1:18 243, 375 bis, 890
1:20 226
1:21 375, 777, 910, 1115, 1117
1:21 f. 434
1:22 437, 496, 644
1:23 243, 717, 1148
1:24 165, 565, 574, 712, 784
1:24, 23 f. 724
1:26 440, 1135
1:27 262, 713
1:29 714
2:1 337, 364, 733, 886, 908
2:11 116
2:2 243, 262, 439
2:3 243
2:4 987
2:5 651, 1026, 1187
2:7 212
2:8 764, 787, 933, 995 bis, 1107, 1116, 1159, 1169
2:8, 19 1164
2:10 712
2:11 215
2:12 152, 529
2:13 560, 789, 1205
2:13f. 658
2:14 524, 528, 634, 648, 783
2:15 226, 474, 589, 805
2:16 204, 1182
2:17 712
2:18 65, 134, 477, 500, 551 bis, 535
2:19 478, 713, 1138, 1139.
2:20 559, 576, 792, 807
2:21 853
2:22 714, 789
2:23 375, 626, 742, 881, 1152 bis
3:1 529, 881

Col.
3:1 f. 547
3:2 1172
3:3 588, 628 bis
3:5 727, 728, 758 bis, 960
3:7 971
3:9 854, 890
3:11 657, 712, 1188
3:13 508, 690, 692, 742, 968
3:14 411, 605, 713
3:15 499
3:16 440, 560, 690, 946, 1133
3:17 727, 729, 957
3:18 393, 807, 887, 920
3:18 ff. 757
3:23 550, 1140
3:24 498
3:25 355, 1217
4:1 788
4:3 407, 638 bis, 1086, 1090, 1140
4:5 625, 810
4:6 269, 396, 439, 880, 1045, 1090, 1208
4:8 699, 846
4:9 355, 547
4:10 255
4:12 172, 630, 772, 994
4:13 244, 257
4:14 172 bis, 255
4:15 172, 257, 608
4:16 600, 1204
4:17 343, 983
4:18 685

1 Thessalonians
1:1 173, 780, 796
1:3 498, 503, 779 bis, 780
1:5 566, 731 ter, 1045
1:7 f. 787
1:8 782
1:9 731, 732, 779, 795, 1032, 1045, 1177
1:10 475, 778, 1107
2:2 1077
2:3 598
2:4 485, 1085, 1103, 1139
2:7 505, 968
2:8 164, 198, 206, 225, 508, 722, 1162, 1215
2:9 593, 1003, 1075
2:10 537, 545, 1032
2:12 787, 997, 1002, 1072
2:13 545, 560, 791
2:14 530
9.15 1205
2:16 1220
2:17 559, 665, 778
2:18 407, 1151, 1152 bis
2:19 587, 1188
3:1 521
3:2 f. 1066
3:3 186 n., 686, 1059
3:5 458, 988 ter, 991, 1071, 1088, 1169
3:6 579, 1036, 1139
3:7 605, 787
3:8 188, 879, 973, 1010 bis
3:9 716
3:10 297, 629, 647, 1002, 1072
3:11 327, 785, 1092
3:11 f. 854, 943
3:11, 12 940
3:12 327, 940, 1181
4:1 439, 560, 739, 766, 1046
4:2 583
4:3 400, 518, 698, 1059
4:3 f. 1078
4:5 1172
4:6 233, 338, 629, 1059, 1078
4:7 605 bis
4:8 1154
4:9 686, 997, 1003, 1071, 1072, 1097
4:10 774
4:10 f. 1066
4:11 1060
4:12 751
4:13 985
4:14 355, 817
4.15 618
4:15, 17 778
4:16 589, 783
4:17 357, 528, 628, 638
5:2 550
5:3 225, 267
5:4 998
5:5 496, 497
5:6 497, 931 bis, 1200
5:8 497, 498
5:10 534, 628, 638, 833, 1017, 1027
5:11 293, 675, 692
5:12 319
5:13 171, 647
5:14 625
5:15 309 bis, 431, 573, 692, 933, 996
5:16 947
5:16-22 890
5:19 218, 318
5:22 518
5:23 940, 1003
5:25 619
5:27 484, 1085

2 Thessalonians

1:3 629, 693
1:4 287, 687, 689, 716
1:5 511
1:7 497
1:8 787
1:10 334, 485, 818
1:11 511, 714
1:12 786, 987
2:1 632 bis
2:2 261, 582, 895, 964, 1033, 1072, 1140, 1189
2:3 497 bis, 856, 933, 1023, 1173
2:3 f. 1202, 1203
2:4 234, 311, 562, 1034, 1105
2:5 1139
2:6 409, 411
2:7 792
2:8 1212
2:10 499, 500
2:12 532
2:13 339, 366, 501, 550
2:14 714
2:15 485, 816, 1045
2:17 940, 943, 1092
3:2, 7 1205
3:3 956, 961, 1219
3:4 540
3:5 500, 1092
3:5, 16 940
3:6 336, 560, 1047, 1172, 1217
3:7 880
3:7 f. 964
3:8 1003, 1075
3:9 965
3:10 699, 950, 1012, 1028, 1046, 1047
3:11 564, 617, 1042, 1103, 1127, 1201
3:12 1046, 1047
3:13 1102, 1121
3:14 317, 329, 529, 698, 944, 1047, 1170
3.15 481, 1123
3:16 309, 326, 940, 1214
3:17 493, 685, 713

1 Timothy

1:1 235
1:3 561, 968
1:3-5 439
1:4 152,782
1:6 518, 714
1:7 325, 726, 737, 1045, 1176
1:8 341, 342, 533, 762, 1201
1:9 185, 539, 699
1:9f. 427
1:10 224, 749, 777, 1100
1:11 485, 776
1:12 1035, 1103
1:13 1115, 1127, 1128
1:14 629, 782
1:15 652
1:16 657, 699, 771
1:17 776
1:18 261, 478
1:19 620
1:20 235
2:2 582, 629
2:3 642
2:4 423
2:6 490, 573, 631, 770
2:7 242, 401
2:8 273, 431, 489, 886, 919
2:9 272
2:12 510
3:1 508
3:2 189
3:3 613, 1172
3:5 876, 1172
3:6 664, 1172
3:7 765
3:8 580, 1172
3:13 811
3:15 729, 880, 983
3:16 242, 295, 401, 422, 428, 534, 546, 551, 713, 793, 954, 1109, 1199
4:1 499, 518, 668
4:3 518, 785, 1121, 1201
4:4 1022, 1129
4:6 543, 717
4:8 272, 535, 547, 1128
4:10 565
4:13 976
4:14 508, 611, 854, 890
4:15 589
5:1 1218
5:2 772
5:4 215, 1103
5:5 302. 547, 565, 623
5:8 509, 516, 691, 1012
5:9 218, 277, 488, 516, 666
5:10 163, 800
5:11 512, 972
5:13 232, 272, 273, 477, 617, 618, 638, 1040, 1103 bis, 1121, 1122, 1172
5:14 919
5:17 284, 511, 654
5:18 223
5:19 251, 603, 640, 1025, 1188
5:21 621

1 Tim.
5:22 854, 890 bis
5:23 779, 789
5:24 235, 620
6:2 508
6:3 609, 1011, 1169
6:4 167, 267, 405
6:5 166, 483, 486, 518, 582
6:7 1191
6:8 324, 871, 889
6:10 542, 617
6:11 476, 1186
6:12 478
6:13 603
6:15 495, 523, 660, 691, 785
6:15 f. 776
6:17 163, 493, 496, 651, 783, 908
6:18 163, 204
6:20 186, 261, 810, 856
6:21 715

2 Timothy
1:1 796
1:3 963
1:5 485
1:6 483, 718, 722
1:6, 12 962
1:8 472, 529
1:8f 1107
1:11 485
1:12 166, 594, 658, 718, 720, 726, 1102
1:13 717, 782
1:14 613, 856
1:15 214, 235, 269, 472, 484, 497, 772
1:16 235, 367, 485
1:16, 18 309, 326, 854, 939, 940, 1214
1:17 665
1:18 277, 299, 488, 665, 733
2:2 . 583, 698, 856
2:3 856
2:5 850, 1019 bis, 1027
2:8 481, 1041
2:12 1008
2:13 1119
2:14 164, 605, 944, 947, 1162, 1163
2:15 856
2:16 316
2:16, 22 f 890
2:17 235
2:18 620, 908
2:19 262, 1154
2:20 1183
2:21 597
2:25 135, 309 bis, 327, 565, 983, 988 bis, 989, 996, 1044, 1214
2:26 707
3:1 699, 769
3:3 162
3:4 661, 663, 666
3:6 148, 155
3:7 1173
3:8 255, 486
3:9 707, 708
3:11 212, 731 bis
3:14 721
3:15 879
3:16 272, 772, 1097
4:11 484
4:2 328
4:7 895
4:8 498, 903
4:9 1205
4:9-21 759
4:10 172, 184, 255, 547, 858, 861
4:11 172, 535, 549, 1127
4:13 186, 221, 235, 255, 614
4:15 419, 949, 955
4:16 779, 854, 939, 940
4:17 212, 818
4:18 1204
4:19 235
4:21 235, 255, 621

Titus
1:2 224
1:2 f. 441
1:6 234
1:7 1172
1:11 774, 962, 1169
1:12 273, 422, 692, 1200
1:13 955
1:14 472
1:15 362
1:16 1036, 1035, 1103
2:3 166
2:4 203, 762, 943, 985
2:7 480, 690, 811
2:8 652, 1087
2:9 691, 944
2:10 311, 780
2:11 272, 537, 653, 656
2:12 788
2:13 82, 786, 787
2:14 518, 618, 632
3:1 483
3:2 311
3:3 1202
3:5 261, 681, 715
3:6 716

Titus
3:7 224, 707, 779
3:8 509, 537, 764, 812
3:9 265 bis
3:11 687
3:12 172, 235
3:13 172 bis, 255, 260, 1217
3:14 1041

Philemon

2 215
5 624, 1200
9 201, 710
10 713, 718
12 399, 416, 846
13 631, 919
13 f. 886
14 550, 763, 994
15 699
16 491, 632, 663, 670
18 342
19 623, 685, 846, 1199
20 310, 509, 784, 939 bis, 940 bis
22 638
23 172
24 172 bis

Hebrews

1:1 545, 546
1:1 f. 422
1:1-3 432
1:2 408, 480, 671, 775
1:3 496 bis, 586, 651, 781, 792, 845, 860, 1099
1:3, 4 f. 422
1:4 218, 420, 532, 615, 663, 667, 710 bis, 733 bis, 966
1:5 420
1:6 773
1:7 626, 1202
1:8 465
1:9 483, 528
1:10 234, 792
2:1 212, 279, 298, 3:50, 613, 996
2:2 583, 1107
2:2-4 432
2:3 710, 828, 1023, 1129
2:4 151
2:6 234, 299, 411, 736, 742, 781, 1001, 1146, 1219
2:7 484, 485, 602, 616
2:7, 9 218, 743
2:8 1073 bis, 1153
2:9 473, 485, 632, 1041, 1123
2:10 530, 565, 583 bis, 861, 887, 1039, 1084, 1086, 1114, 1128
2:11 718, 1179
2:11 f. 863
2:12 216
2:13 323, 361, 375, 460, 906
2:14 412, 509, 687, 705
2:15 582, 1052, 1060 bis, 1070
2:16 1146, 1149, 1200
2:17 474, 486, 530, 658, 887 920, 1072
2:18 721, 722, 963, 1128
3:1 505, 722, 785, 955
3:2 661
3:3 244, 511, 615, 661, 667, 722, 733, 967
3:4 742
3:5 374, 878, 1119
3:6 413, 789, 792
3:7 722
3:9 717
3:11 916, 968, 1000, 1024
3:12 330, 496, 504, 872, 996, 1073 bis, 1169
3:13 221n, 608, 744, 745, 974, 975
3:14 1027, 1154
3:15. 439
3:16 233, 583, 613, 917
3:17 233
3:18 877, 1032, 1082
3:19 1035, 1183
4:1 814, 908 n., 996
4:2 526, 903, 967, 1154
4:3 132, 778, 968, 1000, 1004, 1129, 1140, 4154, 1202
4:3, 5 1024
4:4 575, 653
4:4, 10 518, 800
4:6 474, 1058
4:8 1015
4:9 541
4:11 744
4:12 278, 504, 580, 633, 667
4:13 625, 1153
4:15 530
4:16 261
5:1 315, 486, 630, 762
5:2 316, 485, 541
5:3 618
5:4 393, 762, 968, 1154
5:5 1089
5:7 580, 598
5:8 720, 721, 1027, 1115, 1129, 1140, 1154 bis, 1201
5:10 485

Heb.
5:11 523, 1076, 1081
5:12 233, 375, 482, 490, 584, 740, 903, 1038, 1039, 1061, 1076, 1082
5:13 395, 516
5:14 497, 514, 580, 584, 757, 789, 902, 910, 1108, 1117, 1122
6:1 498
6:1, 3, 9, 11 407
6:2 501
6:3 1027, 1154
6:4 473
6:4 f. 449, 507
6:5 474
6:6 539, 613
6:7 584, 603, 708
6: 8 640, 1134
6:9 218, 485, 508, 637
6:10 506, 716, 860, 998, 1001, 1060, 1080, 1082, 1090
6:11 311
6:12 1153
6:13 475, 1159
6:13, 16 607
6:14 192, 551, 1004, 1024 bis, 1110, 1150 bis
6:17 148, 654, 763
6:18 778, 827, 828
6:19 258, 259, 274;298, 418, 715
7:1 697, 701, 1134
7:2 714, 1153
7:3 594
7:4 258, 292, 399, 418, 741 bis, 1177
7:5 343, 371 bis, 412, 705, 1076, 1129, 1154
7:6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 20, 23 . 896
7:7 218, 277, 409, 654, 752, 763
7:7, 19, 22 218
7:8 1035, 1153
7:9 208, 967, 990, 1086, 1091, 1093
7:11 604, 1015, 1027, 1095, 1151, 1162, 1164
7:11, 13, 15 748
7:12 1023, 1129
7:13 580, 721
7:14 719, 1034
7:15 279, 659, 663
7:16 158 bis
7:18 763
7:20 733, 963
7:20 f. 435, 967
7:20-22 710
7:20, 23 695
7:21 334, 819
7:23 613, 1061, 1085, 1119
7:24 401, 656, 789, 1039, 1070, 1122
7:25 550
7:26 667, 710, 1086, 1181
7:26 f. 710
7:27 280, 691
7:28 315, 418, 480
8:1 605, 705, 710 bis
8:2 317, 408, 715 bis
8:3 928, 955, 956, 961, 989
8:4 207
8:4, 7 1015
8:5 233, 392, 874, 932, 949, 1214
8:6 218, 728, 733 bis, 801, 967, 1220
8:7 708
8:8 255, 473, 475
8:9 514, 560, 1123
8:10 440, 479, 1135
8:11 361, 746, 906, 1215
8:12 260
8:13 895, 1073
9:1 777
9:2 232, 714
9:2 f. 660
9:3 408, 612
9:4 253, 348
9:5 154, 409, 517, 550, 629, 632, 647, 792, 1058
9:6 313, 1215
9:6 f. 1153
9:6-8, 15, 19 1131
9:7 441, 505, 637, 715, 769, 776, 955
9:8 700, 1036, 1039, 1040, 1049, 1078
9:9 413
9:10 1078
9:11 399, 412, 416, 705, 1139
9:12 272, 339, 809, 861, 1114
9:14 355
9:15 501, 604
9:16 969
9:17 604, 963, 971, 1159, 1169, 1173
9:19 214, 254, 686
9:19, 21 212
9:20 716
9:23 218, 615, 667, 686
9:24 574
9:25 207, 589
9:26 604, 887, 920, 963, 965 bis, 1026, 1085
9:27 733, 963, 967, 1058
9:28 871
10:1 187, 392, 439, 550, 716, 1135

Heb.
10:2 778, 963 bis. 965 bis, 1015, 1026, 1102, 1175
10:6, 8 474
10:7 895, 1088
10:9 895, 909
10:10 719, 891
10:11 617, 687
10:13 487, 495
10:14 891, S95, 1111, 1116
10:15 909, 979, 1074
10:15 f. 439
10:15, 26 1074
10.16 440, 1135
10:22 211, 225, 340, 362, 485, 486, 1217
10:24 501
10:25 124, 532, 710, 733 bis, 967, 1123
10.26 612
10:27 743
10:28 251, 566, 604
10:29 434, 511, 859
10:31 1059
10:32 470, 475
10:33 457, 705, 1153
10:34 218, 1035, 1036, 1038, 1041, 1103
10:35 728
10:36 998
10:37 395, 733, 978
10:39 497, 515
11:1 234, 1138
11:1, 35 1139
11:3 423, 909 his, 1003, 1036, 1049, 1070, 1072, 1090
11:4 667, 724, 1038, 1085
11:5 365, 371
11:6 234
11:7 334, 1173
11:9 593
11:10 262
11:11 616, 686, 793
11:12 524, 704, 705, 777, 1129, 1140, 1181
11:13 533, 833, 1137
11:14 1034
11:15 887, 921, 923, 1015, 1062
11:15 f. 1153
11:16 399, 416, 508
11:16, 35, 40 218
11:17 359, 760, 885
11:17, 28 895
11:18 1034
11:19 818
11:20 788
11:21 775, 827, 979, 1115
11:22 260, 812
11:23 833
11:24 1036
11:25 529
11:26 480, 500, 575, 594, 1202
11:27 833, 1113, 1121
11:25 148 bis, 189
11:29 476, 563, 565, 582 bis, 652, 800
11:31 317, 529
11:32 210, 420, 934, 1126
11:33 477, 509, 606
11:34 476, 748
11:35 1138
11:36 749
11:37 534, 590
11:39 833
12:1 168, 420, 425, 524, 542, 562, 583, 653, 810, 931, 1154
12:1 f. 432
12:1, 2 764
12:2 154, 502, 512, 574, 575, 1106
12:3 524, 635, 1107, 1121
12:4 368, 645, 975
12:5 508, 509
12:6 966, 1184
12:7 738, 794, 1159
12:8 420
12:9 480, 532, 546, 1152
12:9, 25 664
12:10 625, 1109
12:11 448, 497, 515, 519, 625, 1109
12:12 315
12:12 f. 1200
12:13 421
12:14 425, 648, 871
12:14 f., 24 422 bis
12:15 496, 774, 800, 934, 995
12:16 190, 308, 573
12:17 319, 360, 611, 941, 1129, 1154
12:18 262, 536, 1118
12:18, 29 542, 793
12:19 261, 818, 1094, 1171
12:20 508, 581
12:21 168, 221
12:22 536, 760
12:23 792
12:24 218, 615, 667
12:25 430, 472, 791, 810, 922, 933, 996, 1160
19:27 766 bis, 1140
12:28 934, 955 bis, 956, 989
13:2 400, 472, 475, 509 bis, 551, 860, 1102, 1120

Heb.
13:4 396
13:5 207, 930, 946, 1165, 1175
13:6 217, 334, 819, 871
13:7 514, 949, 955
13:8 206, 395
13:9 1095, 1162, 1166
13:10 599
13:11 718, 719, 953
13:13 425, 1154
13:15 108, 203, 268, 399, 524, 541
13:16 532, 816
13:17 374, 634, 877, 1119 bis 1128, 1140, 1214
13:18 407, 678, 1035
13:19 279, 545, 664
13:20 777, 778, 784
13:21 327, 940
13:22 583, 845
13:22 f 407
13:23 664, 910, 1041, 1103, 1110, 1123
13:24 548, 578, 766

James
1:1 329, 394, 944, 1093
1:2 524, 772
1:3 763
1:5 518, 1023
1:6 149, 478, 801, 895
1:7 1035
1:8 580
1:11 837
1:13 516, 579, 1034
1:13f. 1186
1:15 232
1:17 153, 233, 413, 421, 501, 655, 772, 1200
1:18 742, 1071
1:19 319, 328, 329, 360, 429, 658 bis, 908, 941, 1003, 1052, 1071, 1072, 1076
1:21 216
1:22 947, 1162
1:23 530,698
1:24 731, 732, 844, 897, 1177
1:25 496, 780
1:26 231, 272, 1038, 1085
1:26 124
1:27 . 516, 700, 1059, 1078, 1219
2:1 408, 503
2:2 124, 169
2:2, 3 762
2: 3 314, 329, 340, 1216
2:4 1175
2:5 480, 537, 716, 763, 917
2:6 408, 510, 763
2:7 62, 776
2:8 874
2:10 956, 957, 959, 897, 898
2.11 1012, 1166
2:13 162, 512
2:14 395, 1038
2:15 406, 412, 655, 1121
2:16 562
2:19 . 404
2:19 f. 430
2:20 273, 464, 878
2:22 367, 477, 529, 1041
2:24 1041
2:25 521, 526, 966, 1128
3.1 423, 1172
3:2 488, 698, 1076
3:3 418
3:4 290, 709, 1129
3:5 991, 733, 737
3:6 233, 399
3:7 533, 534, 776, 902
3:8 124, 413
3:9 473, 500, 785
3:10 319, 920, 1220
3:11 653, 786
3:12 417, 1189
3:13 738, 1045
3:14 560, 1173
3:15 881
3:17 273, 424, 1152 bis
4:2 1083
4:2 f. 805 bis, 966, 1071, 1091
4:4 411
4:5 626
4:7 1023
4:7 f 948
4:8 355, 538, 1214
4:9 561, 856
4:11 512
4:12 778, 1107
4:13 289, 299, 32S, 348, 474, 696, 770, 799, 1193, 1217
4:14 728, 735, 740, 767, 961, 1158
4:15 574, 697, 708, 1060, 1069, 1070
4:16 710
4:17 764 bis, 1106
5:1 299, 391, 428, 430, 763, 854, 949, 1106, 1116
5:2 801
5-2 f. 405, 898
5:3 769
5:4 337, 579
5:6 757

James
5:7 201, 652, 856
5:9 394, 621
5:10 480
5:12 328, 427, 471, 475, 484, 622, 853
5:13 430, 515, 740, 1023
5:14 124, 328
5:15 208, 325, 300, 375, 908, 1019
5:17 392, 531 bis, 802, 1094
5:18 348, 799

1 Peter
1:2 127 bis, 793, 854, 940
1:3 774, 778, 783, 785
1:4 273, 535
1:5 272, 769, 775, 783, 794
1:6 881, 941, 949, 978, 1119
1:6-12 724, 954
1:7 654, 763, 778, 1107
1:8 127, 224, 531, 715, 1096, 1135 bis, 1139, 1172, 1212
1:10 597, 719, 721, 778
1:10 f. 563
1:11 594, 735
1:12 195, 778, 1029, 1031
1:13 314, 602, 777
1:14 497, 782
1:17 127, 997, 779
1:18 272, 412, 656, 774, 777
1:18 f. 533
1:19 127
1:20 603
1:20f. 1114
1:24 837
1:25 535, 778
2:1 408, 773
2:2 349
2:3 192, 1035
2:4 424
2:5 338, 401, 941
2:6 392, 772, 800, 802
2:7 418, 715
2:8 714
2:9 xii, 101, 597
2:10 910, 1117, 1138, 1139, 1163
2:11 518, 728 bis, 1084
2:11 f. 1039
2:12 497, 721, 789, 946, 1134
2:13 772
2:13, 16 1140
2:15 343, 400, 700 bis, 779, 1078
2:16 127
2:18 946, 947, 1161
2:19 500, 699, 704
2:19 f 411
2:20 740
2:21 633, 784
2:21-24 954
2:24 561, 723
2:25 787
3:1 127, 324, 516, 638, 779, 946, 984, 1026, 1217
3:3 127, 498 bis, 779, 947, 949, 1161
3:4 200, 272, 274, 712, 779
3:6 479
3:7 1072
3:7, 9, 16 946
3:8 470, 487
3:8 f. 945
3:9 208, 573 bis, 699
3:10 1061, 1171
3:11 561
3:12 1106
3:13 127, 374, 878, 1118
3:13 f. 1020
3:14 127, 327, 478, 683, 1021, 1023, 1027
3:14, 17 1023
3:15 482
3:16 473, 721
3:17 127, 218, 1021, 1039, 1084
3:18 523, 618 bis, 757, 1114
3:18-99 432
3:19 f. 778
3:20 399, 416, 560, 656, 705, 779
3:21 714
3:22 792
4:1 518, 816
4:2 348, 479, 1070, 1071
4:3 127, 364, 909, 992, 1062, 1076
4:5 793
4:6 699, 792, 1031
4:8 622, 789
4:8 ff 946
4:9 638
4:11 396
4:12 532, 626
4:13 967
4:14 602, 767, 777, 779, 785
4:15 204
4:16 192
4:17 395, 512, 1061, 1076
4:18 357, 763, 871
4:19 231
5:1 587, 779, 557, 878
5:2 551
5:4 355, 498, 1217
5:5 808

1 Peter
5:6 258, 635
5:7 212, 539, 560, 946
5:8 740, 795, 1040, 1044, 1085
5:9 502, 505, 523, 541, 542, 687, 949, 955
5:10 195, 606, 778, 1126
5:12 173, 415, 583, 593, 846, 949, 1036, 1039
5:13 169

2 Peter
1:1 82, 127, 530, 785, 786 bis
1:1, 11 786
1:2 127, 940
1:2-7 432
1:3 101, 127, 533, 778
1:4 279, 670, 783
1:5 126, 460, 487, 686, 705 bis
1:5-7 1184, 1200
1:8 315
1:9 127, 423, 542, 720, 962, 1169
1:10 787, 985
1:11 127 bis, 401, 785 bis, 786
1:12 483, 656, 1129, 1154
1:14 127
1:15 127, 333, 356
1.15 f 1191
1:16 1139
1:17 290, 438, 636, 709, 842, 1135
1:18 778, 864, 1097
1:19 185, 663, 1121
1:20 514, 518, 699, 772, 1039
1:21 751, 1165
2:1 127, 613, 1134, 1203
2:3 297, 440, 474, 551, 724
2:4 1012, 1160
2:4-10 438
2:5 275, 348, 672
2:6 257, 498, 539
2:7 212, 783
2:8 126, 434, 470, 597
2:10 127, 1122
2:11 205, 665
2:12 473, 721
2:12-15 1125
2:13 355, 374, 485, 529, 560, 878
2:14 162, 185, 497, 516
2 : 15 521
2 : 16 127
2:17 186, 704
2:19 533, 534
2:19 f. 218
2:20 341, 476, 785, 786, 881
2:21 127, 219, 597, 887, 909, 920, 1014, 1039, 1058, 1084, 1094
2:22 394, 502, 767, 807
3:1 701, 714
3:1 f. 127
3:2 503, 762, 779, 785, 1086, 1107
3:2, 18 786
3:3 775, 1039
3:3, 8. 699
3:4 653, 717, 880, 978
3:5 320, 582, 793, 794, 1035, 1134
3:6 201, 547
3:8 281
3:9 518, 1128
3:10, 12 374
3:11 705, 741, 1131
3:14 537; 542
3:15 480
3:15 f. 117
3:16 773 bis
3:17 518 bis, 993

1 John
1:1 713, 724, 791, 896
1:1-3 901
1:2 777
1:3 611, 713, 724
1:3, 6, 7 528
1:4 406, 678, 907
1:5 579, 699, 1033
1:7 518
1:9 961, 998
2:1 406
2:2 424, 441, 618, 685, 1185, 1199
2:3 590, 700, 850, 1079
2:4 904
2:5 500, 897
2:6 708
2:6, 9 1038
2:7 884
2:8 713, 879
2:9 879, 1183
2:12-14 845
2:13 694
2:16 788, 963
2:18 573, 769, 794
2:19 753, 906, 922, 923, 1015, 1086
2:20 230
2:21 753, 845, 1166
2:22 1035, 1094, 1164, 1205
2:24 437
2:25 400, 416, 479, 538, 704, 718, 777
2:26 845
2:27 230, 339, 437, 1217
2:28 473, 1147

1 John

3:1 135, 741, 999
3:4, 11, 23 992
3:2 233 bis, 736
3:4 769
3:6 880
3:8 699, 880 bis
3:9 890, 1081
3:10 404, 1164, 1173, 1174
3:11 f. 1192, 1203
3:11, 23 699, 1079
3:12 425, 647, 652, 968, 1176
3:13 532, 965
3:14 586, 1041
3.15 753
3:16 632, 1033, 1079
3:19 871
3:19, 24 699
3:20 512, 667
3:21 512
3:22 850
3:23 850
3:24 442, 679, 716
4:1 752
4:2 480, 1103, 1116, 1123
4:3 546, 724, 962, 964, 1149, 1169
4:7 692, 931
4:8 794, 845
4:9 584, 777, 845-9
4:9, 10, 13 699
4:10 845
4:11 1009
4.13 401, 519, 599
4:14 894
4:16 768
4:17 611, 699
4:18 758
4:19 549
4:21 699, 992, 1079
5:2 432, 700
5:3 400, 699, 1034, 1079
5:3, 4, 9, 11, etc. 704
5:3, 9, 11 993
5:4 258, 409, 698
5:6 583, 589, 657, 659, 1166
5:8 593
5:9 393, 964, 1034, 1049
5:9, 11, 14 699
5:10 226, 963, 1159, 1169
5:11 400, 1033, 1034
5:12 1164
5:13 360, 401, 418, 699, 778, 845, 846, 983, 993, 1034
5:14 805, 1033
5.15 482, 805, 1010
5:16 392, 477
5:16 f. 234
5.18 226, 763, 1117
5:20 201, 325, 652; 703, 707, 763, 776, 984
5:21 476, 689, 856

2 John

1 273, 657, 713, 1116
2 441, 1199
4 515, 902, 1041
5 339, 1140 bis
6 699, 992
6 f. 703
7 480, 1036, 1041, 1103, 1107, 1123 bis
8 403
10 792, 1093, 1160
12 368, 625, 846, 919
13 273

3 John

2 619
3 968
4 277, 663, 685, 699, 704, 992, 1042
6 861, 1121
8 134, 633 235, 269, 846
10 1166, 1185, 1189
12 635
13 582
14 625

Jude

1 501, 58S, 767
2 125
2, 9 940
3 1106
4 127, 265, 341, 613, 776, 786, 1107, 1214
5 125, 1032, 1035, 1129
7 125, 263, 486, 748, 1032
9 125, 232, 529
10 473
11 510
12 704
13 272
14 125, 589
15 716
16 439, 474
18 603
20 280, 670 bis
22 1153
22 f. 696
22, 23 342
24 505, 644, 1200

Revelation

1:1 258, 349, 780, 793
1:3 764, 788, 1108
1:4 135, 270, 394, 414, 459, 574, 764, 877, 1202
1:4, 8 734, 735, 777
1:5 136 ter, 202, 414, 458, 764, 777, 779
1: 6 441
1:7 475, 1150
1:8 414, 769, 785
1:9 504, 785
1:10 645
1:11 218, 257, 263
1:12 257
1:13 216, 218, 219, 257, 258, 274, 485, 530
1:15 414, 1104
1:16 266, 414 bis, 1135
1:17 669, 762, 769 bis, 777, 785
1:18 231, 265
1:19 404
1:20 512, 715
2:1 203, 216, 274, 289
2:2 135, 312, 857, 1214
2:2, 9 440
2:3 309, 337
2:4 309, 337, 1035
2:5 309, 337, 1010, 1218
2:5, 16 538, 539, 1025
2: 6 1034
2:7 203
2:7, 17 341, 414, 437
2:8 218, 775
2:9 1039
2:10 498
2:11 599, 1175
2:12 655, 777
2:13 172, 235, 255, 614, 712, 969
2:14 474, 482, 519, 1106
2:15 1105
2:16 534, 536, 590, 610
2:17 . 203, 270, 441, 519 bis
2:18 263, 441
2:19 789
2:20 136, 315, 414, 1216
2:22 203, 593, 1010
2:23 871
2:24 232, 392, 406, 654, 775, 866 bis
2:25 720, 975 bis
2:26 136, 414, 416, 437, 683, 1130
2:28 901
3:2 375 bis, 857, 884, 890, 921, 960
3:2, 16 878
3:3 470, 740, 901, 1045
3:5 475, 483, 485, 589, 809, 819, 1213
3:7 265, 762
3:8 94, 136, 420, 722, 1213
3:9 135, 307, 311, 324, 873, 984, 992, 1039 bis, 1214
3:10 598
3:12 136, 243, 414 bis, 459, 655, 760, 1104
3:12, 21 437
3:14 759, 765, 777
3:15 886, 923, 1004, 1097
3:16 184, 857
3:17 204, 487, 751, 769, 777, 785
3:18 202, 216, 232, 483, 807, 1036, 1220
3:19 148
3:20 707, 601 bis, 895
3:21 414, 459, 586, 1130
4:1 136, 307, 328, 396, 412, 1042, 1105, 1193, 1213
4:1-5 1135
4:2 601
4:3 211, 272, 530
4:3 f. 644
4:4 266 bis, 274, 396, 485, 1042
4:5 412, 713
4:6 216, 300, 505, 640, 644
4:7 201, 412
4:8 300; 412, 414, 644, 675, 793
4:9 324, 348, 601, 872, 972
4:10 601, 642
4:11 427, 466 ter, 758
5:1 565
5:3 427
5:3 f. 1189
5:4, 9 1061
5:5 782, 835, 1001, 1088, 1089 bis, 1090
5:6 320, 412, 414, 712
5:7 897, 899 bis, 901
5:8 274, 713
5:9 510, 589
5:11 231, 283 bis, 502, 644
5:12 427, 758, 1182
5:12, 13 794
5:12-14 1200
5:13 603, 714, 758
6:1 367
6:3 368
6:4 203, 213, 437, 984
6:6 501, 511
6:8 452, 590, 635

Rev.
6:8, 13 635
6:9 910, 1118
6:10 465, 505
6:11 201, 213, 409, 802, 992, 1213
6:15 203, 268
6:16 338, 483
7:1 266, 752
7:2 683, 722, 864, 1118
7:3 609, 975
7:4 672
7.6 263
7:9 136, 413, 441, 722, 816, 1135
7:9, 13 485
7:11 319, 339, 366, 644
7:12 427, 758, 787, 794, 1182
7:14 349, 899, 902 bis
7:16 752, 1175
7:17 170, 262
8:1 204, 958, 973, 1146
8:3 782, 876, 984
8:4 529
8:5 510, 899 bis, 901
8:7 350, 412, 502, 653, 779
8:11 253, 458, 598
8:12 341, 349, 350, 1220
8:13 135, 391, 487, 537, 674, 1193
9:1 231, 864, 910, 1116 bis, 1118, 1123
9:4 752, 992, 1159 bis, 1169
9:4, 20 1159
9:5 992
9:6 324, 709, 870, 873, 889
9:8 339
9:10 272
9:11 104, 458, 653, 1202
9:12 270, 405, 410
9:13 782
9:14 255, 266, 412, 414, 604, 760
9:16 580
9:19 273
9:20 203, 998
10:1 485, 892
10:2 155, 414, 828, 1135
10:2, 8 1213
10:4 853 bis
10:5 593
10:6 1034
10:7 474, 799, 847, 1215
10:8 155
10:9 155, 339
10:10 155, 563
10:11 605
11:1 1135
11:2 642
11:2, 19 782
11:3 485
11:4 410, 412, 704, 786
11:5 1017, 1026
11:6 974
11:7 802
11:8 727, 729
11:9 315, 515, 599
11:9, 11 775
11:10 565, 1220
11:12 307, 328
11:13 502, 709
11:14 135, 270, 410
11:15 412 bis
11:17 309, 337, 414, 734, 801, 834, 901, 1217
11:18 414, 757, 1076
11:19 1213
12:1 485
12:3 213
12:4 224, 315, 857, 878, 1219
12:5 349, 413
12:6 203, 392, 579, 820, 985
12.6, 14 723
12:7 1066, 1093
12:9 399, 777
12:10 136, 262
12:11 224, 584
12:12 537, 1193
12:13 258, 728
12:14 407, 502, 672, 775
12:15 169
12:17 781
13:1 892
13:2 210
13:3 334, 496, 818
13:4, 8 476
13:8 722
13:10 590, 787
13:11 892, 1203
13:12 992
13:13 998
13:14 256, 258, 713
13:15 984
13:16 401, 787, 984
13:17 984, 1169
13:18 283 bis
14:1 320, 760
14:1-3 1135
14:3 672
14:4 958, 969
14:6 474, 565, 799, 892, 1215
14:6, 8, 15, 17, 18 747
14:7 414, 788
14:8 843
14:9 565, 601
14:10 317, 680
14:12 414

Rev.
44:13 201, 518, 597, 992
14:14 135,136,391,414,530, 658,1135
14:15 590
14:18 265
14:19 253, 410
14:20 469, 517, 575, 642
15:1 1106
15:1, 6 762
15:2 341, 475, 529, 598, 881
15:3 461, 464, 465
15:4 395, 930, 934
15:5 1213
15:6 485, 560, 620
16:1 339, 342, 352, 1220
16:2 232, 342
16:5 414
16:6 339
16:9 478, 485, 998, 1001, 1088, 1089, 1090
16:10 214, 375, 598, 903
16:11 598
16:12 255, 760
16:16 104
16:18-21, 546, 710, 723, 731 bis, 978
16:19 458, 503
16:21 599
17:1 774, 777
17:2 441, 724
17:3 412, 414, 455, 474, 506, 510
17:4 156, 485
17:5 233
17:6 478
17.7 532
17:8 334, 719, 819, 1216
17:9 683, 723
17:10 234, 747, 750, 764
17:13 311, 1214 bis
17:16 590
17:17 872, 975
17.18 234, 604,
18:1 892
18:2 260, 269, 843, 1200
18:3 337, 599, 1218
18:6 317, 580, 716
18:9 1217
18:10 498, 1193
18:11 475
18:12 192, 280, 670
18:12f. 441
18:13 186
18:14 348, 873, 1165
18:16 485, 653, 710, 771, 1193
18:17 474
18:19 1193
18:20 461, 464, 786
18:92 75
18:23 341, 349, 1290
18:24 689
19:1 205
19:2 1220
19:3 337, 902
19:4 283
19:5 459
19:7 1212
19:8 485
19:9, 17 262
19:10 949
19:11 1213
19:12 414
19:13 135, 211, 364, 374, 485, 533
19:14 407, 412, 485
19:15 503, 680, 960, 1001
19:16 660
19:17 269, 949
19:20 414
19:21 260, 269, 599
20:1 265, 892
20:2 414, 714
20:3 528
20:3, 5 975
20:4 833, 834
20:8 722
20:12 349, 714, 1213
20:15 1008, 1012
21:1 394, 413
21:2 539
21:3 611
21:4 262
21:5 480
21:6 337, 785
21:8 712, 1118
21:9 777
21:11 150, 280, 670
21:11f. 414
21:13 254, 494, 791 bis
21:14 412
21:14, 19 262
21:16 263, 405, 732, 967
21:17 268, 672, 714
21:18 201
21:18 (21) 253
21:19 262
21:20 168, 199, 204
21:21 282, 460, 555, 556, 568, 571, 673, 675, 746
21:23 541
21:25 793
21:27 753, 1187
22:2 258, 300 bis, 311, 745, 1214
22:3 166, 753
22:4 871

Rev.
22:8 214
22:9 932, 1203
22:11 947
22:13 429, 777
22:14 757, 984
22:16 399, 762
22:19 356
22:20 105n.

(b) OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis
1:2 252
2:24 574, 595
3.15f 680
3:22 1002, 1067, 1086
3:24 639
4:12, 14 889
4:24 673
6:4 973
6:17 325
10:19,30 1074
13:11 746
14:23 1024
16:2 1061
17:17 916, 1176
18:9 916
19:8 967
19:19 1067
19:21 1002
20:6 1061
21:26 1187
22:1 1042
24:30 1042
24:33 1074
24:45 1042
25:24 696
27:30 973
28:16 1027
29:13 1042
31:20 1067
32:19 1073
33:10 959
34:12 481
34:30 263
37.9 888
37:10 916
38:5 551
38:11 973
38.27 696
40:5 745
41:36 907
43:8 907
44:32 907
47:29 1067
49:12 661
50:18 696
1:16 972, 1075

Exodus
2:3-6 192n
3:4 268
3:10 187
3:11 1001
5:22 337
6:7 691
7:10 211
8:25 696
9:16 699
10:23 693
12:6 907
12:10 819
12:16, 43 752
13:11 f . 1042
14:13 1078,
16:3 973, 1003
16:33 253
17:12 903
19:13 1027
20:10 752
20:17 508
20:23 690, 691
25:9 268
25:21 822
29:20 775
31.3 485
32:1 436, 899, 960
39:23 906

Leviticus
2:13 269
6:51f. 254
10:6 984
14:6 254
19:18 288n.
21:17 738
22:9 1010
23:15 917
25:10 606

Numbers
1:1 671
4:41 268
9:10 98
10:2 878
11:9 973

Numb.
11:29 938, 940
14:2 1003
4:8 880
4:30 1024
20:3 1003
22:12 903

Deuteronomy

3:21 263
8:3 361, 649
8:5 1017
9:10 364
9:14 637
9:24 888
19:15 649
23:1 809
24:3 669
28:1 95
28:24ff 937
28:29 889
29:18 738
30:14 649
31:29 669
32:21 1163
33:10 98

Joshua

5:1 1042
9:12 437
10:10 507
11:22 218
17:13 531
23:13 174

Judges

1:7 888
3:25 265
6:11 1070
6:13 918
6:18 97, 822
8:11 906
8:33 1086
9:6 801
9:29 940
11:9 1017
11:10 890
16:20 637

Ruth

1:9 932
2:10 1090
3:3 1070

1 Samuel (1 Kings)

1:17 596
4:1 1042
7:2 772
8:7 1061
11:1 1042
12:23 1067
14:45 1024
14:47 1060
17:34 973
17:42 680
18:16 680
25:20 256

2 Samuel (2 Kings)

6:20 739
10:11 878
14:15 722
15:2 649
18:33 940

1 (3) Kings

1:8 964
4:19 254.
8:18 1067
8:39 670
10:21 1165
12:18 1120
13:16 1078
14:6 341
16:31 1067
17:20 1002
17:20, 21 465
18:1 819
18:12 880
22:8 1072

2 (4) Kings

3:13 736
8:13 1001
8.14 729
13:21 260
18:33 95

1 Chronicles

4:9 633
5:10 643
17:6 729
28:4 588
28:6 588

2 Chronicles

3:1 98
6:7 1067
15:16 891
18:34 906
28:22 966, 1062
33:9 1090

Nehemiah

5:18 628
9:10 337

Esther

4:14 964, 1033
13:3 938

Job

3:21 198
13:22 977
14:13 1003
21:24 276
22:3 1010
24:12 691
25:5 916
30:24 1003
31:31 938

Psalms

8:5 1001
14:1, 3 751
15:9 1212
16:8 367
16:10 502
22:1 29, 476
32:1 367
37:21 311
38:2 1061
40:6 738
48:9 166
51:6 193, 463, 986 bis
53:5 197
62:2 198
68:24 1061
69 (68):23 174
72:14 903
77:18 1086
90:11 1068
91.3 1067
94:11 1000
94-95:11 1024
101:3 972
103:15 437
108:4 1070
109:8 939
110:1 314
117:23 655
118 (119):5 1004
118:22 718
(117) 118:23 411
118:23 704
118:32 973
119:7 973
120(119).3 940
122:2 1070
140:6 637

Proverbs

1:22 973
3:5 890
11:31 871
12:14 268
24:21 292, 750
27:15 691

Ecclesiastes

1:16 1062
2:16 460
2.17 97
3:12 1067

The Song of Solomon

7.6 739

Isaiah

1:4 487
1:12 819
1:16 807
1:31 765
3:5 746
5:9 1165
5:14 1002
5:26 775
5:27 1174
6:2 644
6:10 201, 204, 367, 844, 988
8:14 907
9:16 1042
10:20 903, 907
10:20, 27 1042
11:9 929, 1174
14:15 591
17:8 907
22:11 637, 643
24:10 1061
26:20 733
28:20 312
33:24 929
36:11 103
37:3 267
40:4 595
40:7 837
42:8 101
42:12 101
48:16 235
49:6 1067
49:8 507
52:11 853
56:6 1062
56:10 213
58:14 907
59:15 312
63:2 253

Jeremiah

1:8 473
1:19 929
2:8 411
2:18 1067
2 22 96
2.28 411
4:10 916
4:16 337
5:23, 26 335
6:8 928, 929, 1016, 1161
7:9 411
7:10 1061
9:2 309
11:17 1073
14:13 415
17.26 644
18:3f. 287
18:8 932
18:11 932
23:15 484
23:21 1183
23:24 1174
24:6 653
31:32 746

Ezekiel

11:23 775
16:21 337
16:51 655
17:24 476
27:4 759
33:27 1024, 1150
34:8 1024,
36:30 213
38:19 1150

Daniel

2:22 171
3:7 973
3:22 647
4:30 900
6:14 512
7:25 199
10:5-7 415

Hosea

2:4, 23 411
2:8 411
4:15 475

Joel

3:2 1148

Amos

1:1 424
4:7 424
5:27 642
9:12 723, 986

Jonah

3:3 539

Habakkuk

2:3 733

Haggai

2:1 671

Zechariah

2:2 741
4:7 265
614 265
11:6 599

Malachi

3:3 889

APOCRYPHA

.

1 Esdras

1:30 185
1:49 1074
2:24 1072
3:5, 9 722
4:54, 63 722
5:67 1067
6:32 722
8:84 1072

2 Esdras

6:8 1059
6:20 643
17:3 638
22:24 1070

Esther

13:3 938

Wisdom

6:8 225
12:19 311
13:9 999

Sirach

Prol. to Sirach 604
6:7 341
19:26 274, 276
25:3 268
37:2 313
38:27 1070

Baruch
1:19 717
2:28 514
4:5 463

Tobit
1:5 411
5:5 585
5:15 97, 371, 822, 878
7:11 973
11:1 1070, 107
12:13 1120
14:2 192

Judith
1:10 979
4:15 1070
6:18 822
8:34 1074
11:19 979
14:5 308

1 Maccabees
3:11 528
4:52 705
10:88 269
10:89 269
13:16 415 bis
14:30 1214
14:36 1090
15:23 260
15:28 415
16:9 1070, 1074, 1075

2 Maccabees
1:8 159
1:11 1141
1:31 974
3:9 1120
3:16 1043
4:13 1163
4:38 618
5:10 729
7:14 1075
7:8 98
6:2 260
8:6 318
8:24 192 bis
9:22 183, 370
12:4 1141
12:15 639
12:27 722
15:7 370

3 Maccabees
4:1 1141
5:20 900

4 Maccabees
1:28 251
2:9 157
5:13 938
12:7 104
16:15 104
17:20, 21 1062

Enoch
6.3 995

Psalms of Solomon
3:10 654
8:23 654

Susanna 0
54 741

TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

Reuben
1:10 654
6:1 946

Levi
2:10 972

Judah
9:1 424, 1185

Gad
3:1 654

Joseph
17:8 664

Benjamin
7:4 673

Naphtali
3:2 946

(c) INSCRIPTIONS

Audollent
Defixionum tabellae, ed. Audollent (Paris, 1904)
No. 238, 29 857

Benndorf-Niemann
Reisen in Lykien and Darien
129 N. 102 1170

B C H
Bulletin de correspondence hellenique
1901, p. 416 (lead tablet at Amorgus) 109
1903, p. 235 522

C I G
Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum
5834 192

C. Insc. Lat. (C I L)
Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum
v, 8733 1093

Deissmann
Light from the Anc. East, p. 75
"Limestone Block from the Temple of Herod at Jerusalem" 1092

Delphian Inscription
Inscriptions recueillies a Delphes (Wescher et Foucart)
220 1074

Heberdey-Wilhelm
Reisen in Kilikien
170, 2 1094
137 1009

Inscr. of Magn.
Die Inschrif ten von Magnesia am Maander (von 0. Kern) 694
16, 29 511
215 938
90, 12 994

Inscription of Thera
Hermes
1901, p. 445 660

I G
Inscriptiones Graecae
xii, 2, 562, 5 1189
7 N. 240, 13 777
5, 647 849
5, 590 669
1, 671 959
5,29 579

I M A
Inscriptiones Maris Aegaei
iii, 174 1129
325 622

J H S
Journal of Hellenic Studies (Hellenic Society)
xix, 14 535
92 406
299 737
1902, p. 349 728
xxii, 1902, 369 1061

Kaibel
Epigrammata Graeca
1878, p. 269 274
p. 134 592

Letronne (Letr.)
Recucil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'E gypte, ed. Letronne (1842)
No. 70, 79, 92 478
149 414
220 521

Michel
Recueil d'inscriptions grecques, ed. C. Michel (Brussels, 1900)
No. 370 1069
622 1024

OGIS
Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae, ed. Dittenberger (Leipzig, 1903-5)
No. 41 1069
90, 23 1141

484 406
458, 71 223
223, 49 223
177, 15 213
748, 20 213
117, 17 193
352, 66 193
458, 41 218
565, 19 204
515, 26 f. 204
618, 2 204

P A S
Papers of American School at Athens
ii, 397 172
iii, 375 172

Pergamon Inscr.
Die Inschriften von Pergamon von M. Frankel
N 13 (B.C. 300) 849
249, 26 959
13, 311 1093
13, 34 1093

Perrot
Exploration arch. de la Galatie
p. 24, N 34 702

Petersen-Luschan
Reisen im sudwestlichen Kleinasien
p. 113, xviii A 5 599
160, N 190 869
174, N 223, 21 959

Pontica
Studia Pontica, (Anderson-Cumont-Gregoire)
iii, 62, 8 931

Priene
Inschriften von (herausg. von F. Hiller von Gaertringen)
112, 98 f. 582
50, 39 595
111, 117 615

Ramsay, C. and B.
Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, by W. M. Ramsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1895, 1897).
ii, 292 1018
317, 391, 395, 399 928
343 972
391 (No. 254) 648
525 668

Syll.
Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum, ed. Dittenberger
No. 326, 12 160
928, 52 375

Viereck
Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus . . . usi sunt, by P. Viereck (Gottingen, 1888)
p 38 958

Waddington
Inscr. de la Syrie
2413[a] 837
2614 595

(d) PAPYRI AND OSTRACA

A. P. (P. Amh. and Amh. Pap.)
Amherst Papyri, part ii (1901)
No. 11, 26 723
31 154
50 470
77 527
78 1134, 1137
81, 11 977
86 944, 1093
93 1009
111 to 113 414
135 611, 994
144 928

B. M. (P. B. M.)
British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon (London, 1893, 1898)

Vol. i. Nos. 1-138

No. 21 939, 994
23 997
37 1033
42 290, 546, 618, 875, 909, 1081, 1145
69 529
77 728
84 1120

Vol. ii. Nos. 139 ff.

No 190 728
233 1010
239 318, 737
331 959
333 745
336 745
356 1122
417 869
854 979, 1074
1178 907

B. U. (B. G. U.)
Berliner Grieehische Urkunden
Vol. i. Nos. 1-361 (1895)

No. 1 522
16 691
22 470
27 611, 1000
36 1061
45 531
46 1068
48 931, 994
86 689, 691
110 213
113 509
114 962
136 900
146 478
164 997, 1061
168 691
179 942
183 691, 857
197 874
226 991, 1069
229 660
242 479
287 833, 843, 1124
297 900
303 928
326 318, 410, 1010
341 691
350 318

Vol. ii. Nos. 362-696 (1898)

No. 363 692
380 487
385 592
388 665
423 188, 419, 464, 514, 592, 833, 834, 835, 846, 1132, 1151
424 972
530 190, 963, 1147, 1181
449 406
456 746
531 993
543 475
546 1009
596 361, 907, 1129
607 730, 972
623 671
664 631
665 1068

Vol. iii. Nos. 697-1012 (1903)

No. 775 806
790 516
814 874
816 1210
822 737, 989
824 933
830 1068, 1082
843 461
846 178, 414
874 990
903 522
925 513
948 734, 737
956 1188
970 513, 589, 1132
998 614
1002 414

Vol. iv. Nos. 1013 ff.

No. 1015 901
1031 997
1040 1132
1079 287, 488, 577, 582, 615, 692, 933

Ch. P.
Greek Papyri from the Cairo Museum, ed. E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1902)
No. 3 817
4 692

C. P. R. and **P. E. R**.
Corpus papyrorum Raineri, ed. C. Wessely (Vienna, 1895)
No. 11 690
12 654
19 962
24 892, 978
156 1002, 1068
237 959

Deissmann
Ostracon, Thebes, 32-3 A.D. 828

Eudoxus
Papyrus of the Astronomer Eudoxus, ed. Blass 692

F. P. (Fay. P. and P. Fay.)
Fayam Towns and their Papyri (1900)
No. 110 817
112 933, 994
118 622, 987
119, 276 595
121 861
124 495
136 959
137 1176

G.
An Alexandrian Erotic Fragmeat, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic (1896)
No. 35 945

G. H.
Greek Papyri, series II (1897)
No. 15 82, 786
23a 745, 746
36 614, 806
38 976

Hb. P. (P. Rib. and Rib. P.)
Hibeh Papyri (all iii/B.c.) (1906)
No. 42 589
44 406
44, 45 974
45, 60, 168 986
56 851
78 1010

K. P.
Papyri from Karanis, ed. E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago, 1900)
No. 46 458, 481, 595

L. P.
Papyri Graeci Musei antiquarii publici Lugduni-Batavi, ed. C. Leemans (1843)
a 35 f 665
b 518 bis, 939, 1062
w 274, 516, 983

M. P.
Papyri from Magdola, in B C H 1902 ff., Jouget's ed. (1912)
No. 16 and 20 584

N. P.
Geneva Papyri, ed. J. Nicole, 2 vols. (1896, 1900)
No. 7 993
16 1061
17 995
19 844
25 692
38 464
47 535
49 1108
50 527
56 728
67 252, 745
69 252, 745

O. P. (P. Oxy. and Oxy. P.)
Oxyrhynchus Papyri
Vol. i. Nos. 1-207 (1898)
No. 34 977
36 1069

37 195, 577, 632, 867, 1040
38 578, 963
48, 49, 722 635
52 990
79 484
86 1068
99 656
105 1010
112 533
115 888
117 723
118 989
119 70, 572, 1174
120 414
121 284, 993
128 931

Vol. ii. Nos. 208-400 (1899)
No. 237 518, 983, 991, 1048, 1069 bis
240 939
255 1150
256 745
260 690
274 666
275 513, 537, 631, 846, 963, 1002, 1129, 1131, 1132, 1139
292 341
294 600, 686, 909, 1081
295 807
299 682

Vol. iii. Nos. 401-653 (1903)
No. 413 932
471 1137
477 470, 471
478 900
482 844, 900
484 474
486 548
491 1137
492 469
494 749
496 1018
523 502, 575, 767
526 922, 939, 1002,1014
528 139, 900
530 863, 922, 1014, 1113
531 1210

Vol. iv. Nos. 654-839 (1904)
No 654 834
715 939
716 668
724 589
727 877
729 522, 1016
742 522
743 999, 1024
744 71, 220, 509, 535, 993
745 686
886 608, 673
905 745
1106 1021
1107 975
1118 877
1120 1091
1122 1073
1125 949, 967, 1085, 1154
1127 xii
1131 xii
1133 577
1150 933, 1009
1157 869
1158 869
1159 1066
1162 550
1164 1145

Par. P. (P. Par.)
Paris Papyri, in Notices et Extraits, xviii, part 2, ed. Brunet de Presle (1865)
No. 5 1108
10 576, 585
15 410
18 1009, 1180
22 590
26 532, 574, 939, 972, 1031, 1043, 1141
28 590
35, 37 517
36 614
37 645
47 615
49 995, 989, 1087, 1169
51 414, 50S, 536, 682, 867
60 774
62 1009
63 587, 590, 938
574 727

P. Eleph.
No. 1 190, 640

P. Fi.
Florence Papyri, ed. Vitelli (Lincei Academy: fast. 1., Milan, 1905)
No. 2 991, 1069, 1071
5 624

P. Goodspeed (P. Goodsp.)
No. 4 632, 877, 1022, 1119, 1129

P. Grenf.
No. 67 632
73 484, 687
77 1080

P. Heid.
Heidelberg Papyri (mainly LXX), ed. G. A. Deissmann (1905)
No. 6 406

Pap. L.
Dieterich, Abraxas, 195, 9 789

P. Lond
Kenyon, Greek P. in British Museum 274
xlii 837

P. P.
Flinders Petrie Papyri, ed. J. P. Mahaffy (in Proc. Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs, viii, 1891)
No. 8 690
i, 15, 15 287
xi, 944
xxv 595
28 672
37 726
42 414

Rein. P.
Papyrus Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905)
7 (ii/B.C.) 922, 1014

R. L.
Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphia (Oxford, 1896)
Col. 29 726
38^{2} 586

Rhein. Mus.
Rheinisches Museum fur Philologie
lxvii, 4, 1912 1182

Tb. P. (P. Tb., Tebt. P. and Tb.)
Tebtunis Papyri (University of California Publications, Part II)
No. 1 752, 983
1, 66 165
6 689, 976
8 633
14 1134
16 590, 594
19^{12} f. 148
24 279, 669
26 406
28 1010
33 877, 1119
35 808, 811
36 613
40 162, 168, 654
41 588
42 1134
43 91, 595
47 689
50 861
58 406, 1009
59 945
72 669
104 1187
105 516, 669, 752
230 517
333 1010
414 834, 932, 986
421 682, 748, 762, 1126

T. P.
Turin Papyri, ed. Peyron (1826)
No. 1 491
7 148

Wess. P.
Papyrorum scripturae Graecae Specimen
xxvi 1012, 1175

Wilcken
Archiv fur Papyrusforschung
4 152

Griechische Ostraka,
i 266
ii, 253 152
1027 631

(e) GREEK LITERATURE

i. CLASSICAL

Homer (? x/viii B.c.)
Iliad i, 137 958
i, 262 1160
i 587 500
iii, 289 1016
iv, 410 1170
iv, 501
x, 127 981
xiii, 700 610
xvi, 301 1170
xviii, 134 1170
xx, 139 1016
xx, 335 972
xxii, 349 674
xxiv, 38 500
Odyssey iv, 684 1136, 1172
xx, 52 1053

Hesiod (? viii/B.c.)
Fragment 981

AEschylus (v/B.c.)
Prom. Vinct. 268 f. 1038
358 538 1214
Persae 981 673

Sophocles (v/B.c.)
Oedipus Coloncus 155 994
317 738
816 878
Oedipus Tyrannus 1141 737
1146 878.
Philoctetes 100 1069
300 932
Electra 817 1161
1078 1094
Ajax 1180 856

Euripides (v/B.c.)
Alcestis 386 837, 846
471 660
Bacchides 1065 563
Hecuba 401 1161
Iphig. in Taur. 962 f. 746
1359 392
Medea 627 629
822 875

Aristophanes (v/B.c.)
Ayes 1237 722
1292 674, 744
1300 712
Ran. 721 375
Vesp. 213 733

Herodotus (v/B.c.)
i, 210, 2 1069
iii, 27 860
iv 44 722
v,108 783
vi, 67, 10 1110
vi, 68, 5 1110
vii, 170 644
1214 837

Thucydides (v/B.c.)
i, 21 899
i 52, 2 706
i, 122 1188
i, 137, 4 1163
i, 141 631
ii, 45, 1 1172
ii, 52, 1 783
iii, 36, 2 435
iv, 54, 3 860
iv, 93 645
v, 50, 3 1163
vii, 26, 9 991

Isocrates (iv/B.c.)

iv, 44 961

Xenophon (iv/B.c.)

Anabasis i, 2, 6 185
i, 3, 14 790
ii, 4, 20 955
v, 9 588
vii, 4, 9 631
vii, 4, 16 620
Cyrus i, 4, 3 1070
i, 6, 18 1048
xii, 3, 9 472
Mem. ii, 6, 39 1102
iv, 4, 25 747
Hellen. i, 1, 2 517
iii, 2, 14 1033
Oec. vi, 14 458

Plato (iv/B.c.)

Apologia, 20 E 851
21 A 851
21 C 1132
36 B 1038
Crito 44 A 897
Theat. 155 C 857
Protag. 309 C 665
312 A 1174
326 D 478
Repub. 337 B 933
433 1060
Crat. 399 A-B 228
405 D 766
Soph. 254 A 779
Polit. (p. 289 C) 149
Phaedr. 78 D 1165
89 D 275
Gorg. 453 B 438
459 B 1172
515 C 630

AEschines (iv/p.c.)

Eum. 737 1069

Aristotle (iv/B.C.)

Rhet. iii, 9 432

Aeneas (iv/B.C.)

114, 5 H 595

ii. KOINH

Theocritus (iii/B.c.)

ix, 25 1001
x, 14 1001

Aristeas (iii/ii B.C.)

7, 34 974

Demetrius (iii/B.C.)

De eloc. 21, 11 1017

Herondas (iii/B.C.)

iv, 61 660

Polybius (ii/B.C.)

iii, 19, 7 607
iv, 32, 5 973
vi, 5, 10 298
xvii, 11, 2 577
xxxii, 12 527

Diodorus (i/B.C.)

i, 75, 5 1031
i, 77, 3 1007
xi, 21, 3 961
xi, 37, 3 1007
xiv, 8, 3 961, 989
xiv, 80, 8 986
xvi, 74, 6 295
xvi, 85 278

Strabo (i/B.C.)

i, 1, 7 973 bis
ii, 5, 22 580
xiv, 41 194
c, 828 837

Philo (i/A.D.)

i, 166, 20 974
ii, 112, 23 973

Flavius Josephus (i/A.B.)

Antiq. v, 82 1172
vii, 9, 2 267
x, 4, 2 1124
xii, 2, 3 973
xvii, 5, 2 152

Bell. ii, 16, 2 253
v, 6, 3 28
v, 12, 2 253
vi, 2, 1 28
Apion iv, 21 900
Vit. 17 255

Dionysius Thrax (i/A.D.)

7, 34, 372, 492, 1101, 1146 bis, 1138

Plutarch (i/A.D.)
p. 256 D 1069
i, 592 B 64
i, 694 C 64
Quest. Conviv. i, 6, 1 697
Cons. ad Uxor. 1 752

[Barnabas] (i/A.D.)
2:28 1124
4:9 773
6:11 1141

Clement of Rome (i/A.D.)

1 Cor. i, 21:9 723
i, 45:1 946
ii, 8:2 1102
ii, 12:2 972

Dio Chrysostom (i/A.D.)
xxxiv, 44 995

Marcus Aurelius (ii/A.D.)
vi, 42 595

Justin Martyr (ii/A.D.)
Apol. i, 16, 6 839
Cohort,. 5 (p. 253 A) 725

Arrian (ii/A.D:)
Epictetus i, 9, 15 931
i, 11, 32 585
ii, 2, 16 999
ii, 17, 14 736
ii, 18, 11 1017
ii, 22, 24 933
ii, 23, 1 937
iv, 1, 41 933
iv, 1, 50 1091
iv, 3, 9 999
iv, 4, 11 963
iv, 5, 8-9 963
iv, 10, 18 1092, 1095
iv, 10, 27 837
iv, 10, 34 963, 1169
iv, 10, 35 1169

Ascensio Isaiae (ii/A.D.)
ii, 12 254

Clement of Alexandria (ii/A.D.)
Paidagogus iii, 1 989
Hermas (ii/A.D)
Vis. i, 1, 8 1148
i, 3, 2 1010
iv, 1, 1 612
viii, 3, 5 348
Sim. v, 1, 1 611
viii, 1, 4 739
viii, 5, 1 424
ix, 9, 1 880
ix, 12, 4 1022
Mand. iv, 1, 5 308
v, 1, 2 1010
viii , 9, 11 278

Epistle to Diognetus (ii/A.D.)
p. 84 631
p. 7 533
Irenaeus (ii/A.D.)
60 198
584 A 984

[Clement] (iii/A.D.)
Homilies i, 6 739
ii, 33 737
iii, 69 875, 942, 1157
ix, 4 298
xi, 3 929
xvi, 20 298
xix, 12 750

Pausanias (ii/A.D.)
ii, 35, 3 1017
Ignatius (ii/A.D.)
Ep. to Romans 8:3 1020
Ep. to Ephesians 10:2 946
Ep. to Polycarp 5:2 1020

Lucian (ii/A.D.)
Alexander 22 974

Origen (iii/A.D.)
1 Cor. 5:7 219
Contra Celsus vii, 59 f. . 85

Heliodorus (iii/A.D.)
AEthiop. vi, 14 595

Acta Christophori (iii/A.D. ?)
68, 18 1001

Theophilus (ii/A.D.)
Ad Autolycum 2, 34 994
I, 6 1022

Acta Barnabae (iii/A.D. ?)
10 1002

Eusebius (iv/A.D.)
Eccl. Hist. vi, xxv, 11 88
P. E. vi, 7, 257d 725
Mark 16:9 672

Epiphanius (iv/A.D.)
Matthew 13:30 673

Theodoret (iv/A.D.)
iv, 851 1069

Gregory of Nazianzus (iv/A.D.)
ii, 13 A 137

Gregory of Nyssa (iv/A.D.)
iii, 557 B 137
Proklus (v/A.D.)
In rem publ. ii, 225, 22 1036

John Philoponus (v/A.D.)

De aetern. 430, 28 1007
p. 85, 19 1011

Callinicus (v/A.D.)
Vita Hypatii 57, 12, 113, 11 . 1040

Achilles Tatius (v/A.D.)
Priscian (v/A.D.)
Lib. V. de Casu 492
Apophthegmata Patrum (vi/A.D.)
105 C 725

ii, 24, 3 923
iv, 16, 3 996
iv, 16, 13 961
N. T. Apocrypha
Gospel of Pet. 35 673
Acta Thomae (Radermacher,
N. T. Gk., p. 128) 932
Acta Pauli et Theclae 29, 993
Martyrium Pauli 594
Quaest. Barthol., pp. 24, 30 1189

Apocalypsis Anastasiae
6, 13 412
Acta S. Theogn.
102 622

Diogenes of Oinoanda
Fragm. iv, 1, 9 1169

Theo
Progymn. 128, 12 1093, 1097

Usener
Legende der hl. Pelagic
18 860, 888
20 1001

Xenophon of Ephesus
393, 28 989
388, 31 1102

Vettius
274, 11 1017

Hippiatrici
177, 2 1017
244, 30 1009

iii. MODERN

Pallis
John 1:6-8 138

The very numerous illustrations of the vernacular modern Greek idiom (cf. p. 481) are not referred to authors.

(f) LATIN

Cicero (i/B.C.)
Pro Archia 10 108
Att 6.5 933, 994
Cato Maj. 23, 3 108

Pliny (i/A.D.)
Nat. Hist. v, 15, 71 214

ADDENDA TO THE SECOND EDITION

Page xxiv, line 11. Field's book is now published as *Notes on the Translation of the N. T*. (1899).

Page xxx. Among numerous other works that should be noted is A. Meillet's *Apercu de la Langue Grecque* (1913). So on p. xxxv some notice should have been made of the Greek Grammar by Prof. E. A. Sonnenschein, of Birmingham, and of his other writings. Note also W. Larfield, *Griechische Epigraphik* (2. Aufg., 1913); 0. Hoffmann and P. Giirtchen, *Sammlung der griechischen Dialect-Inschriften*, Bd. IV, Heft 4, Abt. 2 (1913), with grammar and index to the whole group; M. N. Tod, "The Progress of Greek Epigraphy" (*Journal of Hell. Studies*, Jan., 1915).

Page 64, line 16. Add "a speaker" after "render,"

Page 138, line 1. Add "ends" after "usually."

Page 143. "In fact the study of language shows that man is not only a social animal, but an etymologizing animal as well." F. H. Lee, "Etymological Tendencies of the Romans" (*The Classical Weekly*, Jan. 17, 1914; p. 90).

Page 151. On words in **–ισκος, --ίσκη** like παιδίσκη (Gal. 4:22) see W. Petersen's "The Greek Diminutive Suffix **—ΙΣΚΗ**--" (1913). He makes παίδίσκη (p. 195) mean "girlie" **(ἡ παῖς).**

Page 172, note 6. Add: It should be noted that **Ἑρμᾶς** is the short form of any name that contains this name-element, like **Ἑρμόδωρος, Ἑρμοκράτης, Ἕρμαρχος, Ἑρμόφιλος, Ἑρμογένης**. In many cases the original unabridged name can only be guessed at. Cf. Fick-Bechtel, pp. 113, 132.

Page 180. On pp. 19-26 of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels (Part I) by Sanders, there is a good discussion of the spelling, grammatical forms, and scribal errors of this interesting document. 'See also The Freer Gospels by E. J.

Goodspeed (1914) in which monograph W is carefully compared with Westcott and Hort's text.

Page 180. Of the inscriptions on the tombs in Phrygia, Ramsay says that the Greek was bad, even that of "persons of high rank in their cities" (*Expos. T.,* Jan. 17, 1915, p. 174).

Page 202. On **ω** and **ου** see **οἵαν ἂν Βουληθοῦμεν** 0. P. 1126, 9 (A.D./v).

Page 266. Note **ἀρο[ύρας] τέσσαρες** 0. P. 1126, 6 (A.D./v).

Page 304. Add this from Westphall: "The noun is a verb at rest, and the verb is a noun in motion."

Page 306 (b). The ending **-μι** in **λύοιμι, ἐθέλωμι**, is apparently a new Greek formation. Cf. Brugmann, *Griech. Gr*., p. 346 (Brugmann-Thumb, pp. 314, 396).

Page 326, line 16. It should have been noted that the middle optative uses only the suffix **–ι-** (**τιθείμην, δοῖτο**) as originally did the active dual and plural (**σταῖμεν, τιθεῖτε**).

Page, 379. Thumb's revision of Brugmann's *Griech. Gr*. (4. Aufl.) has for syntax pp. 414-672.

Page 414. The sudden change from accusative with **εἶδον** to nom. so common in the Apocalypse is found in Ezek. 3:13, **ἴδον φωνὴν –καὶ φωνή**.

Page 417. Note the careful balancing of words in 1 Cor. 14:20. In 14:26 note the asyndeton and repetition of **ἔχει**.

Page 424 (i), line 7. Add "Mt. 23:28" as another example of in the fifth place and "Ro. 7:25" in sixth place.

Page 424 (i) , line 12. Add "Mt. 22:28" as another example of **οὖν** in the fourth place.

Page 472. See Ezek. 2:6 for **μὴ φοβηθῇς αὐτούς** and 3:9 for **μὴ φοβηθῇς ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν**.

Page 490. An example of **τυχόν**= 'perhaps,' appears in Epictetus, Ench. § 4.

Page 537, line 15 from bottom. Add **υἱός** after **μονογενής**.

Page 539. A good instance of the ethical dative appears in Gal. 6:11 **ὑμῖν** (‘mark you’).

Page 560, line 6. With **ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον** (Lu. 5:36) compare **ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ** (Mt. 9:16).

Page 561. I gave no example of do-- followed by I note one in Rev. 11:11 **πνεῦμα ζωῆς εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς**, the reading of A 18. 28** 36. 79. 95. But CP 1. 7. 12. 17. 38 have simply **αὐτοῖς**, while **א** B $a1^{30}$ give **εἰς αὐτούς**, and 49. 91. 96 have

ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς. W. H. doubtfully print ἐν αὐτοῖς in brackets. The variation shows how iv is giving way before dc.

Page 576. The force of ar6 in composition as meaning 'in full' comes out finely in Lu. 16:25 ὅτι ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθά σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου.

Page 580. Re "be-tween," note Beowulf, lines 859, 1298, 1686, 1957, *bi saem tweonum*.

Page 587, line 4. Add: ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν (Lu. 5:17; 8:22; 20:1).

Page 594. On εἰς like a dative, note τῆς δεδομένης εἰς σέ (Ezek. 3:3).

Page 599. On the partitive use of ἐκ in the κοινή see Radermacher's review of Lietzmann's " Griechische Papyri" (*Zeitschrift f. d. osterr. Gymn*., 1914, III. Heft, _Separatabdruck, p. 8): "Die PrOposition E ist in der Koine der tiblichste Ersatz des partitiven Genitivs."

Page 607, line 10 from bottom. With κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος compare ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία in Mt. 12:31.

Page 608. The distributive use of both ἀνά and κατά occurs in 1 Cor. 14:27.

Page 609. For κατά with acc. in sense of 'like' (standard), note Gal. 4:28 κατὰ Ἰσαάκ.

Page 619. Cf. Job 1:5 for three examples of περί.

Page 644. Μέσον as preposition appears in Epictetus, Bk. II, ch. xxii, § 10, Βάλε καὶ σοῦ καὶ τοῦ παιδίου μέσον ἀγρίδιον (Sharp, Epict. and N. T., p. 94).

Page 657. On ἐχόμενα as possible preposition see Ezek. 1:15, 19.

Page 669. As examples of the true superlative in –τατος, note λαμπροτάτ[ῃ]πόλει 0. P. 1100 (A.D. 206), and ἐν τοῖς τῶν νομῶν φανερωτάτοις (ib.). Cf. also 0. P. 1102, 4 f. (A.D. 146).

Page 686, line 2 from bottom. After καὶ αὐτούς add Mk. 1:19.

Page 702. On the use of ταύτης without article in Acts 24:21, see the magical incantation in 0. P. 1152, 4 f. (A.D./v–vi) βοήθι ἡμῖν καὶ τούτῳ οἴκῳ

Page 720, line 9. In 1 Cor. 15:10 the neuter gender is to be noted.

Page 724, line 7 from bottom. In Lu. 7:43 ὅτι ᾧ there is ellipsis of the verb.

Page 753. Sharp, in his *Epictetus and the N. T*. (1914), which is full of suggestive parallels between the idiom of Epictetus and that of the N. T., quotes (p. 13) Bk. II, ch. xxii, § 36, εἰδὼς

ἀκριβῶς τὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος, ὅτι πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἄκουσα στέρεται τῆς ἀληθείας, 'knowing accurately the teaching of Plato that no soul is willingly deprived of the truth,' a striking parallel to πᾶς — **οὐ** in the sense of "no one." He quotes also from the Rylands Papyri, vol. II, a papyrus dated 133 A.D., the **μὴ**-πᾶς idiom, **μὴ ἔχοντας πᾶν πρᾶγμα πρὸς ἐμέ.**

Page 760. Note **αὕτη ἡ Ἰερουσαλήμ** in Ezek. 5:5.

Page 811. See example of redundant middle in Hos. 3:2, **ἐμι-σθωσάμην ἐμαυτῳ**.

Page 812. Ramsay notes **εἰσ́λθοιτο** on a tomb in Phrygia and adds that the middle voice was loved in Phrygia (*Expos. T.*, Jan., 1915, p. 174).

Page 823. The aorist is a sort of flashlight picture, the imperfect a time exposure. Iterative action is like the repetition in moving pictures.

Perhaps a word more should be said as to the point of view of the speaker or writer. The same action can be viewed as punctiliar or linear. The same writer may look at it now one way, now the other. Different writers often vary in the presentation of the same action.

Prof. C. W. Peppier, of Trinity College, Durham, N. C., contributes this note: " **Ἔσχον**, 'I got,' is the only aorist that is always ingressive. Hence **εἶχον**, 'I had,' has to do duty as both imperfect and aorist."

Page 844. In *The Expositor* (May and June, 1915), Rev. Frank Eakin, of Allegheny, has a very interesting discussion of "The Greek Aorist" or more exactly "An Investigation into the Usage of the Greek Aorist in the Now Testament, and its Proper Translation into English." By a study of 800 aorist indicatives in the Gospel of John he shows that Weymouth uses other tenses than the simple past in English in 21 per cent, Moffatt in 22, the A. V. in 18, and the R. V. in 8. He argues that modern knowledge as seen in Weymouth and Moffatt, is freeing itself from the bondage of Winer's mistaken conception of the Greek aorist which was followed by the Revisers. Nothing is now clearer than that the Greek aorist indicative cannot be made to square regularly with the English past. It more commonly does so in narrative than elsewhere, but no ironclad rule can he laid down. Mr. Eakin concludes that the aorist is "to be regarded as what it essen-

tially is — an indefinite tense — except when it is seen to derive definition from the context."

Page 880. With Jo. 13:27 **οἳ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχειον** compare **ποίει ἃ ποιεῖς** (Epictetus IV. 9. 18).

Page 889. A good example of the linear future appears in Gal. 6:16 στοιχήσουσιν.

Page 895. Moulton (*Exp*., April, 1901, p. 280) quotes Plato, Apol. 28C **ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελευτήκασι**, a reference to the Greek Bible (Homer).

Page 907. Note **ἵν᾽ ὦμεν εὐηργετημένοι** 0. P. 1117, 18 (A.D. 178).

Page 910. Note aorist and perfect participles in **ὁ τὴν ὑπόσχ**[εσιν] **δοὺς καὶ ὁ τὴν σύνοψιν εἰληφώς** 0. P. 1117, 6 f. (A.D. 178).

Page 927. Prof. Sonnenschein's more developed theory of the subjunctive is to be seen in his little volume on The Unity of the Latin Subjunctive (1910). He plausibly argues that originally the subj. and opt. were identical in meaning like the first and second aorist tenses and "only gradually differentiated in Greek through a long process of development." He makes the subj. (p. 54) stand midway between the ind. and the imper.

Page 929. Sonnenschein (*Cl. Rev*., April, 1902, pp. 165-169) suggests "the interrogative imperative" or "the interrogative prohibition" as the explanation of the origin of the use of **οὐ μή** with the subjunctive and even for **οὐ μή** with the future indicative by analogy or because of the future indicative of command. But R. Whitelaw replies (*Cl. Rev*., June, 1902, p. 277) that the notion of a prohibitive **μή** with future indicative is untenable. On the whole one must admit that the origin of the **οὐ μή** construction is unsolved.

Page 932. Note **ὅρα μὴ ἀμελήσῃς** 0. P. 1158, 9 (A.D./iii).

Page 935. On the history of the subj. and opt. see further F. Slotty, *Der Gebrauch des Konj. and Opt. -in den griech. Dialekten* (1915).

Page 958. Note a Co in Ezek. 1:12, 20, and **ὡς ἂν συνετελέσθησαν** in Job 1:5.

Page 959. Note **καθὼς ἂν εἴη** in Ezek. 1:16.

Page 964. See declarative **διότι** (=**ὅτι**) in Ezek. 5:13 **ἐπιγνώσῃ διότι ἐγὼ Κύριος** λελάληκα. Cf. also 6:10, 13. Dr. James Moffatt (*The Expositor*, Feb., 1915, p. 187, "Professor Robert-

son's N. T. Grammar") says: "The use of διότι for ὅτι may be illustrated from Polybius, where the former seems to be used after a preceding vowel to avoid hiatus; a similar practice may explain the interchange of ὡς and ὅτι, and of πηλίκος and ἡλίκος."

Page 968. For καθώς at the beginning of a sentence (1 Tim. 1:3) see καθὼς ἐνετιλάμην σοι Oxy. P. 1299, 9-10.

Page 994. J. Rendel Harris in a review of Moffatt's "New Translation of the N. T." (*The Expositor,* Dec., 1914, p. 537) commends his rendering of Eph. 3:17 (the inf. κατοικῆσαι and of Jo. 17:21 and Col. 2:2 (ἵνα) as wishes, and adds: "These new renderings are a great improvement, even if for the present grammarians are ignorant of them and the classical scholars acknowledge them not."

Page 1018. In Lu. 16:31 we have the first and third class conditions side by side.

Page 1043. But μὴ γένοιτο and the inf. does occur often enough in the LXX, as in Gen. 44:7, 17; Josh. 22:29; 24:16; 1 Ki. 21:3; 1 Macc. 9:10; 13:5.

Page 1069. In the Papyrus de Magdola 11 three examples of παρὰ τό and the inf. occur: παρὰ τὸ εἶναι (line 5), παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι (line 7), παρὰ τὸ εἶναι (line 15).

Page 1137. About negatives with the participle Robison (Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers, 1913, p. 39) says that in the Apostolic Fathers μή with its compounds occurs 168 times, while οὐ with its compounds is found 29 times. He adds that about 5% per cent of the participles have negatives, an increase in comparison with classical Greek "and shows the growth of the feeling that a participle is equivalent to a subordinate clause." But Robison still endeavours to preserve the purely subjective meaning of μή with the participle like the classic idiom.

Page 1145. Add Lu. 14:26 ἔτι τε καί as a good illustration of particles bunched together.

Page 1154. Gildersleeve, *Am. J. of Ph*., 1912, p. 240; calls τοι "the confidential particle" and τοίνυν "doubly so." "**Τοι** is an appeal for human sympathy, as rov is a resigned submission to the merciless *rerum natura*."

Page 1179. The use of τε καί in pairs is well illustrated in Jas. 3:7.

Page 1183. The adversative use of Kai occurs in Ezek. 3:18, 19, 20.

Page 1186. In 1 Cor. 14:20, 22 note the use of ἀλλά--δέ side by side where the main contrast is presented by δέ and the minor one by ἀλλά.

Page 1200. The zeugma in Rev. 1:12 βλέπειν τὴν φωνήν appears in Ezek. 3:13 ἴδον φωνὴν πτερύγων.

Page 1206. An example of hendiadys occurs in Jas. 4:2, φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε.

Page 1286. Add "Mk. 5:22 . . . 502."

Page 1287. Add "Mk. 9:7 . . . 506."

Page 1292. Add " 7:2 . . . 546. "

Page 1349. Add "2 Macc. 6:21 . . . 184."

ADDENDA TO THE THIRD EDITION

Page 37. In the *Expos. T.* for Dec., 1916, the late J. H. Moulton accepts the suggestion of Hrozny and E. Meyer that the Hittite language is a member of the Indo-European family as is true of the Tokharian.

Page 107, lines 16, 17. Add "Mt. 13:25" ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν: "Lu. 12:15" ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν.

Page 109, line 9 *ab imo*. **Τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν** (Mk. 15:15). Mr. J. F. Springer, of New York, furnishes me several citations of this Latin idiom in Greek for 350 years, so that Mark's use of it was neither at the beginning of the use nor when it was dying out. The examples appear in Polybius, *Historiae* 32. 3 (7). 13 (cited in J. Schweighauser) and in Diogenes Laertius, *De Vitis*, etc., 4. 50 (cited by Liddell and Scott); Hermas, Pastor *Sim*. 6. 5. 5; Appian, *Bell. Pun*., p. 68; Arrian, *Exped. Alex*. 5, p. 370. Evidently Mark's idiom was current for centuries.

Page 115. Mr. H. Scott has counted the entire number of the words in the text of W. H. for Matthew as 18,302; for Luke 19,461; for Acts 18,296.

Page 118, line 10 *ab imo.* To Mk. 3:11 add "6:56; 8:35."

Page 119, line 5. Mr. Scott gives this table for **οὖν** in Synoptics:

	MARK	MATT.	LUKE	TOTAL
In Narrative or Editorial	0 [16] 1	2	3	5
In Speeches				
without parallels	0	23	13	36
not used in the parallels	0	20	8	28
occurs also in parallels	4	11	7	22
Total[1]	4	56	31	91

Page 122, line 8. Luke has bi r43 c. inf. 42 times in all (Gospel 34, Acts 8). Aorist 8 in Gospel, 1 in Acts; pres. 26 in Gospel, 7 in Acts. So Scott's count from Geden.

[1] Matthew has 4=with Mark and 7 with Luke. Luke 7=are with Matthew only. See Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary, p. 360.

Pages 127-31. On Paul's Style in Preaching see able and discriminating article by M. Jones in *The Expositor* for Oct. and Nov., 1917.

Page 150 f. "On the Origin of the Indo-European Stem-Suffixes" see articles by Prof. Walter Petersen in *Am. J. of Ph*. for April and July, 1916. A full survey of the material.

Page 161 f. E. W. Burlingame discusses "The Compound Negative Prefix an-a in Greek and Indic" in the July, 1918, *Am. J. of Ph*.

Page 190 f. Prof. Walter Petersen calls attention to the fact that, so long as ἄν ('if') and modal ἄν were distinguished in vowel quantity, there was little confusion. When they became alike in quantity, the syncretism in usage came. Mr. Scott furnishes this table:

Book	ἐάν for ἄν (see Geden, p. 237) with								
	ὅς	ὅσος	ὅπου	ὅστις	ὁσάκις	οὗ	ἡνίκα	καθό	TOTAL
Mt.	12	6	3						21
Mk.	6	1	4	1					12
Lu.	2								2
Ac.	2								2
Jo.	1								1
1 Jo.	2			1					2
3 Jo.	1								1
Rev.		2			1				3
Jas.	1								1
	27	9	7	2	1				46
1 Cor.	2			1	3	1			7
2 Cor.							1	1	2
Gal.	2								3
Col.	1			1					2
	5			3	3	1	1	1	14
Total	32	9	7	5	4	1	1	1	60

Page 205, line 13. For example ἰσχύϊ.

Pages 208, 984. For κἄν=καί note these examples: **Οὐκ** [ἐ] δήλωσάς **μοι κἂν περὶ τῆς ὁλοκληρίας**. Oxy. P. XII. (iv/A.D.) 1593, 1. 5. **Κἂν νῦν, ἀδελφέ, πάντα ὑπερθέμενος ἀντίγραψόν μοι** (ib 1. 7). **Κἂν μοσθίον οἴνου μοι φολέτρισον** (ib., 1. 16).

Page 224, line 5. Cf. Lightfoot's note on Phil. 2:23 concerning ἀφίδω. Papyri examples are common. Cf. **ἐφιορκοῦντι**. Tb.

P. 78, l. 17, B.C. 110-8; TO &k,ctir)ptoi, Tb. P. 119, l. 17, B.C. 105-1; τοῦ ἐφετινοῦ; Oxy. P. XII, 1482, l. 12 (ii/A.D.).

Pages 232, 267. Note about Ἐλαιών Fay. P. 112, ll. 14, 15 (99 A.D.) ἐπίγνοθι εἰ ἐσκάφη ὡ τῆς Διονυσιάδος ἐλαιών. Cf. also nom. ἰβίων, gen. ἰβίωνος (Ibis-shrine) Tb. P. 62, l. 23; 64, ll. 10, 11; 82, l. 43.4 So ἰβίων (gen.) in phrase ἰβίων τροφή Tb. P. 5, l. 70; 62, l. 19; 63, l. 28; 82, l. 38 (all ii/B.C.).

Page 233, line 8. *Per contra* Mr. Scott notes his inability to find an aorist indic. with ὅς ἐάν(ἄν) in the N. T. Cf. Mt. 16:19. See Moulton's comment on p. 317 of the *German Ed. of his Proleg.*

Page 256 (c). On the accent of the vocative see Jannaris, Hist. Gk. Gr., §§ 257, 281.

Page 256 (c). Cf. τῷ θωμᾷ. (Jo. 20:27).

Page 264, end of (a). See γύναι in 1 Cor. 7:16.

Page 266. An instance of πάντες (acc.) appears in τοὺς ἐν ὔκῳ πάντες Fay. P. 115, l. 11, A.D. 101.

Pages 279, 516. For περισσός as a positive see Mt. 5:47; Jo. 10:10; 2 Cor. 9:1.

Page 292 (h), line 10. Note ἀπὸ τοῦ δ(ε)ῖ(να) in P. Par. 574, l. 1244 (iii/A.D.).

Page 299, 4 (a). The use of ἐσχάτως ἔχειν (Mk. 5:23) appears, Mr. Springer reports, in Diod. Siculus (ii/B.c.), Bibl. Historica, 10. 3. 4. Cited by Toiller in note to ἐσχάτως ἔχειν, in Thomas Magister (Blancardi's edition, about 1757). Both Sallier and Toiller cite Artemidorus, Oneirocritica (ii/A.D.) 3. 60 (61) as using it. Phrynichus (grammarian) also gives it (ii/A.D.), Eclogce Nominum Atticorum ad ἐσχάτως ἔχει. There is also an example from Galen of doubtful genuineness Tar ἐσχάτως ἔχουσιν and a genuine one in *Vita Porphyrii* 99 by Marcus Diaconus.

Page 308. The form γνῶ imperative occurs in B. M. CXXI, 613 (iii/A.D.). Mayser (p. 327) says: "Die Endung --θι findet sich nur noch in ἴσθει (=ἴσθι, von εἶναι) and ἴσθι. (von οἶδα)."

Page 309, line 19. Against Blass's scepticism concerning ἔδωσα note ἔλγέν μοι Ἀπόλλων ὅτι οὐδέν μοι ἔδωσεν Oxy. P. 1066, ll. 11, 12 (iii/A.D.). Rev. W. H. Davis furnishes προδώσας from Hesychius: προδώσας Hesychio condonandum, quem etiam admisisse certum est. Vide Lobeck, *Phryn.*, p. 723.

Page 311, line 2 *ab imo*. Note **δείδι=δίδου** in Oxy. P. 1185, 1. 12 (A.D. 200) **ἂν δὲ καὶ οἶνον αἰτῇ, κονδύλους αὐτῷ δείδι.**

Pages 325, 360. Mr. Scott offers the following table on the use of the perfect subjunctive in the N. T.:

	μή ποτε		ἐάν		ἵνα		
BOOK							Total
	εἰδῶ etc.	Perfect Part.	εἰδῶ,etc.	Perfect Participle	εἰδῶ etc.	Perfect Participle	
Mk.					2:10		1
Mt.					=19:6		1
Lu.		14:8			15:24		2
Jo.				3:27; 6:65..		16:24; 17:9, 23	5
1 Jo.			2:29 ..		5:13	1:4	3
2 Jo.						12	1
Jas.				5:15 .(active)			1
		1	1	3	4	5	14
1 Cor.			13:2; 14:11		2:12	1:10	4
2 Cor.						1: 9 (active); 9:3	2
Eph.					6:21		1
1 Tim.					3:15		1
	—	---	2	3	3	8	1
Total	---	1	3	3	7	8	22

Periphrastic: 12 (all passive, except Jas. 5:15; 2 Cor. 1:9). **εἰδῶ,** etc.,

Page 334, line 19. For **ἀπεκρίνατο**-form see also Mk. 14:61; Mt. 27:12; Jo. 5:17, 19.

Page 335 f. Examples of **–οσαν**-forms occur in **ἐφάγοσαν** Oxy. P. 1007, 1. 29 (Gen. 3:16, vellum leaf of Gen. 2 and 3, iii/A.D.) and in a fragment of Xenophon's *Hellenica* in Oxy. P. 226, 1. 16 (i/ii A.D.) **ἐπεπόμφοσαν**.

Page 337, line 16. For the **--ες**-form note 6.73 **ὡς ἔπεμψές** Oxy. P. 1489, 1. 4 (iii/A.D.); **ἀφῆκες** and **οἶδες** Oxy. P. 1067, 11. 5, 20 (iii/A.D.); **δέδωκες** Oxy. P. 903, 1. 30 (iv/A.D.). It is not quite so rare in the papyri as Mayser thought.

Page 348, line 12. T. Nicklin (*Cl. Rev.*, Aug., Sept., 1918, p. 115) says *re* **ἦξα**: "One would like to know if any other instances can be adduced, and to have some fresh consideration of the evidence." It so happens that I have just come across

συνάξας in vol. XII, Oxy. P. 1414, l. 21 (A.D. 270-5). I have learned to be chary about saying that the **κοινή** does not show this form or that. A fresh papyrus may turn up and prove me false. So we shall have to admit the ἦξα-form.

Pages 348, 1215. The form ἦξα, (from ἥκω) occurs in Oxy. P. 933, l. 13 (ii/A.D.). Note also the infinitive **φάγαι**, Oxy. P. 1297, l. 10; **μετῆλθαι** (note augment) P. Tor. i. 5. 27; **ἐπενέγκαι** B. G. U. 250. 8 (all iv/A.D.).

Page 360, 7, line 9. Mr. Scott counts 6 perf. imperatives out of 1623 imperatives and 22 perf. subjs. out of 1872 subjs. in the N. T. An undoubted perfect imperative occurs in Oxy. P. 1409, l. 21 (A.D. 298) ἵστω.

Pages 360 (cf. 109), 361, 375, 480, 809, 818, 902, 1108, 1110, 1122. In these references to the idiom **ἔχε με παρῃτημένον** (Lu. 14:18, 19) it is not meant that this is what is usually called the periphrastic perfect, but only that it furnishes a kind of analogy to the modern Greek perfect and the modern English. The syntax of the Greek idiom is, of course, plain enough, the predicate participle agreeing in case with the object of ἔχω as in Mk. 3:1; 8:17; Lu. 19:20.

Pages 362, line 5, 375. The complete list of active periphrastic perfects is Acts 5:25; 21:33; 25:10; 1 Cor. 15:19; Heb. 7:20, 23. A periphrastic perfect passive infinitive occurs in Acts 19:36.

Page 363. Note **ἠκουκέναι**, Oxy. P. 237, l. 23 (A.D. 186).

Page 375, line 15 ab imo. Mr. Scott counts 32 present passive and 6 active perfects in the periphrastic form.

Page 390. On "The Predicating Sentence" see able paper by Prof. A. J. Carnoy in Trans. of Am. Ph. Ass., 1917, pp. 73-83.

Pages 392, 1058. Re subject. infinitive Votaw finds 289 anarthrous infs. with 39 verbs as predicates. Scott notes that 6€1, has 122 infs., **γίνομαι** 36 (32 Lu.), **ἔξεστιν** 31 (Syns, and Acts 29), **καλόν (ἐστιν)** 21, **εὐκοπώτερον** (Syn.) 13. Of verbs peculiar to authors Mk. has 2, Mt. 4, Lu. (Gospel and Acts) 14, Heb. 3, Paul 3, Jas. 1. For further details see Viteau, i. 151-2. There are 23 subject **τό** infs. (12 pres., 11 aor.) confined to Mt. 2, Mk. 4, Paul 16, Heb. 1.

Page 394, line 6. For **εἰ δὲ μή** Mk. has 2 exx. (parallels in Mt. and Lu. **εἰ δὲ μήγε**, Jo. (Gospel) 2, Rev. 2=6. For **εἰ δὲ μήγε** Mt.

shows 2 exx., Lu. 5, 2 Cor. 1=8. Mr. Scott observes that ἐὰν δὲ μή (or μήγε) is not in the N. T.

Page 394, line 14 *ab imo*. If δότω is correct in 2 Cor. 9:7 Mr. Scott affirms that it is the only instance of μή and 3d sing. aor. imp. by Paul.

Page 395, line 10. For omitted ἐσμέν add "Jo. 17:11, 22; Gal. 2:15.

Page 404, 3. Mr. Scott notes that of the 174 N. T. examples of ὄχλος, sing. and plural, 118 are in the singular. Of these 63 are in an oblique case, 55 in nom. sing. Of these .55 there are 44 with singular verb and 11 with plural verb. When ὄχλος is subsequently referred to in narrative or by some speaker, the reference is always in the plural, whether verb or pronoun αὐτοῖς, etc., except Rev. 7:9 where proximity is probably the cause of the sing. That also is the only passage where the relative is used.

Of the 31 exx. of πλῆθος only one (Ac. 5:14) is in the plural; 12 are in oblique cases; 14 have nom. with sing. verb. Only 4 (Mk. 3:8; Lu. 2:13; 19:37; 23:1) have plural verbs. Where further reference is made (7 times), the verb is always plural (κατὰ *σύνεσιν*, p. 412).

As to λαός out of 141 exx. 123 are in oblique cases. Of 24 with sing. nom. only two (Ac. 3:11; Rev. 18:4) have plural verb and there are only four plural noms. Where repeated reference occurs, the reference is in the plural except Lu. 20:6; Ro. 11:2.

Mr. Springer finds numerous examples in LXX (Ex. 19:8, 9; Lev. 9:5; Dt. 22:18, 19, etc.) where a collective noun is used with singular and with a plural verb as in Mk. 5:24; Ac. 3:9, 10.

Page 404, line 2 *ab imo*. Add "1 Thess. 2:20."

Page 408, line 8 *ab imo*. Add ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς (Rev. 21:13).

Page 414. Add "Ro. 12:6-8" for examples of acc. and nom. in apposition (after εἴτε).

Page 424 (i), line 6. For μέν in fourth place add "Lu. 22:22."

Page 460 (f). Mr. J. F. Springer furnishes the following note which is pertinent:

Mk. 13:19, ἔσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψις: This expression is abundantly supported whether we regard αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι as subject or as the nominative of time.

I

As Subject

καὶ ἔστ ὑμῖν ἡ νυξ προφυλακή, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἔργον (LXX Neh. 4:22 (16),); ἡ νὺξ[1] ἐκείνη εἴη σκότος (LXX Job 3:4); οὐχὶ σκότος ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ οὐ φῶς; καὶ γνόθος οὐκ ἔχων φέγγος αὕτη; (LXX Am. 5:20); ἐξάλειψίς σου ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη (LXX Mi. 7:11).

II

As Expression of Time

LXX: Job 1:6, 13; 2:1
Esth. 4:11; 9:27
Hos. 2:3 (5); 7:5
Mi. 7 :14
Is. 11:16
Jr. 11:5; 39 (32) :20; 43 (36):2; 51 (44):6
Ba. 1:15, 20; 2:6, 11, 26

Theodotion: Dn. 9:7, 15 (cf. LXX).

Examples of the formula, ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα ἅτη, are: LXX 1 Ki. 22:13; 3 Ki. 8:24, 61; Neh. 9:10.

The plural ἔσονται in Mk. 13:19 may be explained, he supposes, as due to its position near αἱ ἡμ. ἐκ.

Page 464 (d). Add Oapto-aie TvcbX (Mt. 23:26). With 7ra7-7),o SLKaiE in Jo. 17:25 compare κύριέ μου πατηρ B. G. U. 423, 1. 11 (ii/A.D.).

Page 466 (b). Cf. "you" (ace. form) used as nom. like "ye."

Page 475, line 6. Κρατεῖν τῆς χειρός occurs in the Gospels five times. Mr. Scott notes Hermas, Vis. 3. 8. 3 7) Kparoiio-a Tar χεῖρας and Lightfoot's translation "the woman with the strong hand." Cf. Mt. 28:9 τοὺς πόδας.

Page 476, line 6. Mr. Scott reports that προσκυνέω occurs 60 times in the N. T., 30 with dative, 14 with ace., 16 other constructions.

Page 477, line 6 *ab imo*. Add πολλάς and read 12:47 f. in next line.

Page 480, line 25. For ποιεῖν with acc. and inf. see Mt. 5:32; Mk. 1:17; 7:37; Lu. 5:34; Jo. 6:10; Ac. 17:26; Rev. 13:13.

[1] ἡ νύξ is reading of B and S1, ἡ ἡμέρα of AS[3,2] C. The example is suitable with either.

Pages 487, line 7 *ab imo*, 518, 3. For χρείαν ἔχω absolutely see Mk. 2:25, with ablative see Mt. 6:8, with τοῦ, and inf. see Heb. 5:12, with inf. see Mt. 3:14, with ἵνα Jo. 2:25.

Page 504, line 14 *ab imo*. Mk. 14:64 is probably the origin of ἔνοχος θανάτου in Mt. 26:66, but the idiom is still unusual.

Pages 514, 1132. Mr. Springer notes unnecessary genitive absolutes (like Mk. 6:22) in Thucydides 1. 114; Xenophon, Cyr. 1. 4, 20; LXX (Numb. 6:7; Dt. 15:10; 1 Ki. 9:11; 2 Mace. 9:2, etc.); (Aratus of Soli) Eratosthenes, Catasterismi 40.

Page 522, line 10. Add "Mk. 6 : 21 =Mt. 14:6" to γενεσίοις.

Page 527 (d), line 5. Prof. Robert Law, of Knox College, Toronto, sends me this example of χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ in Plato, Leges 678 D.

Page 530 (f), line 4 from end. It should be noted, Mr. Scott reminds me, that ὁμοιόω is also used, with acc. of person (Lu. 7:31) or thing (Mk. 4:30), while to whom or to what the acc. is likened is put in the instrumental (assoc.). In the passive, as usual, the ace. becomes the nom. and the instrumental is retained (Mt. 13:24).

Page 535. The syncretism of the dative forms (locative, instrumental, true dative) is ably and clearly discussed by Prof. Walter Petersen under the caption "Syncretism in the Indo-European Dative" (*Am. J. of Ph.*, xxxvii and xxxix, 2, Jan. and April, 1918). With great pains and skill he shows how the psychology of the cases appears in the process of blending. He supports the thesis that the dative is not a purely local case in origin and is not a purely grammatical case, but syncretistic. Originally a case without ending, which "secondarily received its endings by association with local cases, and that these local cases then in turn thrust upon the dative certain meanings like that of direction which were foreign to it." It was originally a suffixless case of indirect object and borrowed its endings from certain local cases.

Page 537, line 10. Note ὑμῶν and αὐτοῖς in Phil. 1:28.

Page 560, line 10. Before 1 Pet. 5:7 add "Lu. 19:35."

Page 566 (b). The preposition is not always repeated, even when words intervene as in Mk. 2:21 7-6 τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ; Lu. 9:8; Ac. 26:18. Mr. Springer notes same idiom in Const. Ap. 7:25.

Page 570, line 9. Add "Mt. 27:48" λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε ὄξους

Page Note local sense in ἀντὶς τοῦ μαρτυρίου opposite the martyr's shrine Oxy. P. 941, 1. 3 (vi/A.D.).

Page 573. The papyri show many examples of the substitutionary use of ἀντί. Cf. ἀντὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀργύριον Oxy. P. 1409, 1. 20 (A.D. 278). So ὀλίγον ἀντὶ πλείονος Oxy. P. 1450, 1. 17 (A.D. 249-50).

Page 596, 7. Mr. Springer notes examples in LXX (2 Ki. 14 :4); N. T. (Mk. 1:10; Mt. 26:10; Lu. 6:20, etc.) and later writings (Didache 1:4; Hermas, Vis. 4. 3. 1) of εἰς where ἐπί would have been used in the earlier Greek. In the modern Greek Eis is very common in such constructions.

Page 601, middle. "Three cases." So Lu. 12:14, 42, 44.

Page 604, 6, line 6. The reading of Text. Rec. in Mk. 2:4 ἐφ᾽ ᾧ is ἐφ᾽ ὃ in Lu. 5:25.

Page 606, 3. Sharp (Epictetus and the N. T., p. 104) quotes Epict. IV, x, 20 τὰς χεῖρας καταφιλῆσαι for weakened sense of κατα—, just "kiss."

Page 607, middle. Mr. Scott supplies some examples for the phrase ἔχειν τι κατά τινος Mt. 5:23; Mk. 11:25; Rev. 2:4, 14, 20.

Page 623, line 1. For καὶ πρός (adverb) =and more see Oxy. P. 488, 1. 18 (ii/iii A.D.).

Pages 625, middle, 626, line 9. For πρὸς αὐτόν rather than aural with verbs of speaking to, Mr. Scott gives this table based on Hawkins' *Horae Syn*., ed. 2, p. 45.

BOOK	εἶπον	λαλεῖν	λέγειν	ἔφη	απεκρίθη	OTHERS	TOTAL
Mk.	1		3				4
Mt.	..						---
Lu.	71	9	15	1	2	ὁμιλέω 1	99
Ac.	29	9	5	4	4	1	52
Jo.	10		8		1		19
Heb.		1	1				2
Paul		1 Th. 1	Ro. 1				2
Total	111	20	33	5	7	2	178

Page 632, middle. The use of ὑπέρ and εἰς with the same words is interesting in Fay. P. 77, εἴργασται ὑπὲρ χωματικῶν ἔργων (A.D. 147) and Fay. P. 78, 1. 4 εἴργασται εἰς χωματικὰ ἔργα (A.D. 147).

Page 643, 21, line 6. As prep. ἕως occurs 86 times, as conj. 62.

Page 643, line 12 *ab imo.* Of the seven examples of ἕως πότε Mr. Scott observes that five Mt. 17:17 and =) have the future, leaving Jo. 10:24; Rev. 6:10 with pres. ind. 701

Page 653, line 10 ab imo. It is, of course, possible that τόπος or χρόνος may be supplied in some of these examples. In that case they would come under (b), p. 652.

Page 661 (d). With καλὸν . . . ἢ in Mt. 18:9 cf. καλὸν . . . ἢ in Ign., Ro. 6:1. Mt.

Page 671 (a). On the use of εἷς=πρῶτος in Mk. 14 : 10 see discussion concerning primacy of Judas Iscariot (ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα Mk. 14:10) by A. Sloman, Jour. of Theol. Studies, Oct., Ac. 1916; A. Wright, *Jour. of Theol. Studies*, Oct., 1916, and The Interpreter, April, 1917; A. T. Robertson, The Expositor, April, 1917; J. Rendel Harris, The Expositor, July, 1917. Harris notes that ὁ εἷς τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, in Enoch xx does not mean ὁ πρῶτος.

Page 688, line 3 *ab imo*. ℵADL read σεαυτὸν instead of ἑαυτὸν in Mk. 12:33.

Pages 695, 696. Mr. Scott furnishes some very informing data concerning the use of the demonstratives ὁ and ὅς.

ὁ, οἱ μὲν . . . ὁ, οἱ δέ

ὁ, οἱ μὲν . . . ὁ, οἱ δέ

Book	μέν		δέ		Others		Total
	ὁ	οἱ	ὁ	οἱ	ἄλλοι δέ	ἕτεροι δέ	
Mt.	..	16:14	..	..	16:14	16:14	3
Jo.	..	7:12	..	..	7:12	..	2
Ac.	..	14:4	..	14:4	..	..	6
	..	17:32	..	17:32	..	..	
	..	28:24	..	28:24	..	..	
Heb.	..	7:21	7:21	..	..	..	6
	..	7:23	7:24	..	..	..	
	..	12:10	12:10	..	..	..	
1 Cor.	7:7	..	7:7	..	..	..	2
Gal.	4:22	..	4:22	..	..	..	2
Eph.	..	4:11 τοὺς	..	τοὺς 11 *ter*	..	..	4
Ph.	..	1:16	..	1:16	..	..	2
Total	2	10	5	7	2	1	27
Ac.	..	καί τινες 17:18	..	17:18	..	..	(1)

Hebrews *ter* οἱ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ are oppositive: the rest partitive.

ὁ, ἡ δέ, οἱ, αἱ δέ of before-mentioned persons (from Geden)
W. H. text

BOOK	PARTICIPLE				FINITE VERB				GRAND TOTAL
	Pres.	Aor.	Perfect	TOTAL	Pres.	Imp.	Aor.	TOTAL	
Mk.	..	11	12:15	12	3	8	21	32	44
Mt.[1]	..	35	..	35	4	4	26	34	69
Lu.	2	14	..	16	1	5	51	57	73
	2	60	1	63	8	17	98	123	186
Ac.	..	7	..	7	..	5	16	21	28
Jo.	..	..	..	..	1	1	10	12	12
[81]	..	1	..	1	..	..	1	1	2
	—	1	—	1	1	1	11	13	14
Total	2	68	1	71	9	23	125	157	228

ὃς μὲν . . . ὃς δέ, etc.

Book	μέν		δέ		Others			Total
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	ἄλλος δέ	ἕτερος δέ	ὁ οἱ	
Mk.	4:4	1	..	1	ἄλλο *ter*	..	..	6
Mt.	5	1	9	..	ἄλλα *ter*	.. καὶ ἕτερον	1	19
Lu.	2	..	1	..	..	3	..	6
	8	2	10	1	6	3	1	31
Ac.	..	27:44	..	27:44	..	..	..	2
Ju.	..	23	..	23	..	..	..	2
1 Cor.	11:21	..	11:21	..	..	..	..	—
	12:8	12:28	..	..	12:8 (6)	12:8 (2)	..	12
2 Cor.	..	2:16	..	2:16	..	..	..	2
Ro.	3	..	2	..	..	..	ὁ δὲ 14:2	6
2 Tim.	..	2:20	..	2:20	..	..	..	2
	5	3	3	2	6	2	1	22
Total	13	7	13	5	12	5	2	57

Line 6, 1 Cor. 12:8. Read ἄλλῳ δέ (6 times) ἑτέρῳ δέ (*bis*).
In Mt. 22:5 ὃς μὲν . . . ὃς δὲ is completed by οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ . . .

[1] Mt. includes 26:57, 67; 28:17 on p. 694.

Page 696. The use of relative Os and demonstrative ὅς in the same sentence appears in Oxy. P. 1189, 11. 6-7 (A.D. 117) ἐπιστολὰς δύο ἃς ἔγραψα ἣν μὲν σοὶ ἣν δὲ Σαβείνῳ. So in ll. 11-16 we see demonstrative and article τὴν μὲν. . . .τὴν δὲ εἰς τὸν κτλ. Mr. Springer notes καὶ ὅς (dem.) in Xenophon, Cyropcedia 2. 2. 7; 2. 2. 30; 3. 2. 18; 4. 1. 11. So Agathias scholasticus (vi/A.D.) has καὶ ὅς *Historiae* 2. 9; 4. 18 and Menander Protector (vi/A.D.) Excerpta e Menandri Historia, 30.

Page 700, line 2 *ab imo*. Add "Mt. 12:45" (2d); Ac. 2:40 where οὗτος is last, and Mk. 9:38 where there are two adjectives. In Ac. 1:25 there are two nouns.

Page 701, line 6. Mr. Scott gives these examples of οὗτος in genitive absolute Mt. 11:7; Lu. 21:28; Ac. 19:36; 28:9; Heb. 9:6; 2 Pet. 3:11. An instance of οὗτος joined to an adverb appears in Ac. 15:8. In Rev. 19:9 the translation is "these are," but in 21:5 and 22:6 "these words are." In Ac. 17:6 Moffatt translates "these upsetters." See Rev. 7:13.

Page 702, line 1. Add "Jo. 4:54."

Page 709, line 10. Mr. Scott offers this table, showing Synoptics and Acts compared with John: Page

ἐκεῖνος with articular noun		ἐκεῖνος as pronoun
Mark	16	3
[161		3
Matthew	50	4
Luke	29	4
Acts	18	4
John	18	52
1 John	---	7
	131	77=208

Page 730, line 5. With Mk. 2:16 see ὅτι. cf. διὰ τί in Mt. 9:11. Mr. Springer notes that ὅτι----'why' in a direct question in Barnabas, Ep. 8:5 871, ὅτι δὲ τὸ ἔριον ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον; ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ξύλου κτλ.; 10:1; ὅτι ποιῶ; Aristophanes, Ranae 198; Gospel of Nic., Pass I, A. 14. 3. The use of ὅτι in a direct question seems clearly established by these examples. He finds ὅτι in indirect questions in Horn., *Od*. T. 464; Page Lucian, *De Asino*, 32; Aristophanes, *Plutus*, 965; Xenophon Page the Ephesian, *De Anth. et Habr.* 4. 2.

Page 738, line 2 *ab imo*. Moffatt translates τί in Mk. 2:24 by "what" and Scott argues ἴδε as favouring "what."

Page 739, line 4. Add "LXX" to Ac. 4:25; 7:26.

Page 759 f. Prof. Eakin (The Greek Article in First and Second Century Papyri, *Am. J. of Ph.*, July, 1916) shows that in the papyri, as the N. T., the article is frequently absent in titular expressions. He finds the same obscurity and uncertainty about the use of the article with proper names in the papyri as in classic Greek. He gives numerous examples of the anaphoric use (the aforesaid and the use of the article before the genitive of the father's or mother's name is very frequent as Deissmann showed, cf. p. 767). But Prof. Miller (*Am. J. of Ph.*, July, 1916, Article before Genitives of Father's Name) shows that in official language in the papyri the article only appeared (as in classic Greek, Gildersleeve's Synt. of Cl. Gk., § 580) before the genitive when the name of son or daughter is in the genitive (or ablative), and even this use vanished from the second century A. D. onward. But the vernacular idiom has the article in nominative as in Mt. 10:2.

Page 760. On **᾽Ιησοῦς** with article see von Soden, p. 1406.

Page 762, line 11 *ab imo*. For full construction see Mt. 12:35.

Page 764 (c). In Col. 1:7 f. note **ὅς ἐστιν** and **ὁ καὶ δηλώσας** as parallel clauses.

Page 770, bottom. Mr. Scott gives this note: **ὁ . . . οὗτος** or **οὗτος ὁ**. **οὗτος** (and cases) stands last (296 times), three times as often as it stands first (98 times). The position of **οὗτος** (and cases) varies in the same phrase without any apparent reason, e.g., Ac. 23:17, 18; Mt. 26:31-34.

᾽Εκεῖνος first 40 times, last 104 times.

Page 773, line 5 ab imo. Mr. Scott remarks that **οἱ πάντες** is subject of verb in 3d person in Phil. 2:21, apparently of verb in 1st person in 1 Cor. 10:17; 15:51; Eph. 4:13, etc., and of 2d person in Jo. 7:21; 1 Jo. 2:21; 1 Pet. 5:5; 1 Cor. 1:10 — apposition to the pronoun implied in the ending of the verb. See Jo. 1:16; 1 Cor. 12:13; Jas. 3:2.

Page 773, bottom. For **ὁ πᾶς** see Jo. 5:22; 16:13; Rev. 13:12.

Page 774. **῞Ολος**. Add "Lu. 11:36 (*bis*)."

Page 774, line 4 *ab imo*. Mr. Scott notes that **ὄχλος πολύς** occurs 22 times in N. T. and **ὄχλοι πολλοί** (Mt. 5, Lu. 2). **῞Οχλος ἱκανός** occurs in Mk. 10:46; Lu. 7:12, and thrice in Acts.

Page 779, 2, line 6. It should be understood that this is the usual Attic idiom. See further Col. 1:8 **τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην**. In Phil. 1:25 note **τὴν ὑμῶν προκοπήν**, but **τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν**, in 1:26.

Page 783, line 5 ff. Observe that all these examples are prepositional adjuncts.

Page 785, line 7. Add "Lu. 6:47" **ὁ ἐρχόμενος κτλ.**

Page 788, line 21. Mr. Scott thinks we may over-refine on the use and non-use of the article with proper names, and cites the variations in Mk. 9:2; Mt. 17:1; Lu. 9:28 in the mention of Peter, James, and John as in point.

Page 791 (c). Prof. Eakin (*Am. J. of Ph.*, July, 1916) shows that in the papyri "anarthrous prepositional phrases" are common as in the N. T. Many of the identical phrases are frequent like **κατὰ καιρόν, ἐν οἰκίᾳ, ἐν χερσίν, κτλ.**

Page 807, line 3 *ab imo*. Mr. Springer cites examples of middle voice (**φυλάσσομαι**=’observe’) from LXX (Ex. 12:25; 13:10; Lu. 18:4, 5; 18:26; 19:3; 19:19; Dt. 5:25; 10:12, 13; 3 Ki. 8:25; 1 Macc. 8:26; Aquila's translation Dt. 11:22 (ii/A.D.). He finds active in sense of 'observe' in Gen. 18:19; 26:5; Ex. 15:26; 19:5; Lev. 18:30; 22:9; Dt. 5:10; 6:17; 33:9.

Page 839, line 8 *ab imo*. Mr. Scott makes out 859 present imperatives and 760 aorist imperatives. in the N. T. It is Paul's usage that makes this situation, 323 presents and 99 aorists.

Page 847. Note the change of tense in Jo. 11:13-15.

Page 848 (c). Mr. Scott counts 459 present subjunctives, 1409 aorists, 22 perfects=1890 subjunctives in N. T. Readers of this grammar have learned to be grateful to Mr. H. Scott for his statistical knowledge of N. T. syntax so freely furnished. Here follow some of his most valuable tables:

AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE — INDEPENDENT

BOOK	HORTATORY		INTERROGATIVE									ASSERTORY			GRAND TOTAL
	1st Plural 'Let us'	ἄφες ἄφετε	1st Plural	τί...; 1st Pers.	τί...; 3d Sing.	πῶς.;	ποῦ..;	ὅπου;	εἰ μή	θέλεις θέλετε	TOTAL	μή 2d Person	οὐ μή	TOTAL	
Mk.	3	15:36 =	6:37; 12:14, 14	6	8:37	4:36	14:12 =	14:14 =	..	15:9	18	9	8	17	35
Mt.	2	27:49 = 7:4	..	9	..	23:33; 26:54	26:7 =		..	13:28	17	38	[16:18] 1 17	1 55	1 72
Lu.	6	= 6:42	..	10	11:5, 7	..	22:9	22:11	9:13	9:54	23	19	17	36	59
	11	4	3	25	3	3	3	2	1	3	58	66	43	109	167
Ac.	2	δεῦρο 7:34 Q	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	.. βουλεσθε	6	5	3	8	14
Jo.	2	..	6:5	12:27	..	..	..	..	..	18:39	5	3:7	14	15	20
Rev.	..	17:1; 21:9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	19:10, 29 (5) no verb	15	20	22
Jas.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2	2
1 Pet.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	2:6 Q	3	3
2 Pet.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	1
Heb.	4:1, 11 (2)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	(3 Q) 5	Q 4	9	11
	6	3	1	4	—	—	—	—	—	1	15	20	38	58	73
1 Th.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	2	2
2 Th.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	μή τις 3 sing. 3:13 2:3	..	2	2
1 Cor.	3	..	(1 sing.) 3	11:23	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	16:11	8:13	2	9
2 Cor.	7:1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	11:16	..	1	2
Gal.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5:16	1	1
Ro.	4	..	6:15	..	..	10:14 (4)	..	..	..	..	9	10:6	4:8 Q	2	11
Col.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2:21 *ter*	..	3	3
1 Tim.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5:1	..	1	1
2 Tim.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1:5	..	1	1
												7 3			
	8	—	4	1	—	4	—	—	—	—	17	10	5	15	32
Total	25	7	8	30	3	7	3	2	1	4	90	96	86	182	272

AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE — DEPENDENT

Book	ἵνα	ὅπως	μή	μή ποτε	μή πως	εἰ	εἴ τις	ἐάν	εἴ πως	ὡς	πῶς	ποῖος	ποῦ	ὅπου	ὅπου ἐάν	ὅς	ὃς ἄν	ὅστις	ὅστις ἄν	ὅσος ἄν	τί	Total
Mk.	54	1	2	Q 2	..	..	..	19 [16] 1	..	1	3	..	..	1	4	..	17	..	1	1	7	113 1]
Mt.	43	17 ἄν	1	12	..	..	..	38	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	33	1	1	5	6	159
Lu.	39	1 3	..	6	..	..	..	21	..	..	3	1	1	1	..	1	14	..	1	..	10	102
	136	1 21	3	20	—	—	—	79	—	1	7	1	1	2	5	1	64	1	3	6	23	375
Ac.	11	3 13 ἄν	5	5	1 μή που	..	..	3	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	3	..	1	Q 2	1	50
Jo.	114	1	..	..	..	..	..	45	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2	1	2	167
1 Jo.	12	..	..	..	..	..	..	9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	23
2 Jo.	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
3 Jo.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	2
	128	1	—	—	—	—	—	55	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	2	1	2	194
Rev.	28	..	..	..	..	..	1	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	ὁσάκις ἄν 1	1	..	36
Heb.	19	2	1	1	..	..	..	ἐάν περ 1 6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	31
Jas.	3	1	..	..	..	..	..	9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	2	..	..	..	16
1 Pet.	11	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	13
2 Pet.	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
	63	4	1	1	—	—	1	1 22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	1	1	—	98
1 Th.	3	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
2 Th.	6	1	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9
1 Cor.	34	1	1	..	2	..	..	28	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	71
2 Cor.	30	1	3	..	5	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	45
Gal.	11	ἄν 1 1	2	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16
Ro.	27	Q 2	..	..	..	..	..	8	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	42
Ph.	8	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10
Col.	11	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12
Phil.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Eph.	21	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	22
1 Tim.	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9
2 Tim.	5	..	..	2	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9
Tit.	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
	171	1 7	7	2	8	1	—	51	3	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	1	258
Total	509	ἄν 5 46	16	28	μή που 1 μή πως 8	1	1	ἐάν περ 1 ἐάν 210	3	1	11	1	1	2	5	3	76	3	ὁσάκις ἄν 1 ὅστις ἄν 5	10	27	975

ἵνα as aorists κρίνω, Jo. 3:17; 12:47. μή ποτε, Lu. 12:58 counted as aorist.

AORIST SUBJUNCTIVE — DEPENDENT (*Cont.*), TEMPORAL

Book	ὅταν	ἐπάν	ὡς ἄν	πότε	πρὶν [ἤ] ἄν	ἕως	ἕως ἄν	ἕως οὗ	ἕως ὅτου	ἄχρις	ἄχρις ἄν	ἄχρις οὗ	μέχρις	μέχρις οὗ	ὁσάκις ἐάν	ἡνίκα ἐάν	Total
Mk.	14	..	..	..	..	1	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	19
Mt.	15	1	..	..	..	2	10	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	32
Lu.	23	1	..	1	1	6	3	3	4	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	44
	52	2	—	1	1	9	16	7	4	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	95
Ac.	2	..	..	..	..	..	Q 1	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
Jo.	13	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14
Rev.	5	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	4	1	..	..	..	1	..	12
Jas.	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
2 Pet.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Heb.	1	..	..	..	..	1	Q 1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
	22	—	—	—	—	3	2	7	—	4	1	—	—	—	1	—	40
2 Th.	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
1 Cor.	9	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	13
2 Cor.	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	2
Gal.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	2
Ro.	Q 1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	2
Ph.	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Col.	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	2
Eph.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
1 Tim.	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Tit.	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
	16	—	2	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	3	1	1	—	1	27
Total	90	2	2	1	1	13	19	14	4	5	2	4	1	2	1	1	162

ὅταν, Mk. 13:28 = Mt. 24:32 counted as aorists.

PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVES IN N. T.

BOOK	INDEPENDENT			DEPENDENT													TEMPORAL							GRAND TOTAL
	1st Plural 'Let us'	1st Pl. Interr.	τί . . .;	ἵνα ἵνα μὴ	ὅπως	μή μή ποτε	ἐάν	ὅσος ἄν	ὃς ἄν	ὅστις ἄν	ὅπου ἐὰν	οὗ ἄν	ποῦ	ὡς	ὅς	TOTAL	ὅταν	ἐπάν	ὡς	ὡς ἄν	ἡνίκα ἄν	ὁσάκις ἄν	TOTAL	
Mk.	2	..	..	19	..	..	4	..	6	..	..	..	..	4:26 (4)	..	33	4	..	..	..	..	..	4	39
Mt.	1	= 1	..	7:12	6:4	..	12	1	5	..	2	..	2	..	..	24	7	..	..	..	..	..	7	33
Lu.	..	= 2	..	10	3	..	8	1	6	..	1	..	1	..	..	30	8	1	..	..	..	..	9	41
Ac.	..	..	..	2	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	5
Jo.	4	..	..	47	..	..	27	..	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	77	4	..	..	..	..	..	4	86
[8:5]	..	..	1	[8:6] 1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1]	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1]
1 Jo.	2	..	..	7	..	..	9	..	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	22	2	..	..	..	..	..	2	26
2 Jo.	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	3
3 Jo.	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	2
Rev.	2	..	..	11	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12	2	..	..	..	..	..	2	16
Jas.	..	..	..	1 Fut.	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	6
1 Pet.	..	..	..	1 2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	2
Heb.	10	..	11:32	4	..	μή 1 μή ποτε 1	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12:28	9	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	20
	21	3	2	110	4	1 1	70	3	24	2	3	—	3	4	1	226	27	1	—	—	—	—	28	280
Paul	17	..	1	89	1	μή πως 2	37 εἴτε 2	..	10	3	..	1	ἐκτός εἰ μή 1	..	..	146	8	..	1	2	1	3	15	179
Total	38	3	3	199	5	1 1 2	2 107	3	34	5	3	1	1 3	4	1	372	35	1	1	2	1	3	43	459

ἵνα Mk. 6:8 counted as 4.

PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE — PAULINE EPISTLES

BOOK	INDEPENDENT		DEPENDENT										TEMPORAL						GRAND TOTAL
	1st Plural 'Let us'	1st Pl. Interr.	ἵνα	ὅπως	μή πως	ἐάν	εἴτε	ὅς ἄν	ὅστις ἄν	οὗ ἄν	ἐκτὸς εἰ μή	TOTAL	ὅταν	ὡς	ὡς ἄν	ἡνίκα ἄν	ὁσάκις ἄν	TOTAL	
1 Th.	4	..	(1. no verb) 5	..	..	..	5:10 (2)	..	..	..	..	7	1	..	2:7 R.V.	..	..	2	13
2 Th.	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
1 Cor.	3	..	22	..	..	19	..	2	1	1	1	46	3	..	..	..	3	6	55
2 Cor.	..	..	15	8:11 (no verb)	12:20 (no verb)	..	..	2	..	..	..	19	3	..	..	1	..	4	23
Gal.	4	..	5	..	2:2	1	..	2	1	..	..	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	14
Ro.	5	6:1	6	..	..	13	..	3	..	..	..	22	1	1	15:24	..	..	3	31
Ph.	1	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	8
Col.	..	..	3	..	..	1	..	1	1	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Phil.	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Eph.	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
1 Tim.	..	..	6	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	8
2 Tim.	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Tit.	..	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	8
Total	17	1	89	1	2	37	2	10	3	1	1	146	8	1	2	1	3	15	179

ἵνα Gal. 4:17 counted present subjunctive.

SUBJUNCTIVE TENSES — SUMMARY

BOOK	PRESENT				AORIST				PERFECT	GRAND TOTAL
	Independent	Dependent	Temporal	TOTAL	Independent	Dependent	Temporal	TOTAL		
Mk.	2	33	4	39	35	113	19	167	1	207
[ ]					1	1		2]		2]
Mt.	2	24	7	33	72	159	32	263	1	297
Lu.	2	30	9	41	59	102	44	205	2	248
	6	87	20	113	167	375	95	637	4	754
Ac.	..	5	..	5	14	50	7	71	..	76
Jo.	5	77	4	86	20	167	14	201	5	292
[8]		1]		1]						1]
1 Jo.	2	22	2	26	..	23	..	23	3	52
2 Jo.	..	3	..	3	..	2	..	2	1	6
3 Jo.	..	2	..	2	..	2	..	2	..	4
	7	105	6	118	20	194	14	228	9	355
Rev.	2	12	2	16	22	36	12	70	..	86
Heb.	11	9	..	20	11	31	3	45	..	65
Jas.	..	6	..	6	2	16	2	20	1	27
1 Pet.	..	2	..	2	3	13	..	16	..	18
2 Pet.	..	..	..	..	1	2	2	5	..	5
Ju.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	—
	13	29	2	44	39	98	19	156	1	201
Paul	18	146	15	179	32	258	27	317	8	504
Total	44	372	43	459	272	975	162	1409	22	1890

Pages 854 (c), 929, line 3 *ab imo*, 1174 (b), line 3. In Heb. 13:5 (LXX) ἐγκαταλεῖπω is read by ℵACD^{c}KIMP 17. Mr. Scott thinks it odd that this reading escaped Text. Rec. But it is rather Alexandrian than Syrian.

Mr. Scott again presents useful data on **οὐ μή** constructions (see inset facing this page).

W. H. Marginal Readings for **οὐ μή**

	Text	Margin
Mk. 13:31	**οἱ λόγοι μου οὐ παρελεύσονται**	**. . . οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται**
Mt. 12:32	**ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ . . . οὐκ ἀφεθήσετα**	**. . . οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ**
10:42	**ὃς ἂν . . . οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ**	**. . . οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται**
Lu. 10:19	**οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσει**	**. . . οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ**
22:68	**ἐὰν ἐρωτήσω οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε**	**. . . οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε –| ἢ ἀπολύσητε |-**
Rev. 3:3	**καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῷς ποίαν ὥραν**	**. . . οὐ μὴ γνώσῃ**
9:6	**καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρήσουσιν αὐτόν**	**. . . οὐ μὴ εὕρωσιν αὐτόν**

Of these 7 readings only 3 (Mk. 13:31; Mt. 12:32; Lu. 22:68, add to the examples of **οὐ μή**. The remaining 4 are only -| |- variations of existing examples. Readings -| |- are in the judgment of W. H. (Introduction, §385) "outside the pale of probability as regards the original text": so that only Mk. 13:31 Mt. 12?32 can claim any right to be counted as additional examples of **οὐ μή.**

SPEAKERS IN GOSPELS

BOOK	Jesus	Peter	Thomas	Others	TOTAL
Mk.	8 [16:18]	14:31	..	..	9 (10)
Mt.	18	16:22, 26:35	..	..	20
Lu.	18	..	..	1:15	19
Jo.	13	13:8	20:25	8:52; 11:56	17
Total	57 (58)	4	1	3	65 (66)

Jesus spoke the Quotation.

Page 854 (ζ). Mr. Scott gives the data for aorist and present optative. Aorist occurs 45, present 22 times. But Paul has aorist 31 and present 0 times, while the rest have aorist 14, present 22 times. **Μὴ γένοιτο** occurs 15 times and **γένοιτο** without **μή** twice. Opt. 67 times in all.

Pages 856, line 8 *ab imo*, 933, line 9. Mr. Scott notes that 3d sing. aor. imper. occurs 8 times in N. T.: Mk. 13:15 (twice) =Mt. 24:7=Lu. 17:31; Mk. 13:16=Mt. 24:18=Lu. 17:31; Mt. 6:3.

Page 858, line 12. Mr. Scott gives the data for aor. inf. with prepositions (**μετά** 14 times, **πρό** 8, **εἰς** 38, **ἐν** 12, **διά**. acc.

1, ἕνεκεν 1, ἕως 1=84). There should be added to the table on p. 858 for articular inf. in N. T.: pres. 164, aor. 148, perf. 10 = 322.

Pages 888, 1120. On the periphrastic imperfect Mr. Scott observes that "Moulton (as usual) has counted Geden's examples. In Mark Geden omits 1:32 ἦν ἔσθων; 2:32 καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι; 14:5 θερμαινόμενος." So Geden omits Mt. 24:38 (four subs.); 27:55, 61. In Luke Geden omits 5:16, and grammatically 18:2 bis and 24:53 may be considered examples. In Acts Geden omits 18:18; 9:9; 16:9; 22:20, and Jo. 18:18. In Paul Geden omits Phil. 2:26, but he counts 2 Cor. 5:19 which Moulton excludes.

Page 891, line 10. Mr. Scott's figures for pres. inf. with preps. are with **ἐν τῷ,** 43 times, διά τὸ 24, πρός τὸ 3, εἰς 32, **ἐκ τοῦ** 1, πρὸ **τοῦ** 1, ἀντὶ **τοῦ** 1, διὰ **τοῦ**, 700 1=106.

Page 894, 2. Mr. Scott counts 868 perfect indicatives in the N. T. of which 37 are periphrastic (5 active and 32 passive). John (Gospel 205, 1 Ep. 60) has far the most and 1 Cor. (73) comes next. **Οἶδα** alone occurs 208 times (Gospel of Jo. 61, 1 Ep. 13).

Pages 903, 906, line 20. Mr. Scott reports his count of pluperfects in the N. T. as 142 in all. (Mk. 13 and one in 16:9, Mt. 11, Lu. 31, Ac. 33, Jo. 46, 1 Jo. 1, Rev. 3, Gal. 2, Ro. 1.) Of these 88 are simple and 54 periphrastic forms, divided again into active (simple 81, periphrastic 13) 94 and passive (simple 7, periphrastic 41) 48. These statistics are based on form only (ᾔδειν gives 34, **ἵστημι** 20).

Page 908, line 4. Add "1 Cor. 1:10; 2 Cor. 9:3." There are 22 perf. subjs., 10 **εἰδῶ**, 12 periphrastic (ten passive, two active).

Page 909. Mr. Scott, by the table on page 1407, corrects Votaw's error as to the number of *perfect infinitives* in the N. T. Further investigation has shown that the number of perfect infinitives in N. T. is 47 (of which ten (10) are articular - 31 separate verbs, but 47 instances). This may account for Votaw's statement on p. 50, but he is undoubtedly in error in making only 8 articular instances.

Page 917, middle. MAI., Mr. Scott notes, occurs 54 times in N. T. It is a favourite word of Luke (Gospel 17, Acts 3) 20, Mt. 9, but not in Mk. It occurs in questions 43 times, 9 times in denials (qualified by ἀλλά) of a previous question or statement. In Lu. 18:30 it is the equivalent of **οὐ μή. Οὐχί** in Lu. 4:22 is **οὐκ** in Mt. and Mk., but Mt. has **οὐχί** like Lu. 12:6.

BOOK	διὰ τὸ	εἰς τὸ	μετὰ τὸ	TOTAL ANARTHROUS		GRAND TOTAL
Mk.	5:4 ter	. .	. .	3	. .	3
Mt.	. .	. .	. .	. .	..	—
Lu.	6:48	. .	. .	1	6	7
Ac.	8:11; 18:2; 27:9	. .	. .	3	6	9
Jo.	. .	. .	. .	. .	2	2
Heb.	. .	11:3	10:15	2	4	6
1 Pet.	. .	. .	. .	. .	1	1
2 Pet.	. .	. .	. .	. .	1	1
1 Th.	. .	. .	. .	. .	2	2
1 Cor.	. .	. .	. .	. .	4	4
2 Cor.	. .	. .	. .	. .	2	2
Ro.	. .	. .	. .	. .	2 (+ 4:1 mg.)	2
Ph.	. .	. .	. .	. .	2	2
Col.	. .	. .	. .	. .	2	2
Eph.	. .	1:18	. .	1	. .	1
1 Tim.	. .	. .	. .	. .	1	1
2 Tim.	. .	. .	. .	. .	1	1
Tit.	. .	. .	. .	. .	1	1
Total	7	2	1	10	37	47

Pages 927, 1381. Prof. F. H. Fowler (*Class. Weekly,* April 16, April 23, 1917) Subjects Sonnenschein's theory of "determined futurity" in "The Unity of the Latin Subjunctive" to a sharp critique. He objects that Sonnenschein makes no room for the *personal* determinant and ignores the Greek. Fowler holds that in Greek "the subjunctive, starting with the *will* meaning, developed the meaning of *determined futurity,* that the optative, starting with the *wish* meaning, did the same thing, and that the optative developed still another meaning, that of *contingent determined futurity*."

Page 928 (a). An instance of the futuristic subjunctive in an independent sentence Occurs in Oxy. P. 1069, 11. 13-18 (iii/A.D.) **τάχα γὰρ δυνασθῶμεν φο[ρ] υτρείσε σοι δύο καμήλους [πυ]ροῦ καὶ πέμψε πρὸ σέν**. The use of raxa with this subjunctive is to be observed.

Page 931, line 3 ab Jannaris, § 1914, quotes this and other examples from Epictetus.

Page 932, line 1. Add **δεῦρο δείξω** (Rev. 17:1; 21:9).

Page 934 (c). Mr. Scott notes that 7.1, in independent aorist subjunctive sentences occurs in Synoptics 28 times, Acts 3, John 1 (Jesus, **τί εἴπω**), 1 Cor. 1, and not in any other book.

OPTATIVE IN N. T.

BOOK	INDEPENDENT SENTENCES							DEPENDENT SENTENCES														GRAND TOTAL
	Wishes				Direct Question			Indirect Question												Temporal		
	Without ἄν		With ἄν		With ἄν		Total	τίς τί without ἄν	τίς τί with ἄν		Total	ποτα-πός	μή ποτε	εἰ without ἄν		εἰ Parenthetical without ἄν		εἰ Conditional without ἄν		Total	πρὶν ἤ		
	Present	Aorist	Present	Aorist	Present	Aorist		Present	Present	Aorist		Present	Present	Present	Aorist	Present	Aorist	Present	Aorist		Present	Aorist	
Lu.	..	1:38; 20:16(2)	..	..	..	..	2	8:9; 18:36; 22:23	1:62; 9:46; 15:26	6:11	7	1:29	3:15	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11
Ac.	8:20	..	..	26:29	8:31; 17:18	..	4	21:33	10:17	5:24	3	..	..	17:11; 25:20	17:27, 27	20:16; 27:12, 39	..	24:19	..	8	25:16	25:16	17
	1	2	—	1	2	—	6	4	4	2	10	1	1	2	2	3	—	1	—	8	1	1	28
Mk.	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Heb.	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
1 Pet.	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3:14, 17	..	2	..	..	3
2 Pet.	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Ju.	..	2	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
	—	6	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2	—	—	8
1 Th.	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
2 Th.	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
1 Cor.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14:10; 15:37	..	..	2	..	..	3
Gal.	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Ro.	..	12	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12
Phil.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
2 Tim.	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
	—	29	—	—	—	—	29	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	2	—	—	31
Total	1	37	—	1	2	—	41	4	4	2	10	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	—	12	1	1	67

In independent present subjunctive sentences Ti occurs only in Jo. 6:28; Heb. 11:32.

Page 936. Mr. Scott has a complete table on page 1408 for the optatives in the N. T.

Page 936, 2. Sonnenschein (Cl. Rev., Feb., March, 1918, p. 211) says: "As in Latin .the past subjunctive, so in Greek the optative may be a, past prospective, owing to its inherent meaning. This I have recognised in my Greek Grammar, § 504 (c) (e.g., **ἕτοιμος ἦν ταῦτα ποιεῖν ἃ εἴποις**, 'the things which you should say'); for the corresponding meaning in present time see Demosth. de Pace 11, **πλὴν δὲ ἃ ἂν ὑμῖν εἴπω δύο**, 'the two things which I shall tell you,' where ay with the subjunctive expresses pure futurity, not generality."

Page 940 (c), line 7. Mr. Scott thinks that the direct question here would be **τί ποιήσωμεν**. I still adhere to my position in the text.

Page 940, line 7 ab In Lu. 1:29; 3:15 there is the optative without **ἄν**, the simple change of mode in indirect question (indicative to optative).

Page 941. Mr. Scott Offers this table for the imperatives in N. T.:

BOOK	PRESENT				AORIST				PERFECT				GRAND TOTAL
	2d Pers.	3d Sing.	3d Pl.	Total	2d Pers.	3d Sing.	3d Pl.	Total	2d Pers.	3d Sing.	3d Pl.	Total	
Mk.	74	6	1	81	58	6	..	64	1	..	..	1	146
Mt.	110	11	1	122	142	21	..	163	..	..	..	..	285
Lu.	118	6	4	128	141	12	1	154	..	..	1	1	283
	302	23	6	331	341	39	1	381	1	—	1	2	714
Ac.	31	7	2	40	78	3	2	83	1	..	..	1	124
Jo. and Epp. 1, 2, 3	61	8	..	69	76	1	..	77	..	..	..	..	146
Rev.	26	1	..	27	46	15	..	61	..	..	..	..	88
Heb.	22	1	..	23	5	..	Q 1	6	..	..	..	..	29
Jas. and 1, 2 Pet.-Ju.	30	15	1	46	44	8	1	53	..	..	..	..	99
Paul	235	73	15	323	89	7	3	99	..	..	..	..	422
	405	105	18	528	338	34	7	379	1	—	—	1	908
Total	707	128	24	859	679	73	8	760	2	—	1	3	1622

Lu. 9:3; 10:4; 14:12 are counted as one each.

ἄν (ἐάν) CONSTRUCTIONS IN N. T.

BOOK	PROTASIS JOINED WITH RELATIVE OR CONJUNCTION																															APODOSIS					OPTATIVE				WITHOUT VERB		GRAND TOTAL
	ὃς (ἐ)ἄν			TOTAL	ὅστις ἄν		ὅσος ἄν		καθότι ἄν	ὅπου (ἐ)ἄν			οὗ ἐάν	ἕως ἄν	ἄχρις ἄν	ὁσάκις ἄν		ἡνίκα ἄν		ὡς ἄν			πρὶν ἢ ἄν	ὅπως ἄν :		TOTAL				TOTAL	DIRECT QUESTION		INDIRECT QUESTION		ὡς ἄν	εἰ μήτι [ἄν]	
	Ind.		Subj.		Subj.		Ind.	Subj.	Ind.	Ind.	Subj.		Sub.	Subj.	Sub.	Subj.		Subj.		Ind.	Subj.		Sub.	Ind.	Subj.					Indicative			Opt.							
	Fut.	Pres.	Aor.		Pres.	Aor.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Imp.	Pres.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Imp.	Pres.	Aor.	Aor.	Fut.	Aor.			Imp.	Aor.	Plup.	Pres.		Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.			
Mk.	1	6	17	24	..	1	1	..	1	..	1	..	4	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	35	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	36
Mt.	..	5	33	38	..	1	..	1	5	..	..	2	1	..	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	58	1	7	..	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	66
Lu.	2	6	14	22	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	30	2	4	..	..	6	..	..	3	1	..	..	40
	3	17	64	84	—	3	1	2	6	—	1	3	5	—	16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	123	3	12	—	—	15	—	—	3	1	—	—	142
Ac.	1 Q	..	3	4	..	1	..	..	2	2	..	..	..	..	Q 1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	13	..	1	..	1	2	1	1	1	1	..	..	19
Jo.	..	2	2	4	1	2	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8	5	7	2	..	14	..	..	..	..	..	..	22
1 Jo.	..	5	2	7	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	9
3 Jo.	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Rev.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	1	-	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Heb.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Q 1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	4	1	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Jas.	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
	1	7	9	17	2	3	—	1	4	2	1	-	—	—	—	Q 2	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	37	9	9	3	1	22	1	1	1	1	—	—	63
1 Th.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
1 Cor.	..	2	2	4	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	3	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	12	1	1	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	1	15
2 Cor.	..	2	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	5
Gal.	..	2	..	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	2	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Ro.	..	3	1	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	Q 1	Q 1	7	..	Q 2	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	9
Ph.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Col.	..	1	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
	—	10	3	13	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	3	—	1	1	1	2	2	—	1	1	31	3	3	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	1	1	39
Total	4	34	76	114	5	6	1	3	10	2	2	3	5	1	19	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	5	191	15	24	3	1	43	1	1	4	2	1	1	244

The six examples in John (Gospel) of ἄν for conditional ἐάν are not counted.

Page 949, line 11. The other imperative in this idiom is in the aorist except Mt. 21:28 and perhaps Rev. 16:1 (durative present). The idiom is not used by Luke and the *word* is not used in Acts or by Paul. So Mr. Scott.

Page 952, line 6. a pp. 696, 714, 722, 724, 953, 962, 963.

Page 956. Mr. Springer notes ὃς ἄν and future indicative in Athenische Mitteilungen 25. 470; Papers of the Am. School II. 159; Inscr. Graecae, Senats Dekr. 73 a.

Page 957, middle. The 122 indicatives with the indefinite relative are: pres. tense 52, imperf. 13, fut. 9, aor. 45, perf. 2, pluperf. 1. So Mr. Scott.

Page 958. Mr. Scott counts 191 examples (as against Moulton's 172, Prol., p. 166) of ἄν and ἐάν constructions in the N. T. according to the table on page 1410.

Page 966 (d), line 4: Luke διὰ **τό** and inf. 18 times out of the 32, pres. 14 (Gospel 8, Acts 6), perf. (Gospel 1, Acts 3).

Page 969, line 4 *ab imo*. **Ὅπου** occurs (Scott) in Mk. 15 times (10 in speeches), 13 in Mt. (12 in speeches), 5 in Lu. (all in speeches), 30 M Jo. (17 in speeches).

Page 969, line 6 *ab imo*. Ellipsis also in Lu. 17:37; 1 Cor. 3:3; Col. 3:11; Jas. 3:16.

Page 969, line 8 *ab imo*. Mr. Scott gives this table for **ὅπου** with subjunctives:

	MARK	MATT.	LUKE
ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθητε	6:10	. .	. .
" " **ἐσέλθῃ**	14:14	. .	. .
" " **καταλάβῃ**	9:18	. .	. .
" " **κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον**	14:9	26:13	. .
" **τὸ πάσχα . . . φάγω**	14:14	. .	22:11
. . . . **ὅπυ ἐὰν ἀρέρχῃ**	. .	8:19	9:57
ὅπου ἐὰν ᾖ τὸ πτῶμα	**. .**	24.28	17:57 **ὅπου**
Total	5	3	2 = 10

Page 971, line 11 *ab imo*. **Ὅτε** (only ind.) 101 times in the N. T. (Scott), pres.,3, imperf. 16, aor. 75, fut. 6, perf. 1.

Page 972, line 7. **Ὅταν** with subj. 125 times (Scott), pres. 35, aor. 90, as given in the following table:

	Present	Aorist		Present	Aorist
Mark	4	14	John	4	13
Matthew	7	15	1 John	2	. .
Luke	8	23	Revelations	2	5
Acts	..	2	Hebrews	. .	1
Paul	8	16	James	. .	1
	27	70		8	20=125

ὅταν with indicative (Mk. 3, Rev. 2) 5

ὅταν in N. T. 130

Page 972, line 18. **Ὅταν** with the ind. only 5 times, pres. 1, aor. 2, imperf. 1, fut. 1. Mr. Springer notes ὅταν with incl. in Ignatius, Ep. ad Eph. 8:1; Barnabas, Ep. 10:3; 15:5. He also offers ὅταν δὲ πέμπεις in L. P. (ed. C. Leemans, 1888) III, 4.

Page 974 (c). **Ἄχρι(ς)** prep. 30, conj. 18 (ind. 7, subj. aor. 11). So Scott gives this table for ἄχρι(ς) as conjunction:

BOOK	INDICATIVE					SUBJUNCTIVE					TOTAL
	Pres.	Imp.	Aorist		Fut.	Aorist					
	ἄχρι(ς) οὗ	ἄχρι οὗ	ἄχρι οὗ	ἄχ ἧς ἡμέρας	ἄχρι	ἄχρι	ἄχ ἧς ἡμέρας	ἄχρι οὗ	ἄχρι οὗ ἄν	ἄχρις ἄν	
Mt.	..	..	..	24:38 } =	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Lu.	..	..	..	17:27 }	..	..	1:20	21:24	..	..	3
Ac.	..	27:33	7:18	1:2	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Heb.	3:13	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Rev.	..	..	..	..	17:17	4	..	..	2:25	..	6
1 Cor.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11:26 15:25 Q	..	..	2
Gal.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	.. [1]	..	3:19	1
Ro.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11:25	..	..	1
Total	1	1	1	3	1	4	1	4	1	1	18

[1] Gal. 3:19 mg.

Note Oxy. P. 933 ll. 14, 15 (ii/A.D.) περὶ τῆς μικρᾶς ἐγενάμην ἄχρις ἄν καταπλεύσῃ.

Page 975, middle. **Ἕως** as preposition (Scott) 86 times, conj. 62 (ind. 13, subj. 49)=148. **Ἕως** alone ind." 7, subj. 13, gon ay subj. 19; ἕως ὅτου ind. 2, subj. 3; ἕως οὗ ind. 4, subj. 14 (Scott).

Page 977. HO) (ij). Scott notes in LXX as preposition πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν Dan. Sus. 35 o 42 θ; as adverb Aquila and Sym. Prov. 8:26 πρὶν ἤ; with subj. Ps. 57 (58):10; Jer. 40 (47):5; with inf. pres. 4 Mace. 9:27; Numb. 11:33 (B).

Page 978, line 3 *ab imo*. For data in N. T. see p. 107.

Page 983, line 1. Mr. Scott gives data for ἵνα μή in the N. T.

There are 117 instances of ἵνα with μή in N. T. (indic. 4, subj. pres. 37, aor. 75, perf. 1 (2 Cor. 1:10)). When the construction with ἵνα is continued in a further clause by μή, μή alone is repeated Mk. 4:12 LXX, Jo. 6:50, 11:50, 1 Jo. 2:28, 1 Cor. 1:10, 2 Cor. 4:7, Rev. 3:18, 8:12; and so with ἵνα μὴ Jo. 4:15, Rev. 7:1. In Rev. 18:4 ἵνα μὴ is repeated, but in Rev. 16:15 neither is repeated. When the construction is continued with ἀλλά 'but on the contrary,' ἵνα is not repeated, Jo. 3:16, 6:39, 18:28, 2 Jo. 8, 1 Cor. 12:25. So with δέ Heb. 12:13. In Rev. 9:5 ἵνα is repeated.

Page 984, middle. See Oxy. P. 1068, l. 19 (iii /A.D.) εἶνα μοι μαρτυρήσουσιν ἀνελθόντες, example of ἵνα and future indicative.

Page 986, line 6 *ab imo*. Mr. Scott notes that ὅπως is almost confined to Matthew and Luke, and gives the following data for ὅπως in N. T.:

BOOK	INDICATIVE		SUBJUNCTIVE			TOTAL
	Future	Aorist	Present	Aorist	Aorist with ἄν	
Mk.	..	..	..	1	..	1
Mt.	..	..	6:4	17	..	18
Lu.	..	24:24	3:26 *bis*, 28	3	2:35	8
	—	1	4	21	1	27
Ac.	..	..	..	13	3	16
Jo.	..	..	..	1	..	1
Jas.	..	..	..	1	..	1
1 Pet.	..	..	..	1	..	1
Heb.	..	..	..	2	..	2
	—	—	—	18	3	21
2 Th.	..	..	..	1	..	1
1 Cor.	..	..	..	1	..	1
2 Cor.	..	..	8:11 (no verb)	1	..	2
Gal.	..	..	..	1	..	1
Ro.	3:4	..	..	9:17 Q (2)	3:4 Q	4
Phil.	..	..	..	1	..	1
	1	—	1	7	1	10
Total	1	1	5	46	5	58

Ro. 3:4 (Ps. 50:6 Swete has aor. subj. twice).

[Of the 18 exx. in Matthew only two have any parallels: Mt. 12:14= Mk. 3:6; Mt. 9:38=Lu. 10:2]

ὥστε CONSTRUCTION IN N. T.

Book	Indicative				Imperative		Subj.	Infinitive			Total
	Pres.	Fut.	Aorist	Perf.	Pres.	Aor.	Present	Pres.	Aor.	Perfect	
Mk.	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	12	..	..	14
Mt.	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	12	4	..	19
Lu.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	2	.	4
Ac.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	7	..	12
Jo.	..	..	3:16	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Heb.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
1 Pet.	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	2
	5	—	1	—	1	—	—	33	13	—	53
1 Th.	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	1	..	3
2 Th.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	2
1 Cor.	3	1	..	..	7	..	5:8	3	..	..	15
2 Cor.	2	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	4	..	8
Gal.	2	..	2:13	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Ro.	1	..	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	15:19	5
Ph.	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	1	1	..	4
	8	1	3	3	10	—	1	8	7	1	42
Total	13	1	4	3	11	—	1	41	20	1	95
								1			1
							add "Ro. 15:20"				

Purpose inf. 7 times, pres. 3 (Mt. 10:1 *bis*; Lu. 24:24), aor. 4 (Mt. 15:33; 27:1; Lu. 4:29; 20:26).

ὥστε with ind. aors. dependent twice (Jo. 3:16; Gal. 2:13).

ὥστε not in James, 2 Pet., Jude, 1, 2, 3 Jo., Col., Phil., Eph., 1, 2 Tim., Titus (11 books).

ὥστε RENDERINGS BY R. V.

	INDICATIVE	INFINITIVE	IMPERATIVE	CONJUNCTIVE	TOTAL
insomuch that	G. 2:13	23	..	..	24
so that . . .	6	29	..	..	35
so as	..	3	..	..	3
as to	..	Mt. 15:33	..	..	1
to	..	(4 Lu. 9:52) 3	..	..	3
that	1	3	..	..	4
therefore .	R. 13:2	..	..	..	1
wherefore .	7	..	10	1 Cor. 5:8	18
so then . .	5	..	1	..	6
Total .	21	62	11	1	95

Page 988. Mr Scott gives this table for 147076 constructions in N. T.:

BOOK	INTERROGATIVE AND INDEPENDENT			DEPENDENT CONJUNCTION					GRAND TOTAL
	INDICATIVE		OPT.	INDICATIVE	SUBJUNCTIVE			TOTAL	
	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Future	Pres.	Aorist	Perf.		
Mk.	..	..	..	14:2	..	4:12 *bis* Q	..	3	3
Mt.	..	..	..	5:25; 7:6; 13:15 Q	..	5 Q (12)	..	15	15
Lu.	..	..	3:15	12:58 *bis*; 14:9	..	4:11 Q (7)	14:8	11	12
	—	—	1	7	—	21	1	29	30
Ac.	..	..	..	28:27 Q	..	5:39; 28:27 Q (4)	..	6	6
Jo.	..	Ind. 7:26	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Heb.	(9:17 mg.)	..	..	3:12	4:1	2:1	..	3	3
2 Tim.	..	Subj. 1:6; 2:25	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
	—	3	—	2	1	6	—	9	12
Total	—	3	1	9	1	27	1	38	42

Lu. 12:58 has same form for pres. and aor. subj. I have counted it as aor. Mt. 25:9 may be independent.

Page 990, middle. Blass, p. 235, points out that roS is added to the second infinitive. Add "Ac. 26:18."

Pages 995, line 6 *ab imo*, 1174, line 7. Mr. Scott thinks that **οὐχ . . . οὐ** simply belongs to **θέλω** according to ordinary rule.

Page 999 ((3). Votaw counts **εὐαγγελίζεσθαι** with **ὥστε**, but it is more likely to be construed with the participle **φιλοτιμούμενον** which with **οὕτως δὲ** loosely carries on the **ὥστε** clause. Leaving out this example there are 95 exx. of **ὥστε** in the N. T. (See Mr. Scott's tables on page 1414).

Page 1001 (d) , line 12. Moulton, Germ. ed. (p. 332 n.), says that Jo. 14 22I is consecutive.

Page 1003, 7. Note Oxy. P. 1489, 1. 6 (iii/A.D.) **εἴθε πάντας πεπλήρωκα ὡς ᾽Αγαθὸς Δαίμων**.

Pages 1007-16. Mr. Scott has valuable tables on pages 1416-17 for the constructions of **εἰ** with indicative. The examples cover both (α) and (β), the two first classes (determined as fulfilled and unfulfilled).

εἰ WITH PRESENT INDICATIVE IN PROTASIS

BOOK	APODOSIS											GRAND TOTAL
	INDICATIVE					TOTAL	IMPERATIVE		TOTAL	SUBJUNCTIVE		
	Present	Future	Aorist	Imperfect	Perfect		Present	Aorist		Present	Aorist	
Mk.	9:42	9:35	..	..	..	2	2	2	4	..	..	6
Mt.	5	2	2	..	..	9	19:7	15	16	..	..	25
Lu.	5	4	11:20	17:6	..	11	..	7	7	..	23:31	19
	11	7	3	1	—	22	3	24	27	—	1	50
Ac.	2	2	..	..	..	4	2	1	3	..	..	7
Jo.	5	2	..	..	..	7	3	3	6	..	..	13
1 Jo.	1	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	1	..	..	2
2 Jo.	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	1
	6	2	—	—	—	8	5	3	8	—	—	16
Heb.	3	..	..	..	6:9	4	..	..	..	.	..	4
Jas.	6	..	..	..	2	8	2	..	2	..	..	10
1, 2 Pet.	5	2	..	..	2 Pet. 2:20	8	1	1	2	..	..	10
Rev.	3	1	..	..	..	4	1	..	1	..	..	5
	17	3	—	—	4	24	4	1	5	—	—	29
1 Th.	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
2 Th.	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2	..	..	2
1 Cor.	12	2	8:2	..	3	18	10	4	14	..	8:13; 15:32	34
2 Cor.	16	11:30	12:11	..	..	18	..	..	..	..	..	18
Gal.	8	..	2:21	..	..	9	2	..	2	5:25	..	12
Ro.	20	4	..	..	4:14	25	12:18	..	1	..	..	26
Ph.	3	1	..	..	..	4	2	4	6	..	..	10
Col.	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Phil.	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	2	..	..	2
Eph.	..	..	..	..	..	..	4:29 ?	..	1	..	..	1
1 Tim.	2	..	..	..	3	5	2	..	2	..	..	7
2 Tim.	2:13	2:12	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	2
Tit.	1:6	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
	64	10	3	—	7	84	21	9	30	1	2	117
Total	100	24	6	1	11	142	35	38	73	1	3	219

BOOK	APODOSIS									APODOSIS		
	INDICATIVE						IMPERATIVE		TOTAL	INDICATIVE		TOTAL
	Present	Future	Aorist	Imperfect	No Apodosis	TOTAL	Present	Aorist		Present	Future	
Mk.	3:26	..	ἄν 13:20	14:21	..	3	..	..	3	..	14:29 = 26:33	1
Mt.	..	10:25	ἄν 3	26:24	..	5	..	..	5	..		1
Lu.	2	3	ἄν 10:13	..	19:42	7	..	..	7	..	11:8	1
	3	4	5	2	1	15	—	—	15	—	3	3
Ac.	..	..	..	11:17	23:9	2	..	..	2	..	..	..
Jo.	3	3	..	15:22, 24	..	8	..	2	10	..	..	..
1 Jo.	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..
	4	3	—	2	—	9	—	2	11	—	—	—
Rev.	..	..	20:15	..	..	1	..	..	1	13:10	..	1
Heb.	..	2	..	ἄν 4:8	..	3	..	..	3	..	..	..
1 Pet.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2:20 *bis*	..	2
2 Pet.	..	..	..	..	4	4	..	..	4	..	..	..
	—	2	1	1	4	8	—	—	8	3	—	3
1 Cor.	3	..	ἄν 2:8	..	..	4	..	..	4	9:12	3:14, 15	3
2 Cor.	7:8	3:7	..	..	7:12	3	..	..	3	..	..	..
Gal.	2:17	..	..	ἄν 3:21	..	2	..	..	2	..	..	..
Ro.	4	6	5:15	..	9:22	12	11:17 *ter*	..	15	..	..	..
Col.	2:20	..	..	..	..	1	3:1	..	2	..	..	..
Phil.	..	..	..	..	..	..	18	..	1	..	..	..
1 Tim.	..	..	..	..	..	..	5 (5:10)	..	5	..	..	..
2 Tim.	..	2:12	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	2:12	1
	10	8	2	1	2	23	10	—	33	1	3	4
Total	17	17	8	7	8	57	10	2	69	4	6	10

BOOK	Protasis: εἰ with Perfect Indicative									εἰ with Pluperfect (8 protases)			
	APODOSIS									APODOSIS (10)			
	Present	Future	Aorist	Imperfect	No Apodosis	TOTAL	Present	Aorist	TOTAL	Imp.	Aorist with ἄν	Pluperfect with ἄν	TOTAL
Mk.	9:42	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..
Mt.	..	7:11	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	12:7; 24:43 *bis*	..	3
Lu.	17:2	11:13	..	..	..	2	..	..	2	..	12:39 ἄν	..	1
	2	2	—	—	—	4	—	—	4	—	4	—	4
Ac.	25:11	..	..	..	..	1	16:15	..	2	26:32	..	..	1
Jo.	13:17	11:12	..	..	..	2	..	..	2	19:11	4:10 *bis*	8:19; 14:7	5
1 Cor.	15:14,17,19	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	3	..	..	..	..
2 Cor.	5:16	..	7:14	Perfect 2:5, 10; 4:3	..	5	10:6	..	6	..	..	..	..
Ro.	2:17	6:5	..	..	..	2	..	..	2	..	..	..	..
1 Tim.	..	3:5	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..
	5	2	1	3	—	11	1	—	12	—	—	—	—
Total	9	5	1	3	—	18	2	—	20	2	6	2	10

εἰ οἶδα–, 4; ἐγνώκαμεν, 1.

εἰ ἐγνώκειτε, 2; ᾔδεις, 4.

ἐάν WITH PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE IN PROTASIS

BOOK	APODOSIS									GRAND TOTAL
	INDICATIVE					IMPERATIVE		SUBJUNCTIVE		
	Present	Future	Aorist	Perfect	TOTAL	Present	Aorist	Aorist	Aorist οὐ μή	
Mk.	1:40 (Triple)	14:31 (οὐ μὴ)	..	..	2	..	9:45, 47	..	..	4
Mt.	8:2 = 6:33	8	..	..	9	..	3	..	..	12
Lu.	5:12 = 6:33	3	..	..	5	10:8	10:10	20:28	..	8
	4	12	—	—	16	1	6	1	—	24
Ac.	..	5:38	..	26:5	2	..	..	..	13:41 Q	3
Jo.	16	6	15:6, 6	20:23	25	4	..	..	..	29
1 Jo.	9	..	..	4:12	10	..	..	..	..	10
	25	6	2	2	35	4	—	—	—	39
Heb.	..	6:3 ἐάν περ 13:23	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	2
Jas.	4	2	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	6
	4	4	—	—	8	—	—	—	—	8
1 Cor.	11	2	..	1	14	14:28 *bis*	..	..	..	16
Gal.	..	5:2	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
Ro.	4	4	..	2:25	9	3 (2 Q)	..	..	..	12
Col.	..	..	..	..	..	3:13 (Pres. Part.)	..	..	..	1
1 Tim.	2	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	2
2 Tim.	2:5	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
	18	7	—	2	27	6	—	—	—	33
Total	51	30	2	5	88	11	6	1	1	107

The above is the number of apodoses.

ἐάν with the subjunctive Aorist in Protasis

BOOK	APODOSIS												GRAND TOTAL
	INDICATIVE				TOTAL	IMPERATIVE		TOTAL	SUBJUNCTIVE			TOTAL	
	Present	Future	Aorist	Perfect		Present	Aorist		Aorist	Aorist οὐ μή	Aorist 2d Person		
Mk.	7	5	..	..	12	13:21	2	3	2	..	..	2	17
[16]										[16:18]		1	1
Mt.	6	20	18:15	..	27	18:17	4	5	..	3	3	6	38
Lu.	5	11	..	..	16	..	17:3, 3	2	20:28	2	..	3	21
	18	36	1	—	55	2	8	10	3	6	3	12	77
Ac.	15:6; 27:31	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	9:2	..	..	1	3
Jo.	16	17	..	20:23	34	..	17:7	1	2	5	..	7	42
1 Jo.	5	3	..	..	8	..	..	..	2	..	..	2	10
3 Jo.	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
	21	21	—	1	43	—	1	1	4	5	—	9	53
Heb.	3:6; 10:38 Q	12:20 Q	..	3:14 ἐάν περ	4	..	..	..	..	..	3 Q	3	7
Jas.	2:16	..	2:3, 3	..	3	5	..	5	..	..	..	..	8
1 Pet.	..	3:13 Part.	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Rev.	..	6	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	3:3	..	1	7
	3	8	2	1	14	5	—	5	—	1	3	4	23
1 Cor.	12	8	7:28, 28	..	22	4	7:11	5	..	..	..	..	27
2 Cor.	5:1	3	..	..	4	..	..	..	9:4	..	..	1	5
Gal.	..	..	..	..	..	1:8; 6:1	..	2	..	..	..	..	2
Ro.	2	2	..	7:2; 14:23	6	..	..	..	10:15	..	..	1	7
Col.	..	..	..	..	..	..	4:10	1	..	..	..	..	1
Eph.	..	6:8	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
1 Tim.	..	2:15	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
2 Tim.	..	2:21	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
	15	16	2	2	35	6	2	8	2	—	—	2	45
Total	59	81	5	4	149	13	11	24	10	12	6	28	201

Pages 1011, line 15, 1012, line 4. Scott remarks that Moulton follows MG **εἰ οὐ**, p. 262, with addition of Jo. 1:25, but there are other doubtful examples (Jo. 3:12; 10:35; 2 Jo. 10; Lu. 14:26; Jas. 1:23) so that Jannaris with 34 may be correct.

Page 1011, line 16 *ab imo*. Mr. Scott doubts if Mk. 6:4 is a real condition, and thinks 1 Tim. 6:3 the only normal example of with first class condition.

Page 1016, line 10. Mr. Scott observes that Moulton (p. 171) divides **εἰ μή** into three classes:

1. in protasis		10
2. 'except' (1) without verb expressed:		
(a) preceded by negative	63	
(b) **τις . . . εἰ μή** . . ; . . .	10	
(2) with verb expressed (Mt. 6:5; Gal. 1:7) .	2	
εἰ μήτι	3	
ἐκτὸς εἰ μή	3	81
3. 'otherwise': **εἰ δὲ μὴ** 6, **εἰ δὲ μήγε** 8		14

		105

Page 1017. Mr. Scott gives two tables on pages 1418 and 1419 for **ἐάν** and the subjunctive: one for the present subjunctive, one for the aorist subjunctive. He finds it difficult to be accurate, because of the compound protases and apodoses as in Mt. 5:23; 24:49; Lu. 20:28; 1 Cor. 13:1-3; Jas. 2:1-3.

Page 1019, line 16. As already seen, Eav with present subjunctive has future apodoses 30 times; MP with aorist subjunctive has future apodoses 81 times. Mr. Scott adds figures for MI/ with perfect subjunctive and with the indicative.

ἐάν WITH PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE (Protasis)	(Apodosis) Present	Future
Jo. 3:27 **ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον**	**οὐ δυναται**	. .
Jo. 6:65 " " " "	**οὐδεὶς δύναται**	. .
Jas. 5:15 **κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς**	. .	**ἀφεθήσεται**
1 Cor. 13:2 **καὶ (ἐὰν) εἰδῶ**	**οὐδὲν εἰμί**	. .
1 Cor. 14:11 **ἐὰν μὴ εἰδῶ**	. .	**ἔσομαι**
1 Jo. 2 : 29 **ἐὰν εἰδῆτε**	**γινώσκετε**	. .
6	4	2

Book	ἐάν with Indicative (Protasis)			(Apodosis)				Total
	ἐάν Pres.	ἐάν Future	ἐάν Perfect	Ind. Pres.	Ind. Fut.	Indicative Perfect	Opt. Pres.	
Mt.	..	18:19 W. H. *alt.*	..	..	18:19	..	..	1
Lu.	..	19:40	..	..	19:40	..	..	1
Ac.	..	18:31	..	..	..	..	18:31	1
1 Jo.	..	..	5:15 οἴδαμεν	..	..	5:15 οἴδαμεν	..	1
Rev.	..	2:22	..	2:22	..	..	..	1
1 Th.	3:8	..	..	3:8	..	..	..	1
Total	1	4	1	2	2	1	1	6

Page 1023, line 7. For **δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου** see 4 Ki. 6:19.

Page 1027 (6). Add to examples of **εἴ πως** Ro. 11:14; Phil. 3:11 which can be construed as aorist subjunctive with **σκοπῶν** implied (so Thayer).

Page 1027 (a). Recitative **ὅτι** occurs in Oxy. P. 1066, 11. 11, 12 (iii/A.D.). Mr, Scott finds, taking R. V. as basis, 184 exx. of recitative **ὅτι** in N. T.

Pages 1028, line 1029, line 17. Mr. Scott considers Mk. 2: 16 a doubtful example. In favour of the interrogative is the fact that Mt. and Lu. (the earliest commentators) read **διὰ τί . . .**

Page 1029. Mr. T. Nicklin (Cl. Rev., Aug.–Sept., 1918, p. 116) suggests that a case like Ac. 4:13 shows that a distinction was preserved between **ἐστιν** and **ἦσαν** in the indirect discourse. The imperfect carries the idea of "had been." He insists on this meaning in Ac. 16:3; and even in Jo. 2:25; 6:6; 9:8. Something can be said for this view.

Page 1030 f. Note Oxy. P. 1204, 1. 24 (A.D. 299) **ἵνα δὲ ἐννομώτερον ἀκουσθείη** after an aorist imperative.

Page 1032. Note Oxy. P. 1483, 11. 15-20 (iii/iv A.D.) **ἴσθει ὡς** like **ὅτι**.

Page 1033. For double indirect discourse see Jo. 4:1.

Page 1034, line 1. In Mk. 1:34 =Lu. 4:41 **ὅτι** is treated as causal by some.

Page 1034, line 12. Subject clause. Add "1 Cor. 6:7."

Page 1035. Add **γνωστὸν ἔστω . . . ὅτι** Ac. 4:10; 13:38 ; 28:28;

χάρις τῷ θεῷ ὅτι Ro. 6:17; **σύνφημι ὅτι** Ro. 7:16; and perhaps **μέλει ὅτι**, Mk. 4:38; Lu. 10:40.

Page 1036, line 6. Mr. Scott observes that **ἀκούω ὅτι** occurs 32 times, dec. and inf. 2 (Jo. 12:18; 1 Cor. 11:18). **Ἀποκρίνομαι ὅτι**. (recitative) 3 times (Mk. 8:4; 12:29; Ac. 25:16), acc. and inf. 3 (Lu. 20:7; Ac. 25:4 bis). **Νομίζω ὅτι**, 4 times, inf. 10 (Luke and Paul). **Λέγω ὅτι**. 162 (and about 900 object clauses without **ὅτι**, inf. 35. **Οἶδα ὅτι**. 133, inf. 12. **Πιστεύω ὅτι** 25, inf. 2. **Γινώσκω ὅτι**. 71, inf. 3. **Βοάω ὅτι**. 1, inf. 1.

Page 1042, line 2. Mr. Scott has this table for the constructions of **ἀκούω** in N. T.:

Book	Absolute: No Object	Accus. with Infin.	Accus. with Part.	ὅτι Clause	Object Clause	Accusative Object: Simple	Accusative Object: With Part.	Genitive Object: Simple	Genitive Object: With Part.	Two Objects	Total
Mk.	25	..	..	2 [16:11]	1	6	..	7	2	..	44
Mt.	28	..	..	9	2	20	..	4	..	..	63
Lu.	26	..	1	..	1	20	..	14	1	2	65
	79	—	1	12	4	46	—	25	3	2	172
Ac.	25	..	1	6	1	23	2	15	10	6	89
Jo.	11	1	..	10	..	11	..	20	2	4	59
1 Jo.	..	..	..	2	..	6	..	5	..	1	14
2 Jo.	v. 1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
3 Jo.	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
Rev.	8	..	..	..	7	13	7	1	10	..	46
Heb.	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	8
Jas.	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	3
2 Pet.	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
	51	1	1	18	8	54	11	45	22	11	222
2 Th.	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
1 Cor.	2	1	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	5
2 Cor.	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
Gal.	..	..	..	1	..	2	..	..	..	..	3
Ro.	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	5
Ph.	..	..	..	1	..	3	..	..	..	..	4
Col.	1	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	4
Phil.	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
Eph.	1	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	5
1 Tim.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1
2 Tim.	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	4
	10	1	—	2	1	15	1	2	—	2	34
Total	140	2	2	32	13	115	12	72	25	15	428

Page 1042 (d), line 13. Mr. Scott's data for **ἐγένετο** construction *with note of time and without* follow here:

Book	Noun: ἐν, μετά	ὅτε	ἐν τῷ Infinitive	ὡς	Gen. Abs.	No note of time	Total
Mk.	1:9; 2:23	..	4:4	..	..	2:15	4
Mt.	..	5	..	..	9:10	18:13	7
Lu.	1:59; 2:1, 46; 5:17; 6:1, 6, 12; 7:11; 8:1, 22; 9:28, 37; 20:1	..	1:8; 2:6; 3:21; 5:11, 12; 9:18, 33, 51; 11:1, 27; 14:1; 17:11, 14; 18:35; 19:15; 24:4, 15, 15, 30, 51	1:23, 41; 2:15; 19:22	3:21, 21; 11:14	16:22	41
	15	5	21	4	4	3	52
Ac.	4:5; 9:37, 43; 11:26; 28:17	21:5	9:3; 19:1	..	16:16; 22:6 dat., 17 dat.	9:32, 43; 14:1; 21:1; 27:44; 28:8	17
	5	1	2	—	3	6	17
Total	20	6	23	4	7	9	69

Ac. 10:251
Lu. 9:29 f not included.

Mr. Scott expands the data for **ἐν τῷ** with **ἐγένετο** thus:

	Luke Gospel				
	καὶ ἐγένετο	6	**ἐγένετο δέ**	4=10	
	‘‘ “ **καί**	7	" " **καί**	3=10	
Lu. 9:29	" " with noun as subj.	1	" " inf.	1= 2	
	Total	14		8=22 out of 38	
Act		0		2=2	2
		14		10=24	40

Page 1043, line 8. Mr. Scott gives this table for **ἐγένετο** with infinitive: Mt. 1, Mk. 2 (2:15, 23), Lu. 9 (6:1, 6, 6, 12; 16:22, 22; 3:21, 22, 22), Ac. 22 (4:5; 9:3, 32, 37, 43; 10:25; 11:26, 26, 26; 14:1, 1; 16:6; 19:1, 1; 21:1, 5; 22:6, 17, 17; 27: 44; 28:8, 17). **Ἐγένετο** with infinitive occurs 25 times, but 'governs' 34 infinitives. This raises the old difficulty of counting verb or construction. In this case, as it is a construction of **ἐγέν**-infin., the infinitive clearly should be counted.

Mk. 2:15 is the Only example of yiverac in this construction.

Page 1053. Meillet has a lucid article on "De Quelques Faits Grammaticaux" (*Revue des Etudes Grecques*, juillet, 1916, pp. 259-274). Page 264 he says: " L'histoire de l'infinitif grec est done celle d'un developpement entierement neuf, propre en grec, qui s'est fait avant l'epoque historique, suivi d'une elimination totale, dont les debuts remontent a la periode hellenistique."

Pages 1059, line 11, 1078, line 15. For **τοῦ** infinitive as subject add "Ac. 27 :1." Mr. Scott has this table for **τό** infinitive in N. T.:

Book	Subject		Object		Apposition		Total
	Present	Aorist	Present	Aorist	Present	Aor.	
Mk.	12:33 *bis*	9:10	..	10:40 =	..	..	4
Mt.	..	15:20	..	20:23 =	..	..	2
Ac.	..	..	..	25:11	..	..	1
Heb.	..	10:31	..	..	..	..	1
1 Th.	..	..	3:3	..	4:6 *bis*	..	3
1 Cor.	7:26; 11:6	11:6	14:39 *bis*	..	..	..	5
2 Cor.	9:1	7:11; 8:11	8:10	8:10, 11; 10:2	..	2:1	8
Ro.	7:18 *bis*	14:21 *bis*	13:8	..	4:13; 14:13	..	7
Ph.	1:21, 22, 24, 29 *bis*	1:21	2:6, 13 *bis*; 4:10	..	..	..	10
Total	12	9	9	6	4	1	41

If Mk. 10:40 and were classed as subject the difference would be increased.

Mr. Scott notes that there are 992 anarthrous object infinitives in N. T. (Votaw's b.), occurring in every book of the N. T., but most numerous in Luke, and Acts (179) more than the Gospels (156); in Paul f235 times, in John and Epp. 102. There are 109 finite verbs producing these infinitives (Hva- **μαι** has 212, **θέλω** 128, **μέλλω** 95, **ἄρχομαι**, 91, **βούλομαι** 137, **ζητέω** 33, **παρακαλέω** 29, **ὀφείλω** 23). For the tenses see Votaw's table, p. 49.

Pages 1060, line 15, 1094. R. V. takes Mt. 5:34 as aorist middle imperative **(μὴ ὄμοσαι)** instead of aorist active infinitive **μὴ ὀμόσαι**.

Page 1061, line 5. In Ro. 11:8 *bis* the quotation here differs significantly from the LXX text of Dt. 29:4.

Page 1061, line 16. Lu. 48 (Gospel 24, Ac. 24), Paul 17, Mt. 7, Mk. 0, rest 8=80. So Mr. Scott counts.

Pages 1061, 1089, 1094. Mr. Scott presents this table for "verbs of hindering":

Word	Anarthrous										Total
	Mt.	Lu.	Ac.	Heb.	1Th.	1 Cor.	2 Cor.	Gal.	Ro.	1 Tim.	
ἀπειλέω	..	..	4:17	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
ἐνκόπτω	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5:7	..	..	1
κωλύω	19:14	23:2	8:36; 16:6; 24:23	7:23	2:16	..	..	..	..	4:3	8
3	1	1	4	1	1	—	—	1	—	1	10
	Articular										
κατέχω	..	4:42	..	τοῦ μὴ	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
κρατέω	..	24:16	..		..	..	..	..	..	..	1
καταπαύω	..	..	14:18		..	..	..	..	..	..	1
ὑποστέλλω	..	..	20:20, 20, 27			..	..	..	..	..	3
ἐνκόπτω	..	..	..		..	..	..	..	15:22	τοῦ	1
ἐξαπορέω	..	..	..		..	..	1:8	..	..		1
κωλύω	..	..	10:47		..	14:39 τὸ	..	..	..		2
7	—	2	5	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	10

Votaw does not class Ac. 10:47 with "verbs of hindering," but with 'result,' and 1 Cor. 14:39 as an 'object' verb. See Votaw, p. 24.

Pages 1062-75. Mr. •Scott's table for articular infinitive in N. T., W. H. text, is shown on pages 1426-27.

Page 1067, note 2. Mr. Scott expands his data for Ta-infinitives thus: 3 presents and 4 aorists in Mt., 6 presents and 18 aorists in liuke; 3 presents in 1 Cor., 2 in 2 Cor., 1 aorist in Gal. (quotation), 7 presents and 2 aorists in Ro., one of each in Phil.

Page 1068, line 8. Mr. Scott thinks Lu. 5:7 surely "aim or purpose."

Page 1069. See Tb. P. 27, 1. 73 (B.C. 113) **ἄνευ τοῦ δοῦναι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν**.

Page 1069, line 2. Cf. p. 647, 41 and note 5. There are examples of **χάραν τοῦ** with infinitive in the papyri. See Tb. P. 38, 1. 17 (B.C. 113); Tb. 27, 1. 35 (B.C. 113); Tb. P. 6, 1. 37 (B.C. 140-39); T. P. 61 (a), 1. 47 (B.c. 118-7); Tb. P. 61 (b), 1. 44 (B.C. 118-7), ib., 1. 353.

ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN N. T., W. H. TEXT

Book	τό		εἰς τό		διὰ τό			μετὰ τὸ			πρός τό		τοῦ		διὰ τοῦ
	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Perf.	Pres.	Aor.	Perf.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.
Mk.	2	2	..	1	2	..	3	..	2 [1]	..	1	..	..	..	..
Mt.	..	2	..	5	2	1	..	..	1	..	..	5	3	4	..
Lu.	..	..	1	..	8	..	1	..	2	..	1	..	6	18	..
	2	4	1	6	12	1	4	—	6	—	2	5	9	22	—
Ac.	..	1	1	..	6	..	3	..	6	..	..	1	11	13	..
Jo.	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Epp.-Jo.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rev.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12:7	..
Jas.	..	..	2	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..
1 Pet.	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..
2 Pet.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ju.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
				Perf.											
Heb.	..	1	4	3 1	3	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	1	3	2:15
	—	2	8	6 1	11	—	3	—	7	1	—	1	12	20	1
1 Th.	3	..	2	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..
2 Th.	..	..	2	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..
1 Cor.	4	1	4	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	3	..	..
2 Cor.	2	6	2	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	2	..	..
Gal.	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..
Ro.	5	2	10	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	2	..
Ph.	9	1	2	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..
Phil.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Col.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
				Perf.											
Eph.	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..
1 Tim.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
2 Tim.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Tit.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total	23	10	23	26 1	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	13	4	—
	25	16	32	38 2	24	1	7	—	14	1	3	9	34	46	1
	41		72		32			15			12		80		

The "Prepositional Infinitive" = Votaw's k.

ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN N. T., W. H. TEXT (*Continued*)

ἐκ τοῦ	πρὸ τοῦ		ἀντὶ τοῦ		τῷ		ἐν τῷ		ἕνεκεν τοῦ		ἕως τοῦ		Total	Prepositional Infinitive	Book
Pres.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.	Pres.	Aor.			
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	15	11	Mk.
													1	1	[ ] xvi
..	..	1	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	27	18	Mt.
..	..	2	..	..	..	..	26	8	..	..	..	..	73	49	Lu.
—	—	3	—	—	—	—	31	8	—	—	—	—	116	79	
..	..	1	..	..	..	..	7	1	..	..	..	8:40	52	27	Ac.
..	1	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	4	Jo.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Epp.-Jo.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	Rev.
..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	6	Jas.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	2	1 Pet.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2 Pet.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Ju.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	2	..	..	..	..	23	18	Heb.
—	1	3	1	—	—	—	9	3	—	—	—	1	91	57	
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	13	10	1 Th.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8	8	2 Th.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	16	8	1 Cor.
8:11	..	..	..	..	..	2:13	..	..	..	7:12	..	..	19	8	2 Cor.
..	..	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	5	4	Gal.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	35	19	Ro.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16	4	Ph.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Phil.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Col.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	3	Eph.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1 Tim.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2 Tim.
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	Tit.
1	—	2	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	1	—	—	115	64	Total
1	1	8	1	—	—	1	43	12	—	1	—	1	322	200	
	9						55								

Present = 164; Aorist = 148; Perfect = 10. — Total = 322.

Page 1069, line 11. Mr. Scott gives exact figures for relation of prepositional infinitives to total articular infinitives: 0. T. 800 to 2107, Apocr. 161 to 349, N. T. 200 to 322, total 1161 to 2778.

Page 1070, line 9. The figures for Ev T4; and infinitive are: with pres. 43, aor. 12, perf. 0 in the N. T. (Scott).

Page 1070, line 10. Mr. Scott refers to Vulgate "postquam" as translation of **μετὰ τό** and infinitive as reason for taking the infinitive clause as "absolute." So Blass, p. 239, "an independent position." But the Greek idiom with the infinitive was not "absolute" and the principles of indirect discourse do apply. The acc. in Lu. 11:8; Ac. 18:3 is predicate adjective only. In Lu. 2:4; 19:11; Ac. 27:4 the ace. of general reference occurs for what would be subject with a finite verb.

Διὰ τό is not repeated with the second infinitive (Mk. 5:4; Lu. 19:11; Ac. 4:2). Mr. Scott notes that **διὰ τό** with aorist occurs only in Mt. 24:12 (passive). There are 8 other passives (pres. 4, perf. 4).

Page 1075, line 13 ab imo. Four of Matthew's 5 examples are peculiar to him and in 26:12 =Mark has a different construction. In Mk. 13:22 (=Mt. 24:24, p. 990) Matthew has 60-Te ("pure purpose"). Paul has 4 examples.

Page 1084, line 12 *ab imo*. Prof. Walter Petersen thinks that **γενέσθαι**, not **εἶναι**, was the original idiom, loosely changed to **εἶναι**.

Page 1088 (cf. 990). Mr. Scott adds this note: Votaw shows on p. 46 how his 211 anarthrous purpose infinitives (d) are distributed in N. T. These infinitives are the product of 71 verbs; **ἔρχομαι** (40) and its compounds (36) [**ἐξέρχομαι** 17], **ἀποστέλλω**, 18, **δίδωμι** 15, are the most frequent. I make 213 anarthrous infinitives: pres. 36, aor. 176, perf. 1 (Lu. 12:58 which Votaw has not counted, on p. 49). Matthew's 38 infinitives are all aorists, while Mark has 3 pres. and Luke 10. (It is odd that the passages with infinitive presents in Mark and Luke have no = in Matthew, or have not infinitive where the passages are =.)

Page 1106, line 7 *ab imo*. Add "Mt. 2:2" **ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεύς**.

Pages 1106, line 3, 1123. Mr. Scott thinks that **λέγοντος** in Mt. 13:35 is simply "when saying." He notes Mt. 1:22; 2:15, 17; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 21:4; 27:9.

Page 1108 (c). Cf. Mk. 7:30 **βεβλημένον ἐξεληλυθός**,

Page 1120, line 6, *ab imo*. Cf. Oxy. P. 935, 11. 20, 21 (iii/A.D.)
ἔφθανε γὰρ προβαστάξας.

Page 1126, line 9. Mr. Scott offers these tables:
Finite Verb followed by **λέγων** and **καὶ εἶπεν**:

Book	Narrative			Non-narrative, etc.	Total	Participle see next table	Grand Total
	λέγων	καὶ εἶπεν	Object				
Mk.	2	..	5	8	15	15	30
Mt.	5	..	3	2	10	45	55
Lu.	1	2	4	2	9	37	46
Ac.	1	..	13	..	14	6	20
Jo.	3	29	45	1	78	..	78
Rev.	1	..	..	..	1	..	1
Paul	..	..	..	1	1	..	1
Total	13	31	70	14	128	103	231

Ἀποκριθεὶς (-έντες) followed by **εἶπεν, ἔφη, λέγει, ἔλεγεν** and **ἐρεῖ**:

Book	εἶπεν	ἔφη	λέγει	ἔλεγεν	ἐρεῖ	Total
Mk.	5	..	8	2	..	15
Mt.	43	1	..	2	1	45
Lu.	29	2	3	2	1	37
Ac.	6	..	..	..	..	6
Total	83	3	11	4	2	103

Page 1142. Cf. Gildersleeve on Particles in Brief Mention (Am. J. of Pk, July and Oct., 1916).

Page 1163, line 21. **Οὐ** belongs to implied **θέλω** in Mt. 9:13.

Page 1166, line 4. Note **οὐχ ὅτι** in Phil. 3:12; 4:11, 17 to correct misunderstanding and not in classic sense of "not only." This is a, distinctive N. T. formula (cf. Jo. 6:45; 7:22; 2 Cor. 1:24; 3:5). When not followed by second clause in classic Greek the meaning is "although."

Page 1169, line 5 (cf. 1011). In Jo. 15:22, 24; 18:30; Ac. 26:32 **εἰ μή** is in condition of second class. Mk. 6:5 can be regarded as simply "except" ("if not" in origin, of course).

Page 1174 (b). Cf. **οὐ μή** construction with aorist indicative in Oxy. P. 1483, 11. 9-11 (iii/iv A.D.) **καὶ ἐξωδίασας τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὧν οὐδὲ ἷς μὴ παρεδέξατο τιμήν**.

Page 1183 f. Gildersleeve is brilliant, as usual, in his comment on **δέ, γέ, ἄρα** (*Am. J. of Ph.*, July, 1916): "For generations δέ has been translated with distressing uniformity by 'but'; and head-master of Grayfriars school apostrophizes Pendennis thus:

'Miserable trifler! A boy who construes δέ and instead of δέ but, at sixteen years of age is guilty not merely of folly and ignorance and dulness inconceivable but of crime, deadly crime, of filial ingratitude which I tremble to contemplate.'

If the doctor had been spared to read Sir John Sandy's translation of Pindar in which the 'but' translation is dodged at every turn, one 'trembles to contemplate' the consequences."

Of γέ Gildersleeve says that "emphasis is the refuge of poverty" and gives it up. "As for ἄρα, science tells us that it is short for ἀραρότως. The full translation would be 'accordingly,' but what after it is reduced to the *canina littera* ῾ρ? There is an ἄρα of accord, there is an ἄρα of discord, the familiar ἄρα of surprise."

Page 1177 (i). There is also Mt. 20:15 **οὐκ . . . ; ἢ . . .**;

Page 1187, line 15. For **ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα** see also Jo. 13:18; 15:25.

Page 1187, line 8 *ab imo*. After Phil. 1:18 add "Ac. 20:23."

Page 1234. Add: Infinitive depending on infinitive, 1040, 1047, 1049, 1085.

Page 1378. Add to "Page 560, line 6," this: Cf. also Mt. 14:14 **σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς**----Mk. 6:34 **ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς** and Mk. 9:22 **ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς** and Lu. 7:13 **ἐπ᾽ αὐτῇ**. With this verb Mark has accusative only, Luke dative (loc.?) only, Matthew accusative and dative. See also **ἐξουσία ἐπί** with genitive "i,d. accusative (Rev. 2:26; 16:9).

Jesus noticed small points of language (**ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κερέα** Mt. 5:18), though we have no documents from his pen. The preacher can be accurate in details and have all the more power in his speech. **Τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωή ἐστιν**, (Jo. 6:63). All the people still hang on the words of Jesus, listening (**ἐξεκρέμετο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων**) Lu. 19:48)

for hope and guidance in a world of disorder and despair. The world will find the way out if it follows the leadership of Jesus. I could not close these three years of further toil on this grammar without this tribute, from my heart to the Master, who makes all work worth while and who challenges us all to share his own work while it is still day, before the night comes when no one can go on with his work (p-yeq-EcrOat Jo. 9:4).[1]

[1] The *Exp. Times* for April, 1919, has the last article from the late Prof. Robert Law, of Knox allege, Toronto, on "Note on the Imperfect of Obligation, etc., in the New Testament." I find myself in hearty agreement with his explanation of an antecedent obligation a *debitum*, not always lived up to. It is already set forth in this volume, pp. 886-7, 919-21,1014.

INDEX TO ADDENDA TO SECOND AND

THIRD EDITIONS

INDEX OF SUBJECTS IN THE ADDENDA
B. 0. HERRING

References to pages.

A

א: see Sinaiticus.
Ablative: c. χρείαν ἔχω 1392, 1397.
Absolute genitive: 139 ; c. οὗτος, 1396.
Accent: of the vocati , 1387.
Accusative: change to nom., 1378; κατά and acc., 1379; ὅ in 1 Cor. 15:10, 1379; nom. in apposition, 1390; c. προσκυνέω, 1391; c. infinitive after ποιεῖν, 13 1; of a person or thing, 1392; ace and inf. after verbs, 1422; as predicate adjective, 1428; general reference, 1428.
Action: iterative, 1364 *bis*.
Active voice: original suffix in opt., 1378; periphrastic perfects, 1389, 1406; in LXX, 1398; pluperfects, 1406; aorist inf., 1424.
Adjuncts: prepositional, 1398.
Adverb: καὶ πρός as adv., 1393; c. οὗτος joined, 1396; πρὶν ἤ in LXX, 1412.
Adversative use of καί: 1383.
Anaphoric use of article: 1397.
Aorist: compared with imperfect, 1380; indicatives in John, 1380; participles, 1381; first and second identical, 1381; with ὅς ἐάν, 1387; imperfect c. μή, 130; imperatives and subjunctives in N. T., 1398 f.; table of subjunctives c. οὐ μή, opp. 1404; optative, 1405; inf. c. preposition, 1405; subj. c. ἐάν, 1420; subj. c. εἴ πως, 1421; imperative in papyri, 1421; middle imperative, 1424; active inf., 1424; infinitives in Matt., 1428; indicative c. οὐ μή, 1430.
Apocalypse: 1378.
Apodosis: indicative and optative, a table, 1410; statistical tables, 1416 ff.; future, 1420.
Apostolic Fathers: 1382.
Apposition: acc. and nom., 1390; to pronoun in verb, 1397.
Article: 1379; c. demonstrative, 1396; absence in papyri, 1397; anaphoric use, 1397; c. Ἰησοῦς, 1397; c. proper names, 1398.
Articular infinitive: 1406; table of, 1426 f.; relation to prepositional infinitives, 1428.
Associative instrumental: 1392.
Asyndeton: 1378.
Attic idiom: 1398.
Augment: of an infinitive, 1389.

B

B: see Vaticanus.
Balancing of words: 1378.

C

Case: 1389; oblique, 1390, 1392; after σπλαγχνίζομαι, 1430.
Clauses: subordinate, 1382; parallel, 1397; subject, 1421; object, 1422; infinitive, 1428.
Collective noun: 1390.
Composition: ἀπό in, 1379.
Compounds: of μή and οὐ in Apostolic Fathers, 1382; protases and apodoses, 1420.
Conditions: first and third class, 1382; conditional ἐάν, 1410; statistical tables, 1416 ff.; first class, 1420; second class, 1429.
Conjunctions: ἕως, 1393, 1412; ἄχρι(ς), a table, 1412.
Construction: οὐ μή, a table, opp. 1404, 1430; ἄν in N. T., 1410; ὥστε, 1414;

μήποτε; 1415; ἀκούω,1422; ἐγέτετο, 1422 f."
Contrast: c. ἀλλὰ -- δέ, 1383.

D
Dative: ethical, 1378, 1379; c. προσ-κυνέω, 1391; discussed, 1392.
Declarative διότι: 1381.
Demonstratives: tables, 1394 f.; 65, 1396; dem. and article, 1396.
Direct Questions: 1396.
Direction: in dative case, 1392.
Distributive use of ἀνά and κατά: 1379.
Dual: original suffix in opt., 1378.
Durative present: 1411.

E
Ellipsis; of the verb, 1379; ellipses cited, 1411.
Enoch: book of, 1394.
Epictetus: 1378, 1379 *bis*, 1381, 1407.
Ethical dative: 1378.

F
Finite verb: a table, 1429.
Future: linear, 1381; indicative, 1381, 1411, 1413; futurity in subj. and opt., 1407 *bis*; av c. subj., 1409; apodoses, 1420.

G
Genitive: 1387; absolutes, 1392; c. οὗτος, 1396, 1397.
Gospel of John: 1380.
Grammar: grammatical forms of W, 1377; dative not a grammatical case, 1392; readers of, 1398.

H
Hendiadys: 1383.
Hiatus: 1382.
History of subj. and opt.: 1381.
Hittite language: 1385.

I
Imperative: 1381 *bis*; form γνῶ, 1387; perfect imperatives in N. T., 1389; aor. imp. c. p15, 1390; aor. and pres. imp. in N. T., 1398; table of, 1409; aor. imp. in Matt., 1411; in papyri, 1421; aor. middle, 1424.
Imperfect: compared with aorist, 1380; opt., 1405; periphrastic, 1406; in indirect discourse, 1421.
Indefinite: aorist, 1381; relatives, 1411.
Independent sentences: c. futuristic subj., 1407; τί c. aorist subj., 1407.
Indicative: 1381 *bis*; c. ὅς ἐάν, 1387; perfect, 1406; future, 1411, 1413; c. indefinite relatives, 1411; c. ὅτε, 1411; c. ὅταν, 1412; c. ἐάν, 1420; aor. c. οὐ μή, 1430.
Indirect discourse: 1421 *bis*; principies of, 1428.
Indirect Questions: 1396; change of mode, 1409.
Indo-European: family of languages, 1385; stem-suffixes, 1386.
Infinitive: 1382; c. μὴ γένοιτο, 1382; in Papyrus de Magdola, 1382; c. ἐν τῷ, 1385, 1428; c. augment, 1389; as subject, 1389; acc. and inf., 1391, 1422; c. τοῦ, 1392, 1415, 1424 f.; aorist c. prep., 1405; articular, 1406 *bis*, 1426 f.; present c. prep., 1406; perfect, 1406 f.; inf., and διὰ τό, 1411; in LXX, 1412; purpose, 1414, 1428; after ἐγένετο, 1423; aor. act., 1424; prepositional and articular related, 1428, 1430.
Inscriptions: in Phrygia, 1378.
Instrumental case: 1392 *bis*.
Interchange of ὡς and ὅτι: 1382, 1389.
Iterative action: 1280

J
Judas Iscariot: primacy of, 1394.

L
Language: study of, 1377; small points of, 1430.
Linear action: 1380; future, 1381.
Locative case: 1392.

M
Margin: marginal readings for οὐ μή, 1405.
Middle voice: optative, 1378; redundant, 1380; in Phrygia, 1380; in LXX, 1398; aor. imp., 1424.

Mode: change of, 1 in indirect discourse, 1409; in conditionalsentences, a table, 1416 ff.

N

Names: name-element, 1377; c. article, 1398.
Negatives: c. participle, 1379 bis; preceding εἰ μή, 1420.
New Testament: idioms, 1379; perf. subj., 1387; anarthrous phrases, 1398; pres. and or. imperatives, 1398; articular in ., 1406; imperatives, 1409; constructions c. ἄν, 1410; ἵνα μή, 1413; data for ὅπως, 1413.
Nominative: changed from acc., 1378, 1387; of time, 1390.
Noun: definition, 1378.

O

Object: clauses, without ὅτι, 1422; verb, 1425.
Obligation: verbs of, 1431.
Oblique case : 1390 bis
Optative: suf. for middle, 1378; c. subj., 1381; hist., 1381; aor. and imp., 1405; futurity, 1407; table, 1408; past prospective, 1409; without ἄν, 1409.
Origin: of οὐ μή c. subj., 1381; of Indo-European stem-suffixes, 1386.

P

Papyri: see List of Quotations.
Parallels: 1379; clauses, 1397.
Participle: aor. and perf., 1381; c. negatives, 1382 bis; bunched, 1382; "confidential participle," 1382; predicate, 1389; c. οὕτως δέ, 1415.
Partitive use of ἐκ: 1379.
Passive: 1392; pluperfects, 1406; perf. subjunctives, 1406, 1428.
Past tense: compared with aor. find., 1380; subj., 1409
Paul: style in preaching, 1386; use of μή and aor. imp., 1390; pres. and aor. imp., 1398; pres. subj., 1403; aor. and impf. opt., 1405.
Perfect: participles, 1381; subjunctives, 1388; imperatives and subjunctives, 1389; periphrastic, 1389 *bis*; subjunctives in N. T., 1398, 1406; indicatives, 1406; infinitives, 1406 f.; subj. c. ἐάν, 1420.
Periphrastic: number of forms, 1388; perfect, 1389 bis; impf., 1406.
Phrases: prepositional, 1398 bis.
Phrygia: inscriptions in, 1378, 1380.
Plato: teaching of 1380 1381.
Pluperfects: number in N. T., 1406.
Position of arms: 1397.
Positive: τερισσός in cited, 1387.
Preaching: style of Paul, 1386.
Predicate: participle, 1389; adj.,1428.
Prepositions: μέσον and ἐχόμενα, 1379; not repeated, 1392; ἕως, 1393, 1412; prepositional adjuncts, 1398; phrases, 1398; c. present infinitive, 1406; in LXX, 1412; prepositional infinitive, 1426 ff.; δέ, γέ, and ἄρα, 1430.
Present imperatives: number in N. T., 1398.
Present infinitive: c. prepositions, 1406.
Present perfect: periphrastic form, 1389.
Present subjunctive: number in T., 1398; tables, 1402 f.; c. τί in independent sentences, 1409; c. ἐάν, 1420.
Prohibitions: 1381 bis.
Protasis: c. relative or conjunction, 1410; in statistical tables, 1416 ff.
Punctiliar action: 1380.

R

Recitative ὅτι: 1421 bis, 1422.
Redundant middle: 1380.
Relative pronoun: 1390, 1396.
Repetition: of ἔχει, 1378; of ἵνα, 1413, of διὰ τό, 1428.

S

Scepticism: of Blass, re ἔδωσα, 1387.
Sentence: καθώς at beginning of, 1382; independent, 1407 bis.
Septuagint: cited, 1382, 1390 f., 1393, 1397, 1412, 1424.

Sinaiticus codex: 1378, 1394.
Speakers: in Gospels, 1405.
Spelling: in W, 1377.
Statistics: on pluperfects, 1406; further, see Tables.
Subject: infinitive, 1389, 1424; in Mk. 13:19, 1390 f.; clause, 1421.
Subjective meaning of 1.1.71: 1382.
Subjunctive: theory of, 1381; c. **οὐ μή**, 1381; history, 1381; table on perf. subj., 1388, 1389, 1406; statistics, 1398 ff.; tenses, 1404; futurity, 1407; present subj. c. **τί** in independent sentences, 1409; **ὅπου** c. subj., 1411; **ὅταν** c. subj., 1411 f.; in LXX, 1412; **ἐάν** and subj., 1418 f., 1420; aor. c. **εἴ πως**, 1421.
Subordinate clauses: 1382.
Substitutionary use of **ἀντί**: 1393.
Suffixes: for middle optative, 1378.
Summary: of subj. tenses, 1404.
Superlative: in **—τατος**, 1379.
Syncretism: 1386; of dat. forms,1392.
Synoptics: uses of **ἐκεῖνος**, 1396; **τί**, in ind. aor. subj. sentences, 1407.
Syntax: 1378, 1389; statistical knowledge of, 1398.

T

Tables: **οὖν** in Synoptics, 1385; **ἄν** and **ἐάν**, 1386; uses of perf. subj., 1388; verbs of speaking, 1393; demonstratives, 1394 f.; uses of **ἐκεῖνος**, 1396; aor. subj., 1398 ff.; pres. subj., 1402 f.; aor. subj. in **οὐ μή** constructions opp. 1404; subj. tenses, 1404; speakers in Gospels, 1405; perf. inf., 1407; opt. in N. T., 1408; imperatives, 1409; **ἄν** constructions, 1410; **ὅπου** c. subj., 1411; **ὅταν** c. subj., 1412; **ἄχρι(ς)** as conj., 1412; **ὅπως**, 1413; **ὥστε** 1414; **μήποτε**, 1415; conditional sentences, 1416 ff.; **ἐάν** c. perf. subj., 1420; c. indicative, 1421; **ἀκούω**, 1422; **ἐγένετο**, 1423; **τό** infinitive, 1424; verbs of hindering, 1425; finite verb,1429.
Teaching of Plato: 1380.
Tense: change of, 1398; subjunctive, a summary, 1404; in conditional sentences, a table, 1416 ff.
Theory: of subjunctive, 1381; of determined futurity, 1407.
Time: nominative of, 1390 f.

U

Uses: of **τε καί**, 1382; of **ἀλλά-δέ,** 1383.

V

Vaticanus codex: cited, 1378.
Vellum: leaf of Gen. 2 and 3, 1388.
Verb: definition, 1378; of speaking, 1393; finite, 1424; hindering, 1425.
Verbs of obligation: 1431.
Vernacular: 1397.
Vocative: accent, 1387.
Voice: middle, 1380; passive, 1392; middle and active in LXX, 1398.
Vulgate: translation of, 1389, 1428.

W

Washington MS.: 1377 f.
Wishes: 1382; in opt., 1407.
Words: number in Matt., Lu., Acts, 1385; of Jesus, 1430.

Z

Zeugma: 1383.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS IN THE ADDENDA

R. B. JONES

References to pages.

A

ἀκούω: table of use, and c. ὅτι, 1422.
ἀλλά: c.—δέ, 1383; ἵνα . . . ἀλλά, 1413; c. ἵνα, 1430.
ἄλλος (οι)--δέ: table of use, 1394 f.
ἄν: in rel. clause, 1381; spelling, 1386; tables c. subj., 1400, 1402; table c. opt., 1408; in indir. quest., 1409; tables of constr., 1410 f.
ἀνά: distributive, 1379.
ἀντί: case of, 1393; (table c. anart. inf., 1427.
ἀνατολῆς: form, 1390.
ἀπειλέω: c. anart. inf., 1425.
ἀπό: in composition, 1379.
ἀποκρίνομαι: form, 1388; c. ὅτι, 1422; table c. verbs of saying, 1429.
ἀποστέλλω: c. anart. inf., 1428.
ἄρα: meaning, 1430.
ἄρχομαι: c. anart. inf. 1424.
αὐτός, ή: without art., and in oblique cases, 1379; c. prop. noun, 1380; case, 1392.
ἄφες: table c. subj., 1399.
ἀφίδω: spelling, 1386.
ἄχρι(ς): tables of use, 1401, 1412.

B

βάλλω: predicate part 1429.
βοάω: c. on 1422.
βούλομαι: table c. subj., 1399; c. anart. inf. 1424.

Γ

γέ meaning, 1430.
γενεσίοις: case of, 1392,
γίνομαι: c. inf., 1389; γένοιτο, 1405; ἐγέντο, tables of use, 1422 f.; γενέσθαι, 1428.
γινώσκω: form, 1387; c. ὅτι, 1422.
γύναι: case of, 1387.

Δ

δέ: ἵνα . . . δέ, 1413; meaning, 1430.
δεῖ: subj. inf., 1389.
δεῖνα: indef. pronoun, 1387.
δεῦρο: table, 1399; c. subj., 1407.
δεῦτε: in conditions, 1421.
διά: c. art. (table), and anart. inf., 1405 ff., 1426, 1428; c. τί, 1421.
δίδωμι: form, 1388; c. inf., 1428.
δίκαιε: case of, 1391.
διότι: for ὅτι, 1381 f.
δύναμαι: c. anart. inf., 1424.

E

ἐάν: table, for ἄν, 1386; tables c. 1388, 1400, 1402 f., 1418-20; c. δέ μή, 1389 f.; table c. πέρ, 1400; table c. ind., 1421.
ἑαυτόν: replaced by σεαυτόν, 1394.
ἐγκαταλείπω: reading, 1404.
ἔδωσα: form 1387.
ἐθέλωμι: ending, 1378.
εἰ: c. δὲ μή, 1389 f.; c. μή, 1399, 1402, 1420, 1429; table c. opt., 1408; tables c. ind., 1415 ff.; c. οὐ, 1420; c. τίς and πως, 1400, 1421.
εἴδω: constr., 1378; perf. subj., 1388, 1406.
εἰμί: subj. inf., 1389; constr., 1390 f.; in indir. disc., 1421, 1428.
εἰς: c. ἐν, 1378 f.; like dat., 1379; for ἐπί and ὑπέρ, 1393; c. inf., 1405 f.; tables c. art. inf., 1407, 1426.
ἑῖς: for πρῶτος, 1394.
εἰσέλθοιτο: voice of, 1380.
εἴτε: constr., 1390; tables c. subj., 1402 f.
ἐκ: partitive, 1379; table c. art. inf., 1427.
ἐκεῖνος: table as pronoun, 1396; c. 1397.

ἐκτός: tables c. εἰ μή, 1402 f.
Ἐλαιών: case of, 1387.
ἐν: c. expressions of time, 1379; c. art. inf., 1385, 1427; without art., 1398; c. inf., 1405 f.; table c. τῷ and ἐγένετο, 1423.
ἕνεκεν: c. inf., 1405 f.; table c. art. inf., 1427.
ἐνκόπτω: c. anart. inf., 1425.
ἐξαπορέω: c. gen., 1392.
ἐξαπορέω: c. art. inf., 1425.
ἐξουσία: c. ἐπί, 1430.
tables in dep. sent., 1401 f.
ἐπάν: repeated, 1362; c. loc., 1393; replaced by εἰς, 1393; constr., 1430.
Ἑρμᾶς: spelling, 1377.
ἔρχομαι: c. anart. inf., 1428.
-ες: ending, 1388.
ἐσχάτως: c. ἔχω, 1387.
ἕτερος: table c. δέ, 1394 f.
ἔτι: c. τε καί, 1382.
εὐαγγελίζεσθαι: constr., 1415.
εὐκοπώτερον: subj. inf., 1389.
ἐχόμενα: prep., 1379.
ἔχω: constr., 1378, 1389; meaning, 1380.
ἕως: prep., 1393, 1412; c. πότε, 1394; tables c. ἄν, οὗ, and ὅτου, 1401; c. inf., 1405 f.; c. art. inf., 1427.

Z

ζηλόω: hendiadys, 1383.
ζηλέω: c. anart. inf., 1424.

H

ἤ: in comparison, 1394.
ἦδειν: form, 1406.
ἥκω: form, 1389.
ἡμέρα: case of, 1390.
ἡμέρα: form, 1406.
ηtables c. tiv and Mv, 1401 ff.
ljEct: form, 1388 f.
fic•tv: meaning, 1421.

Θ

θέλεις: table in interrog. sent., 1399.
θέλω: constr., 1415; c. anart. inf., 1424.
θερμαινόμενος: form, 1406.
Θωμᾶ: case of, 1387.

I

-ι- suffix, 1378.
ἰβίων: case of 1387.
ἴδε: meaning , 1396.
c. art., 1380.
Ἰησοῦς: c. art., 1397.
ἵνα: in wishes, 1382; tables c. subj., 1388, 1400, 1402 f., 1413; c. fut. ind., 1413.
-ισκος, -ίσκη: suffix, 1377.
ἵστημι: form, 1406.
ἵστω: perf. impv. , 1389.
ἰσχύϊ: spelling, 1386.

K

καθώς: beginning sent., 1382.
καί: adv., 1383; crasis, 1386; c. 53, 1396; c. διαλογίξομαι, 1406; C. ὅς, 1429.
καλόν: c. ἔστιν, 1389; c. ἤ in comparison, 1394.
κατά: c. acc., 1379; in composition, and c. gen., 1393; anart. prep. phrase, 1398.
κατέχω: c. art. inf., 1425.
κατέχω: c. art. inf., 1425.
κατοικῆσαι: meaning, 1382.
κρατέω: c. gen., 1391; c. art. inf., 1425.
κωλύω: c. anart. inf., 1425.

Λ

λαός: case of, 1390 f.
λέγω: c. ὅτι, 1422; meaning, 1428; table of λέγων c. finite verb, 1429.
λύοιμι: ending, 1378.

M

μέλλω: c. anart. inf., 1424.
μέν: postpositive in fifth and sixth place, 1378; in fourth place, 1390. c. inf., 1405 f.; tables c. art. inf., 1407, 1426 ff.
μέσον: as prep., 1379.
μέχρις: table in dep. sent., 1401.
μή: c. πᾶς, 1380; after οὐ, 1381; c. part., 1382; c_γένοιτο and inf., 1382, 1405; table c. ποτε, 1388, 1390, 1400, 1402, 1408, 1415; table c. τίς, 1399; tables c. subj., 1399 f.,

1402; table c. **που**, 1400; table c. **πως**, 1400, 1402 f.; c. **ὅμοσαι**, 1424.

N

νομίζω: c. Orc, 1422.
and inf., 1391; constr., 1409.

O

ὁ, ἡ, τό: c. **ἱκανόν** and inf., 1385; subj. inf., 1389; tables c. **μέν** and **δέ,** 1394 f.; as rel. and dean. 1396 f.; c. **πᾶς**, 1397; not repeated, 1398; tables c. art. inf., 1415, 1425 ff.; tables c. inf., 1424, 14 6.
οἶδα: c. **ὅτι**, 1422.
ὁμοιόω: constr., 1392.
ὀμόσαι: form, 1424.
ὅπως: tables c. **(ἐάν)** subj., 1399 f., 1402, 1411.
ὅπως: tables c. subj., 1400, 1402 f.; table of use, 1413.
ὅς: **ὅ**, 1379; c. **ἐάν**, 1387; tables c. subj., 1400, 1402 f.; **οὗ ἄν**, 1403; c. **ἄν** and fut. ind., 1411.
ὁσάκις: tables c. **ἄν** and **ἐάν**, 1401 ff.
-οσαν: ending, 1388.
ὅσος: tables c. **ἄν**, 1400, 1402.
ὅστις: tables c. subj., 1400, 1402 f.
ὅταν: tables c. subj., 1401 ff., 1411 f.
ὅτε: c. ind., 1411.
ὅτι: c. **ᾧ**, 1379; in dir. quest., 1396; recitative, 1421 f.
οὐ: after **πᾶς**, 1379 f.; tables c. p.47, 1381, 1399; c. compounds, 1382; in-set facing 1404, 1405, 1430; constr., 1415, 1429; c. **ὅτι,** 1429; **οὐκ . . . ἤ** 1430.
οὖν: postpositive in fourth place, 1378; table of use 1385.
οὐχί: use, 1406.
οὗτος: meaning, 1396;
ὀφιέλω: c. anart. inf., 1424.
ὄχλος: form, 1390; c. **ἱκανός** and **πολύς**, 1397.

Π

παιδίσκη: meaning, 1377.
παρά: c. art. inf., 1382.
παρακαλέω: c. anart. inf., 1424.
πᾶς: c. **οὐ** and **μή**, 1380; case of **πάντες**, **περί**: use, 1379.
περισσός: positive, 1387.
πηλίκος: for **ἡλίκος**, 1382.
πιστεύω: c. **ὅτι**, 1422.
πλῆθος: use, 1390.
ποιέω: tense of **ποιεῖς**, 1381; c. acc. and inf., 1391; constr., 1409
ποῖος: table c. subj., 1400.
πολλάς: case of, 1391.
ποταπος: table c. opt., 1408.
πότε: table c. subj., 1401.
ποῦ: meaning, 1382; tables c. subj., 1399, 1402.
πρίν: table c. **ἄν** 1401; table c. **ἤ** 1408; use, 1412.
πρό: c. inf., 1405 f.; table c. art. inf., 1427.
πρός: c. **καί** as adv., 1393; table c. **αὐτόν** and verbs of speaking, 1393; c. inf., 1405 f.; table c. art. inf., 1426.
προσκυνέω: constr., 1391.
πρῶτος: replaced by **εἷς**, 1394.
πῶς: tables c. subj., 1399 f.

Σ

σεαυτόν: for **ἑαυτόν**, 1394.
σπλαγχνίζομαι: c. 1430.
στοιχήσουσιν: linear fut., 1381.

T

-τατος: superlative ending 1379.
τάχα: c. subj., 1407.
τε: c. **καί** 1382.
τέσσαρες: case of, 1378.
τεχθείς: art. part. 1428.
τί: meaning, 1396; tables c. subj., 1399 f., 1402 f.; use, 1407 ff.
τίς: tables c. **τί** 1408; c. **ἄν** **1408**,
τοι: meaning, 1382.
τοίνυν: meaning, 1382.
τόπος: substantive, 1394.
τυφλέ: case of, 1391.
τυχόν: adv. acc., 1378.

Υ

ὑμῖν: case of, 1378.
ὑμῶν: case of, 1392

ὑπέρ: for **εἰς,** 1393.
ὑποστέλλω: c. art. inf., 1425.

Φ

φθάνω: meaning, 1429.
φοβέω: constr., 1378.
φονεύω: hendiadys, 1383.
φυλάσσομαι: voice of, 1398.
φωνή: case of, 1378; zeugma, 1383.

X

χάριν: c. art. inf., 1425.
χρεία: c. **ἔχω,** 1392.
χρόνος: substantive, 1394.

Ω

ὡς: for **ὅτι**, 1382; tables c. (**ἄν**) subj., 1400-3.
ὥστε: table of constr., 1414 f., 1428.

INDEX OF QUOTATIONS IN THE ADDENDA
(a) NEW TESTAMENT
KYLE M. YATES

Figures at end of lines refer to pages.

Matthew			
1:22	1428	12:17	1428
2:2	1428	12:31	1379
2:10	1388	12:32,	Inset, 1405
2:15	1428	12:35	1397
2:17	1428	12:45	1396
3:3	1428	13:14	Inset
3:14	1392	13:15	1415
4:14	1428	13:24	1392
5:18	Inset, 1430	13:25	1385
5:20	Inset	13:28	1399
5:23	1393, 1420	13:35	1428
5:24	1388	14:6	1392
5:25	1415	14:14	1430
5:26	Inset	15:5	Inset
5:32	1391	15:20	1424
5:34	1424	15:33	1414
5:47	1387	16:14	1394
6:3	1405	16:19	1387
6.4	1402, 1413	16:22	Inset, 1405
6:5	1420	16:28	Inset
6:8	1392	17:1	1398
7:6	1415	17:17	1394
7:11	1417	18:3	Inset
7:12	1402	18:9	1394
8:2	1418	18:13	1423
8:17	1428	18:15	1419
8:19	1411	18:17	1419
9:6	1388	18:19	1421
9:10	1423	19:7	1416
9:11	1396	19:14	1425
9:13	1429	20:15	1430
9:16	1378	20:23	1424
9:38	1413	21:4	1428
10:1	1414	21:19	Inset
10:2	1397	21:28	1411
10:23	Inset	22:5	1395
10:25	1417	22:28	1378
10:42	Inset, 1405	23:26	1391
11:7	1396	23:28	1378
12:7	1417	23:33	1399
12:14	1413	23:39	Inset
		24:2	Inset

Matt.
24:7 1405
24:12 1428
24:18 1405
24:21 Inset
24:24 1428
24:28 1411
24:32 1401
24:34 Inset
24:35 Inset
24:38 1406, 1412
24:43 1417
24:49 1420
25:9 Inset
26:7 1399
26:10 1393
26:12 1428
26:13 1411
26:24 1417
26:29 Inset
26:31-34 1397
26:33 1417
26:35 Inset, 1405
26:54 1399
26:57 1395
26:66 1392
26:67 1395
27:1 1414
27:4 1428
27:12 1388
27:48 1392
27:49 1399
27:55 1406
27:61 1406
28:9 1391
28:17 1395

Mark
1:9 1423
1:10 1393
1:17 1391
1:19 1379
1:32 1406
1:34 1421
1:40 1418
2:4 1393
2:15 1423
2:16 1396, 1421
2:21 1392
2:23 1423
2:24 1396
2:25 1392
2:32 1406
3:1 1389
3:6 1413
3:8 1390
3:11 1385
3:16 1413
3:26 1417
4:4 1395, 1423
4:12 1413, 1415
4:26 1402
4:30 1392
4:36 1399
4:38 1422
5:4 1407, 1428
5:22 1383
5:23 1387
5:24 1390
6:4 1420
6:5 1429
6:8 1402
6:10 1411
6:21 1392
6:22 1392
6.34 1430
6:37 1399
6:56 1385
7:30 1429
7:37 1391
8:4 1422
8:17 1389
8:35 1385
8:37 1399
9:1 Inset
9:2 1398
9:7 1383
9:10 1424
9:18 1411
9:22 1430
9:35 1416
9:38 1396
9:41 Inset
9:42 1416, 1417
9:45 1418
9:47 1418
10:15 Inset
10:40 1424
10:46 1397
11:25 1393
12:14 1399
12:15 1395
12:29 1422
12:33 1394, 1424
13:2 Inset
13:15 1405
13:16 1405
13:19 1390, 1391, Inset
13:20 1417
13:21 1419
13:22 1428
13:28 1401
13:30 Inset

Mark
13:31 Inset, 1405
14:2 1415
14:5 1406
14:9 1407, 1411
14:10 1394
14:12 1399
14:14 1399, 1411
14:21 1417
14:25 Inset
14:29 1417
14:31 Inset, 1405, 1418
14:61 1388
14:64 1392
15:9 1399
15:15 1385
15:36 1399
16:9 1406
16:11 1422
16:18 1405, 1419

Luke
1:8 1423
1:15 Inset, 1405
1:20 1412
1:23 1423
1:29 1408, 1409
1:38 1408
1:41 1423
1:59 1423
1:62 1408
2:1 1423
2:4 1428
2:6 1423
2:13 1390
2:15 1423
2:35 1413
2:46 1423
3:15 1408, 1409, 1415
3:21 1423
3:26 bis, 28 1413
4:11 1415
4:22 1406
4:29 1414
4:41 1421
4:42 1425
5:7 1425
5:11 1423
5:12 1418, 1423
5:16 1406
5:17 1379, 1423, 1425
5:25 1393
5:34 1391
5:36 1378
6:1 1423
6:6 1423
6:11 1408
6:12 1423
6:20 1393
6:33 1418
6:37 Inset
6:42 1399
6:47 1398
6:48 1407
7:2 1083
7:4 1399
7:11 1423
7:12 1397
7:13 1430
7:31 1392
7:43 1379
8:1 1423
8:9 1408
8:17 bis Inset
8:22 1379, 1423
9:3 1409
9:8 1392
9:10 1423
9:13 1399
9:18 1423
9:27 Inset
9:28 1398, 1423
9:31 1423
9:33 1423
9:37 1423
9:46 1408
9:51 1423
9:52 1414
9:54 1399
9:57 1411
10:2 1413
10:4 1409
10:8 1418
10:10 1418
10:13 1417
10:14 1409
10:19 Inset, 1405
10:40 1422
11:1 1423
11:5 1399
11:7 1399
11:8 1417, 1428
11:13 1417
11:14 1423
11:20 1416
11:27 1423
11:36 1397
12:6 1406
12:14 1393
12:15 1385
12:39 1417
12:42 1393
12:44 1393

Luke

12:58 1400, 1415, 1428
12:59 Inset
13:35 Inset
14:1 1423
14:8 1388, 1415
14:9 1415
14:12 1409
14:18, 19 1389
14:26 1382, 1420
15:26 1408
16:22 1423
16:25 1379
16:31 1382
17:2 1417
17:3 1419
17:6 1416
17:11 1423
17:14 1423
17:27 1412
17:28 1412
17:31 1405
17:37 1411
17:57 1411, 1412
18:2 1406
18:4 1398
18:5 1398
18:7 Inset
18:13 1423
18:17 Inset
18:26 1398
18:30 Inset
18:35 1423
18:36 1408
19:3 1398
19:11 1428
19:15 1423
19:19 1398
19:20 1389
19:22 1423
19:35 1392
19:37 1390
19:40 1421
19:42 1417
19:48 1430
20:1 1379, 1423
20:6 1390
20:7 1422
20:16 1408
20:26 1414
20:28 1418, 1420
21:18 Inset
21:24 1412
21:28 1396
21:32 Inset
21:33 Inset
22:9 1399
22:11 1399, 1411
22:18 Inset
22:22 1390
22:23 1408
22:26 Inset
22:67 Inset
22:68 Inset, 1405
23:1 1390
23:2 1425
23:31 1416
24:4 1423
24:15 1423
24:16 1425
24:24 1413,1414
24:30 1423
24:51 1423
24:53 1406

John

1:16 1397
1:25 1420
2:25 1392, 1421
3:12 1420
3:16 1413, 1414
3:17 1400
3:27 1388, 1420
4:1 1421
4:10 1417
4:14 Inset
4:15 1413
4:48 Inset
4:54 1396
5:17, 19 1388
5:22 1397
6:5 1399
6:6 1421
6:10 1391
6:28 1409
6:35 Inset
6:38 Inset
6:39 1413
6:45 1429
6:48 1407
6:50 1413
6:63 1430
6:65 1388, 1420
7:12 1394
7:21 1397
7:22 1429
7:26 1415
8:5 1402
8:12 Inset
8:19 1417
8:51 Inset
8:52 Inset, 1405
8:56 1405

John
9:4 1431
9:8 1421
10:5 Inset
10:10 1387
10:24. 1394
10:28 Inset
10:35 1420
14:12 1417
11:13-15 1398
11:26 Inset
11:50 1413
11:56 Inset, 1405
12:18 1422
12:27 1399
12:47 1400
13:8 Inset, 1405
13:17 1417
13:18 1430
13:27 1381
13:38 Inset
14:7 1417
14:22 1415
15:6 1418
15:22 1417, 1429
15:24 1417, 1429
15:25 1430
16:7 Inset
16:13 1397
16:24 1388
17:7 1419
17:9, 23 1388
17:11 1390
17:21 ff. 1366
17:25 1391
18:11 Inset
18:18 1406
18:28 1413
18:30 1429
18:39 1399
19:11 1417
20:23 1418, 1419
20:25 Inset, 1405
20:27 1387

Acts
1:2 1412
1:25 1396
2:40 1396
3:9, 10 1390
3:11 1390
4:2 1428
4:5 1423
4:10 1421
4:13 1421
4:17 1425
4:25 1397
5:14 1390
5:24 1408
5:25 1389
5:38 1418
5:39 1415
7:18 1412
7:26 1397
7:34 1394
8:11 1407
8:20 1408
8:31 1408, 1421
8:36 1425
8:40 1427
9:2 1419
9:3 1423
9:9 1406
9.32 1423
9:37 1423
9:42 1423
9.43 1423
10:17 1408
10:25 1423
10:47 1425
11:17 1417
11:26 1423
13:38 1421
13:41 Inset, 1418
14:1 1423
14:4 1394
14:18 1425
15:6 1419
15:8 1396
16:3 1421
16:6 1425
16:9 1406
16:15 1417
16:16 1423
17:6 1396
17:11 1408
17.18 1394, 1408
17:26 1391
17:27 1408
17:32 1394
18:2 1407
18:3 1428
18:18 1406
18:31 1421
19:1 1423
19:36 1389, 1396
20:16 1408
20:20 1425
20:23 1430
20:27 1425
21:1 1423
21:5 1423
21:33 1389, 1408

Acts
22:6 1423
22:17 1423
22:20 1406
23:9 1417
23:17 1397
23:18 1397
24:19 1408
24:21 1379
24:23 1425
25:4 1422
25:10 1389
25:11 1417, 1424
25:16 1408, 1422
25:20 1408
26:5 1418
26:18 1392, 1415
26:29 1408
26:32 1417, 1429
27:1 1424
27:4 1428
27:9 1407
27:12 1408
27:31 1419
27:33 1412
27:39 1408
27:44 1395, 1423
28:8 1423
28:9 1396
28:17 1423
28:24 1394
28:26 Inset
28:27 1415
28:28 1421

Romans
2:17 1417
2:25 1418
3:4 1413
4:8 1399, Inset
4:13 1424
4:14 1416
5:15 1417
6:1 1394
6:5 1417
6:15 1399
6:17 1422
7:2 1419
7:16 1422
7:18 1424
7:25 1378
9:17 1413
9:22 1417
10:6 1399
10:14 1399
10:15 1419
11:2 1390
11:8 1424
11:14 1421
11:17 1417
11:25 1412
12:6-8 1390
12:18 1416
13:8 1424
14:2 1395
14:13 1424
14:21 1424
14:23 1419
15:19 1414
15:20 1414
15:22 1425
15:24 1403

1 Corinthians
1:10 1388, 1397, 1406, 1413
2:8 1417
2:12 1388
3:3 1411
3.14 1417
3:15 1417
5: 8 1414
6:7 1421
7:7 1394
7:11 1419
7:16 1387
7:26 1424
7:28 1419
8:13 1399, Inset, 1416
9:12 1417
10:17 1397
11:6 1424
11:18 1422
11:21 1395
11:23 1399
11:26 1412
12:8 1395
12:13 1397
12:25 1413
12:28 1395
13:1-3 1420
13:2 1388, 1420
14:10 1408
14:11 1388, 1420
14:20 1378, 1383
14:26 1378
14:27 1379
14:28 1418
14:39 1424, 1425
15:10 1379
15:14 1417
15:17 1417
15:19 1389, 1417
15:25 1412

1 Cor.
15:32 1416
15:37 1408
15:51 1397
16:11 1399

2 Corinthians
1:8 1425
1:9 1388
1:10 1413
1:24 1429
2:1 1424
2:5 1417
2:10 1417
2:13 1427
2:16 1395
3:5 1429
3:7 1417
4:3 1417
4:7 1413
5:1 1419
5:16 1417
5:19 1406
7:1 1399
7:8 1417
7:11 1424
7:12 1417, 1427
7:14 1417
8:10 1424
8:11 1403, 1413, 1424,1427
9:1 1387, 1424
9:3 1388, 1406
9:4 1419
9:7 1390
10:2 1424
10:6 1417
11:16 1390
11:30 1416
12:11 1416
12:20 1403

Galatians
1:7 1420
1:8 1419
2:2 1403
2:13 1414
2:15 1390
2:17 1417
2:21 1416
3:19 1412
3:21 1417
4:17 1403
4:22 1377,
4:28 1379
4:30 Inset
5:2 1418.
5:7 1425
5:16 1399, Inset
5:25 1416
6:1 1419
6:11 1378
6:16 1381

Ephesians
1:18 1407
3:12 1387
4:11 1394
4:13 1396, 1397
4:29 1416
6:8 1419
6:21 1388
8:5 1396
10:1 1396

Philippians
1:16 1394
1:18 1430
1:21 1424
1:22 1424
1:24 1424
1:25 1398
1:26 1398
1:28 1392
1:29 1424
2:6 1424
2:13 1424
2:21 1397
2:23 1386
2:26 1406
3:11 1421
3:12 1429
4:10 1424
4:11 1429
4:17 1429

Colossians
1:7f. 1397
1:8 1398
2:2 1382
2:20 1417
2:21 1399
3.1 1417
3:11 1411
3:13 1418
4:10 1419

Thessalonians
2 :7 1403
2:16 1425
2:20 1390
3:3 1424
3:8 1421
4:6 1424

1 Thess.
4:15 Inset
5:3 Inset
5:10 1403

2 Thessalonians
2:3 1399
3:13 1399

1 Timothy
1:3 1382
2:15 1419
2:16 1425
3:5 1417
3:15 1388
4:3 1425
5:1 1399
5:10 1417
6:3 1420

2 Timothy
1:5 1399
1:6 1415
2:5 1418
2:12 1416, 1417
2:13 1416
2:20 1395
2:21 1419
2:25 1415

Titus
1:6 1416

Hebrews
2:1 1415
2:15 1426
3:6 1419
3:12 1415
3:43 1412
3:14 1419
4:1 1399, 1415
4:8 1417
4:11 1399
5:12 1392
6:8 1418
6:9 1416
7:20, 23 1389
7:21 1394
7:23 1394, 1425
7:24 1394
8:11 Inset
8:12 Inset
9:6 1396
9:17 1415
10:15 1407
10:17 Inset
10:31 1424
10:38 1419
11:3 1407
11:32 1402, 1409
12:10 1394
12:13 1413
12:20 1419
12:28 1402
13:23 1418
13:55 bis Inset

James
1:23 1420
2:1-3 1420
2:7 1426
2:16 1419
3:2 1397
3:7 1382
3:16 1411
4:2 1383
5:15 1388, 1420

1 Peter
2:6 1399, Inset
2:20 1417
3:13 1419
3:14 1408
3:17 1408
5:5 1397
5:7 1392

2 Peter
1:10 Inset
2:20 1416
3:11 1396
3:1,6 1419

1 John
1:4 1388
2:21 1397
2:28 1413
2:29 1388, 1420
4:12 1418
5:13 1388
5:15 1421

2 John
8 1413
10 1420
12 1388

Revelation
1:12 1383
2:4 1393
2:11 Inset
2:14 1393
2:20 1393
2:22 1421

Rev.

2:25	1412	15:4	Inset
2:26	1430	16:1	1411
3:3	Inset, 1405, 1419	16:9	1430
3:5	Inset	16:15	1413
3:12	Inset	17:1	1399, 1407
3:18	1413	17:17	1412
6:10	1394	18:4	1390, 1413
7:1	1413	18:7	Inset
7:9	1390	18:14	Inset
7:13	1396	19:9	1396
7:16	Inset	19:10	1399
8:12	1413	19:29	1399
9:5	1413	20:15	1417
9:6	Inset, 1405	21:5	1396
11:11	1378	21:9	1399, 1407
12:7	1426	21:13	1390
13:2	1414	21:25	Inset
13:10	1417	21:27	Inset
13:12	1397	22:6	1396
13:13	1391		

(b) OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA

T. W. PAGE

Genesis

3:16	1388	10:12	1389
18:19	1398	10:13	1389
26:5	1398	11:22	1389
44:7	1382	15:10	1392
44:17	1382	22:18	1390
		22:19	1390
		29:4	1424
		33:9	1389

Exodus

12:55	1398
13:10	1398
15:26	1398
19:5	1398
19:8	1390
19:9	1390

Leviticus

9:5	1390
18:30	1398
22:9	1398

Numbers

6:7	1392
11:33	14:12

Deuteronomy

5:10	1389
5:25	1389
6:17	1389

Joshua

22:29	1382
24:16	1382

1 Samuel (1 Kings)

9:11	1392
21:3	1382
22:13	1391

2 Samuel (2 Kings)

14:4	1393

1 (3) Kings

8:24	1391
8:25	1398
8:61	1391

2 (4) Kings

6:19	1421

Nehemiah
4:22 1391
9:10 1391

Esther
4:11 1391
9:27 1391

Job
1:5 1379, 1381
1:6 1391
1:13 1391
2:1 1391
3:4 1391

Psalms
50:6 1413
57 (58):10 1412

Proverbs
8:26 1412

Isaiah
11:16 1391
2:11 1391

Jeremiah
11:2 1391
11:5 1391
11:6 1391
11:20 1391
11:39 1391
11:43 1391
11:51 1391
44 (l7):5 1412

Ezekiel
1:12 1381
1:15 1379
1:16 1381
1:19 1379
1:20 1381
2:6 1378
3:3 1379
3:9 1378
3:131 1378, 1383
3:18 1383
3:19 1383
3:20 1383
5:5 1380
5:13 1381
6:10 1381
6:13 1381

Hosea
2:3 1391
3:2 1380
7:5 1391

Amos
5:20 1391

Micah
7:11 1391
7:14 1391

Baruch
1:15 1391
1:20 1391
2:6 1391
2.26 1391

1 Maccabees
8:26 1398
9:10 1382
13:5 1382

2 Maccabees
"6:21 . . .184" 1383
9:2, etc. 1392

4 Maccabees
9:27 1412

Aquila and Sym. (ii/A.D.)
Deuteronomy 11:22 1398
Proverbs 8:26 1412

Theodotion
Daniel 9:7, 15 1391

(d) INDEX OF PAPYRI IN THE ADDENDA

R. F. PALMER

B. G. U.
No. 250 1389
423 1391

B.M.
No. 613 1387

F. P.
No. 77 1393
78 1393
112 1387
115 1387

L. P.
III, 4 1412
M. P.
No. 11 1382

0. P.
No. 226 1338
237 1389
488 1393
903 1388
933 1389, 1412
935 1429
941 1393
1007 1388
1066 1387, 1421
1067 1388
1068 1413
1069 1407
1100 1379
1102 1379
1117 1381 bis
1126 1378 bis
1152 1379
1158 1381
1185 1388
1189 1396
1204 1421
1297 1389
1299 1382
1409 1389, 1393
1414 1389
1450 1393
1482 1387
1483 1421, 1430
1489 1388, 1415
1593 1386

Par. P.
No. 574 1387

P. Tor.
Papyri graeci regii Taur. Musei Aeg., ed. A. Peyron. 2 vols. Turin, 1826, 1827
i. 5:27 1389

P. Rylands
Catal. of the Gk. Pap. in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, ed. A. S. Hunt. Vol. 2. Manchester, 1911
Vol. ii 1380

Tb. P.
No. 5 1387
6 1425
27 1425 bis
38 1425
61 (a) 1425
61 (b) 1425
62 1387 bis
63 1387
64 1387
78 1386
82 1387 bis
119 1387

(e) INDEX OF GREEK LITERATURE IN THE ADDENDA

R. F. PALMER

i. CLASSICAL

Homer (? x/viii B.c.)
Odyssey T. 464 1396

Aristophanes (vi/B.c.)
Plutus 965 1396
Ranae 1396

Thucydides (v 'B.C.)
i, 114 1392

Demosthenes (iv/B.c.)
de Pace 11 1409

Xenophon (iv/B.C.)
Cyro. 2. 2. 7 1396
2. 2. 30 1396
3. 2. 18 1396
4. 1. 11 1396
Cyrus 1. 4, 20 1392
Hellen., Ox. P. 226, 1. 16 . 1388

Plato (iv/B. .)
Apol. 28C 1381
Leges 678D 1392

Eratosthenes (iii/13.c.)
Catasterismi 40 1392
Ep. to Ephesians 8:1 1412
Polybius (ii/B.c.)
32. 3 (7). 13 1385

Diodorus Siculus (ii/B.C.)
Bibl. Hist. 10. 3. 4 1387

ii. KOINH
Barnabas (i/A.D.)

8:5 1396
10:1 1396
10:3 1412
15:5 1412
Appian (ii/A. .)
Bell. Pun. 68 1385

Arrian (ii/A.
Epictetus ii, 22, 10 1379
ii, 22, 36 1379
iv, 9, 18 1381
iv, 10, 20 1393
Ench. i, 4 1378
Exped. Alex. 5, 370 1385

Artemidorus (ii/A.D.))
Oneiro. 3. 60 (61) 1387

Hermas (ii/A.D
Vis. 3.18. 3 1391
4. 3. 1 1393
Sim 6 5 5 1385

Ignatius (ii/A.D.)

Ep. to Romans 6:1 1394

Lucian (ii/A.D.)
De Asino 32 1396

Phrynichus (ii/A.D.)
Eclogue Nominum Atticorum 1387

Diogenes Laertius (? iii/A.D.)
De Vitis 4. 50 1385

Agathias (vi/A. .)
Hist 2 9 1396
4.18 1396

Menander Protector (vi/A.D.)
Excerpta e Men. Hist. 30 1396

Diaconus
Vita Porph. 99 1387

N. T. Apocrypha

Gospel of Nic., Pass I, A. 14. 3 1396
Didache 1:4 1393

Xenophon of Ephesus
De Anth. et Habr. 4. 2 1396

Const. Ap. (? A.D.)
7:25 1392

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt: ted.hildebrandt@gordon.edu